

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.

24/01269/FUL

CASE OFFICER

Sam Yuen

DETERMINATION DATE 13.08.2025 **EXT OF TIME**

Address: Harwood Street Garage, Harwood Street, Littleborough, Rochdale, OL15 8NA

Proposal: Erection of bungalow with detached garage and associated parking, landscaping and boundary treatment

PUBLICITY	Weekly list expired?	Y	Site notice expired?	Y
	Neighbour letters expired?	Y	Press Notice expired?	N/A

DELEGATION	Significant departure from local plan?	N	Contrary to national policy?	N
	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	N	Contrary to previous decision?	N
	Major with 10 or more objections and recommending approval?	N	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	N

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	N
	Neighbour comments received?	N

EIA	Screening opinion completed and saved to Onbase?	N
-----	--	---

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	N
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE
----------------	--------

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RK

DATE: 13/08/2025

SITE

The application relates to a parcel of land comprising Harwood Street Garage, a car repair garage and an open grassed area, located in Littleborough. Access to the site is via James William Street (formerly Harwood Street). The nearest adopted highway is James Street, located circa 37m to the southeast.

The car garage occupies the southeast corner of the site and forms part of Baroger Business Park. A separate gravel track traverses some 50m to the north, where the field gently slopes upwards. An outbuilding is located near the end of the track and is used as a store for construction material. The grassed areas are bounded by mature trees and also contains a body of water body to the north end of the site.

The wider area is predominantly residential in context. To the north of the site lies onto Barkers Wood woodland area and open recreational space.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two-bedroom detached bungalow and a detached single garage sited at the end of the existing gravel track to the north of the site, following the demolition of the outbuilding.

The proposed dwelling is of redbrick construction and comprises a rectangular building with a footprint of 119.82m² and measuring 13.6m in length, 11.63m in depth and 5.35 in height. It is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form with a front porch canopy and a single-storey rear projection.

The proposed garage is also of redbrick construction and a similar built form to the dwelling. It is characterised by a dual-pitched roof form and occupies a footprint of 8m by 7m with a ridge height of 5.07m. It features a front garage door of a 3.45m height.

The submitted landscaping plan indicates the formation of paving slabs around the rear perimeter of the dwelling, as well as block paving to serve as hardstanding around the dwelling and garage. Five silver birch trees (*Betula pendula*) are proposed; four along the curtilage boundary to the southeast of the dwelling, and one in a landscaped area to the centre of the block paving along four mixed species shrubs. Much of the existing grassed areas would be retained, as would the existing pond and gravel track.

In addition, 2.1m-high timber fencing would surround the curtilage boundary towards the north of the site.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (PfE)

The Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan was adopted and became part of the statutory development plan for each of the 9 authorities covered by the plan on 21st March 2024. The following policies are relevant:

Policy JP-S1 Sustainable Development

Policy JP-H3 Type, Size and Design of New Housing

Policy JP-G7 Trees and Woodland

Policy JP-G8 A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

C1 Delivering the right amount of housing in the right areas

C3 Delivering the right type of housing

P3 Improving design of new development

G6 Enhancing green infrastructure

G7 Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity

G8 Managing water resources and flood risk

G9 Reducing the impact of pollution, contamination and land instability

T2 Improving accessibility

DM1 General development requirements

Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):

Supplementary Planning Guidance note 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (June 2016)

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

19/00542/OUT - Outline application (including access) for residential development comprising up to 9 dwellings, including demolition of existing buildings – Grant subject to conditions

11/D54327 - Application For New Planning Permission To Replace An Extant Planning Permission (D50492) In Order To Extend The Time Limit For The Erection Of One Dwelling – Refuse

08/D50492 - Erection Of One Dwelling - Resubmission D49544 – Grant subject to conditions

07/D49544 - Erection Of One Dwelling - Withdrawn

05/D45221 – Renewal of Planning Application D39890 for Residential Development – Approved

02/D39890 - Renewal Of Outline Planning Permission D35891 For Residential Development – Approved

98/D35891 - Renewal Of Planning Application D32306 For A Residential Development – Grant subject to conditions

95/D32517 – Erection of one detached dwelling – Grant subject to conditions

95/D32306 - Renewal Of Planning Application D28428 For Residential Development – Grant subject to conditions

92/D28428 – Residential Development – Grant subject to conditions

79/D08570 - Outline Application One Dwelling - Refuse

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Ecological Appraisal

The PEA survey was carried out in January 2024 and the report subsequently submitted. In line with CIEEM guidance, it is recommended that an updated survey is undertaken to ensure that the current site conditions are captured and the impacts are relevant to the current proposals, given that around 18 months has now passed. The submitted PEA refers to a different proposal which includes the demolition of all existing buildings onsite and the creation of nine dwellings. Given these points, a full review of the PEA has not been undertaken as the survey data requires an update.

Given that bat roosting potential was found onsite, the applicant should clarify as to whether any buildings and trees will be removed to facilitate the proposal for one dwelling.

The PEA recommends Environmental DNA (eDNA) surveys on the pond onsite and all ponds within 250m to determine whether great crested newts (GCN) are present. It appears that these surveys have not been carried out, however this will be required given the very close proximity of the onsite pond to the development area. The eDNA survey season is between mid-April to end of June so it is likely that these surveys will need to be carried out in 2026 if they have not been done already.

The above information is required prior to determination of the application.

Biodiversity Net Gain

The proposal is listed as a self-build/custom build application and is therefore exempt from a BNG assessment. Rochdale Borough Council must be satisfied that this is accurate.

Summary

Insufficient information has currently been provided for this application including consideration for great crested newts, out of date survey data and clarifications as to whether any buildings/trees will be removed which may support roosting bats. The information is required prior to determination of the application.

Tree Officer

No comments received at the time of writing.

United Utilities

UU has provided standard advice relating to drainage and UU's assets. Development should explore all options for sustainable management of surface water and avoid surface water entering the public sewer unless absolutely necessary, in line with the NPPG drainage hierarchy. The applicant is advised of their responsibility to investigate the existence of any infrastructure which might impact the proposed design and the need to adhere to relevant guidelines and building regulations including water efficiency.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

No comments received at the time of writing.

Highways And Engineering

This proposal will generate no problematic volume of traffic. The access to the site and parking onsite is satisfactory. No concerns regarding emergency access or refuse collection from this location.

No changes are proposed to the existing highways network and no new highways are intended as a part of this development.

Highways have no new road safety concerns as a result of this development.

The proposal will have no noticeable impact upon the highway network and no objection are had to the proposal.

Environmental Health - Noise/Odours

The Environmental Protection Team recommends a condition restricting construction hours.

Environmental Control (Landfill Gas)

The Environmental Health Officer has noted the submitted Phase I and II report details further work to be undertaken, including a Phase III Remediation Strategy Report and a Phase IV Validation Report, which should be provided to assess the adequacy of any remediation strategy. If this is not forthcoming and should the LPA deem fit to grant permission, the Officer recommends a pre-commencement condition relating to the submission of a remediation scheme.

The Coal Authority

The Coal Authority considers that the content and conclusions of the supporting Combined Phase I – II Geoenvironmental Report are sufficient for the purposes of the planning system in demonstrating that the application site is safe and stable. The Coal Authority therefore has no objection to the proposed development.

The Authority has also made note on the need to consider potential for mine gases and the impact of any SuDS on land stability and public safety risks posed by coal mining legacy.

REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbour notifications via letters were sent to surrounding properties and a site notice was posted within the vicinity of the site. No comments were received.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development

The application site is located within the Defined Urban Area as allocated under saved UDP Policy G/D/1. New development, wherever possible and appropriate, should be concentrated within the urban area in order to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside.

The proposed development is sited in an area comprising open grassland and a car repair garage. Whilst the garage would be considered previously developed land the remainder of the site is undeveloped and thus constitutes greenfield land. Policy C1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy states the Council will consider the sustainable development of greenfield sites within the urban area where it is demonstrated that the development would have limited adverse impact on green infrastructure or amenity value in and around the site; green infrastructure is, wherever possible, incorporated into the scheme; and where the sites which provide the best access to a range of services, jobs and facilities.

The principle of development for the application site was considered in a previous outline application (ref: 19/00542/OUT), which was accepted by reason of its contribution towards the Borough's five-year housing land supply from 2018. The proposed dwelling in the current plans would still represent contribution to the housing supply albeit as a single dwelling this weight is diminished. Nonetheless the proposal for residential use of the site could be acceptable in principle under Policy C1 subject to

consideration of the impact on green infrastructure or amenity value in and around the site along with assessment against all other material considerations which are set out in this report.

Design and Appearance

The NPPF states achieving good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. This is also reflected in Policy JP-P1 of the PfE and Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which require development to respect local context with regard to scale, density, massing, height, layout, landscape, materials and access. In addition, Section 5.1 of the SPD states development proposals should be in keeping with the host property and generally should be subservient to it.

Paragraph 139 states *“development that is not well designed 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.”*

CS Policy C3 seeks to make efficient use of land available for residential development by building at appropriate densities and Paragraph 130 of the Framework states applications which fail to make sufficient use of land should be refused.

The application proposes a single dwelling on a parcel of land which measures circa 0.48 hectares. PfE Policy JP-H4 sets out the minimum density standards for new housing; the application site is located outside of designated centres and public transport stops and would be subject to a minimum net residential density of 35 dwellings per hectare. The proposal would equate to a density of two dwellings per hectare which falls substantially short of the density standard of the PfE. Considering the site is located in an accessible location close to established residential developments and within walking distance to the A58 and high frequency bus routes, the proposal development does not comprise an appropriate density and does not represent an efficient use of the available land.

The design of the proposed dwelling also fails to respond positively to the surrounding site context and identity. The surrounding area is characterised by strong building lines of characteristic two-storey stone-built buildings along New Road. The regular layout and composition of streets and dwellings is extended to James Street and the connecting roads. Key buildings set back from the main routes through the local area are of notable architecture and provide a positive variety to the townscape, such as those found 250m southeast of the site east of Deanley Ave and South of New Street/Featherstall Road.

Whilst the local character is somewhat diminished in the more recent redbrick housing development, there remains uniformity in the layout, density and built forms of the surrounding dwellings.

The proposal is a large, detached bungalow which sits in an isolated position within open grassland. Considering its proximity to the existing residential development, there is little evidence to suggest the local context and identity has informed the design of the proposal in terms of the site layout, scale and built forms. The proposed bungalow lacks visual interest or detailing which would define itself as high-quality design and would fail to enhance the overall character and appearance of the area.

By virtue of its excessive size and height, and the irregular form of the opening door, the proposed garage would also constitute a non-subservient addition to the host dwelling and would distort the visual relationship between the two buildings.

Taken as a whole, the proposal fails to demonstrate an efficient use of the available land and fails to address the site context in strong or visually interesting way, resulting in a development which would not be considered to be well-designed in the context of NPPF Paragraph 139. The proposal therefore fails to accord with CS Policies DM1 and P3, the SPD, PfE Policy JP-P1 and the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

Protection of residential amenity is considered under Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, which states development proposals should ensure they do not adversely affect the amenity of residents or users through visual intrusion, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of privacy.

Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers

The proposed dwelling and garage would be sited on a relatively isolated and enclosed location within the site and does not directly face any properties. The proposed rear-facing bedroom window would be sited in excess of 10m from the curtilage boundary of nos. 1 and 2 Starring Grove to the northeast. Section 4.1 of the SPD sets out a minimum distance of 10.5m between an upper floor principal window and a directly facing curtilage boundary. Given the single-storey form of the dwelling, and the substantial screening afforded by the mature trees at the common boundary, it is considered the proposal would not result in significant overlooking into the neighbouring amenity space.

The proposed side-facing master bedroom window is sited 10.53m from an ancillary outbuilding to the southeast. Considering the building is not a residential dwelling, no adverse amenity impacts have been identified in this regard.

Amenity of Host Occupiers

The proposal is a single-storey, two-bedroom dwelling with a gross internal area of 105.65m² which far exceeds the minimum standard for a 2b4p dwelling, as set out in the *nationally described space standard* (NDSS). The application has not detailed the number of expected occupants, notwithstanding, the two bedrooms would satisfy the NDSS in relation to the minimum floor area and width of a double and single bedroom respectively.

The submitted plans indicate the provision of natural light to all habitable rooms and that ample garden space of a functional layout would be retained.

Noise

CS Policies G9 and DM1 require that new development does not have impacts that lead to an unacceptable increase in noise pollution and to mitigate against any impacts due to noise, air, dust, light and odour pollution.

The Environmental Health Officer was consulted and raised no objection to the proposal. Notwithstanding, should the application be approved, a condition for construction hours restrictions would be recommended in the interest of noise and residential amenity.

Taken as a whole, the proposed development would not adversely impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and would ensure a satisfactory standard of amenity for the host occupiers, in accordance with CS Policy DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Highways and Parking

Policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy aims to locate development where good access to public transport is available or can be provided. Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy requires development proposals to provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location.

The Council's Highways Officer was consulted on the proposed plans and raised no objections. The proposed dwelling is sustainably located and would retain satisfactory access to the site as well as sufficient off-street parking space as per Appendix 5 of the Core Strategy. The proposal would not generate unacceptable level of traffic and would have a neutral impact on the highway network.

The proposal would not result in any undue harm to highway safety and would accord with CS Policies T2 and DM1.

Ecology

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment through minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. PfE Policy JP-G8 aims for a net enhancement of biodiversity through increasing the quality of existing habitats and its management. CS Policy G7 also requires developments to protect existing biodiversity including trees and vegetation and developments should result in a net gain. The following headings sets out the assessment of the impact on relevant species and biodiversity net gain.

Bats

The submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal was carried out in January 2024 and refers to a different proposal relating to the development of nine dwellings following the demolition of all existing buildings onsite. As over 18 months has passed since the completion of the survey, the PEA is therefore out of date and does not capture the current site conditions in relation to the current proposed dwelling.

Notwithstanding, the submitted plans indicate the removal of an outbuilding to the centre of the site, currently used as a store for construction material. The PEA has assessed this building (B2) to have low value for roosting bats though recommended a bat emergence or re-entry survey to be conducted during active bat season. However, no subsequent survey has been submitted during the course of this application. It was also noted that during validation, the applicant had queried the submission of an endoscopic test in lieu of a bat survey which was accepted by GMEU. However, no evidence of this test has been submitted.

Notwithstanding this, the removal of the outbuilding as low value roost would still potentially require a license and a dusk survey should have been carried out prior to determination.

In considering the acceptability of the development within the planning regime, in respect of protected species, specific regard must be given to The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 that requires that “Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.” Damage or destruction of a breeding site would be an offence under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (the ‘Regulations’) unless a Natural England (NE) European Protected Species (EPS) licence is issued prior to commencement of works or confirmation is received from NE that the development would not require such a licence.

When determining whether or not to grant a licence, Natural England must be satisfied that the following three tests have been met:

- (a) Preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest;
- (b) There is no satisfactory alternative; and
- (c) The action will not be detrimental to maintaining the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in its natural range.

In the absence of an application for an EPS Licence, the LPA are required by Regulation 9(3) of the Regulations to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive in the determination. The LPA are therefore required to consider whether there would be a reasonable prospect of a licence being granted by applying the three tests.

In regards the first test the development is not addressing any identified public harm or public safety concerns. In regards the second test the LPA considers the application site to be capable of delivering a residential development without the removal of the outbuilding and thus it is considered that there is an alternative for the site. The

application therefore fails the second test. For the third and final test, insufficient information has been submitted regarding the presence of bats in the outbuilding, though it is noted mitigation details can be secured by planning conditions. As such, subject to conditions, the application may satisfy the third test in terms of maintaining the population of bats at the site.

In light of the comments provided by GMEU, and in the absence of a dusk survey, it is considered that LPA cannot be satisfied at this time that there is a reasonable prospect of European Protected Species Mitigation License being granted by Natural England. The information submitted with the application in regards to protected species is therefore unacceptable and is contrary to CS Policy G7, PfE, and the NPPF.

Great Crested Nests

The PEA recommends Environmental DNA (eDNA) surveys on the pond onsite and all ponds within 250m to determine whether great crested newts (GCN) are present. No subsequent surveys have been carried out. Whilst it was noted in the PEA submitted under 19/00542/OUT that the pond is unlikely to support GCN, in the absence of an up-to-date PEA and survey, the LPA cannot discount the impact to the protected species given the close proximity of the onsite pond to the development area.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

As of 12th February 2024, BNG of 10% is mandatory for development in England under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. In the submitted supporting statement the applicant has claimed the development to be self-build which falls within the exemptions listed under The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024.

However, in order to meet the self-build exemption, the development must meet the definition provided in the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act (2015) in that such is the case where an individual, an association of individuals, or persons working with or for individuals or associations of individuals, build or complete houses to be occupied as homes by those individuals.

In order to comply with the specific requirements to meet the definition of self-build and the requirements in perpetuity, a legal mechanism for controlling this would be necessary were the application proposals to be approved. The applicant has not put forward any such mechanism.

In the absence of a biodiversity matrix, it is not possible to conclude the specific impact upon biodiversity that the development would have. The application fails to demonstrate that bats and great crested newts on the site would be appropriately protected with the absence of a dusk survey and eDNA survey. No assessment to demonstrate quantifiable biodiversity net gain with regard to the proposed trees and landscaping has been set out in the submission. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Paragraph 187 of the NPPF and Policy JP-G8 of the PfE.

Taken as a whole, the proposed development would not be acceptable and would be contrary to CS Policies G6 and G7, the PfE, and the NPPF.

Trees

The proposed plans do not appear to indicate the removal of existing trees and would include additional planting of silver birch trees and other shrubs. A brief survey on the existing trees was submitted though no formal Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Survey have been carried out. The Council's Tree Officer was consulted but has not provided comments. Notwithstanding, adequate protection of the existing trees during construction can be controlled through condition as to prevent harm to existing green infrastructure.

Drainage

CS Policy G8 requires the Council to manage water resources and flood risk. The application site is not located within a flood zone but is within a critical drainage area. The area containing the pond also has been identified to have a 3.3% chance of surface water flooding each year. The proposed dwelling would be within close proximity to this area but is not expected to be directly encroaching it.

The submitted Flood Risk Assessment refers to a proposal for residential development but does not specifically reference the current proposed plans. The Council's Drainage Officer has not provided comments regarding the proposal. United Utilities was also consulted and provided general drainage advice with respect to its infrastructure. Notwithstanding, in the event the application is acceptable, further details could be secured through planning conditions or through compliance with Building Regulations where more appropriate as to mitigate the flood risk impact in the area.

The proposed plans indicate the use of block paving for the hardstanding but has not detailed whether it would be permeable; should the application be acceptable on all considerations, subbase details would be sought from the applicant.

On this basis the proposal would be acceptable in accordance with CS Policy G8 and the NPPF.

Land Contamination

CS Policy G9 states the Council will ensure that any risks arising from contaminated land or land instability are identified, and that any appropriate actions to address these risks are taken, prior to development taking place.

Consultation has been carried out with the Council's Public Protection Officer who noted the submitted Phase I and II report recommended further work to be undertaken, including a Phase III Remediation Strategy Report and a Phase IV Validation Report, which is required to assess the adequacy of any remediation strategy. In the event the application is approved a pre-commencement condition would be attached requiring the submission of a remediation scheme.

Coal Mining Risks

The application site falls within the Defined Development High Risk Area. The Coal Authority records indicate that within the application site and surrounding area there are coal mining features and hazards which need to be considered, specifically probable coal workings at shallow depth. The Phase I and II report confirms that the shallowest coal seams will have sufficient competent rock cover above them to afford ground stability. The Coal Authority is satisfied with the findings of the report and has no objection to the development.

Subject to the suggested condition and the carrying out of any subsequent actions in respect of the outcome of the Phase I and II investigation, the requirements of Policy G9 of the adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF will have been met.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

1. The proposal dwelling would not be constructed at an appropriate density for the size of the application site and would represent an inefficient use of the available land. By virtue of its layout, scale, built form, and lack of visual interest, the proposed dwelling constitutes an unsatisfactory standard of design which fails to reflect the local context and would cause undue visual harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. The proposals do not make efficient use of the site and are not well-designed and therefore fail to accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development', the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development would not unduly impact on bats and great crested newts at the site, which are European Protected Species. In the absence of a dusk survey, the development fails to meet the three tests as required by the Habitats Directive to establish that there would be a reasonable prospect of a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence being granted. The proposal therefore does not provide appropriate protection to a European Protected Species and is contrary to Policy G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. In the absence of a completed biodiversity matrix and any legal mechanism set forward to comply with the definition of self-build housing in perpetuity, the application fails to demonstrate that the proposals would be able to secure an enhancement to biodiversity. The proposal would as such be contrary to Policies G6 and G7 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-G8 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Procedure Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

Notes for Applicant:

INFORMATIVES

For the avoidance of doubt, this Decision Notice relates to the following submitted plans:

- Location Plan – drawing no. 2024/027/100A received 27/03/2025
- Existing Site Plan – drawing no. 2024/027/101A received 27/03/2025
- Proposed Site Plan – drawing no. 2024/027/102A received 27/03/2025
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – drawing no. M24-27-103 REV01 received 23/12/2024
- Proposed Site Elevations – drawing no. M24-27-104 received 23/12/2024
- Proposed Boundary Treatments – drawing no. M24/027/106A received 27/03/2025
- Proposed Landscaping Plan – drawing no. M24/027/105 received 23/12/2024