

APPLICATION NUMBER: 24/01280/FUL

DELEGATED DECISION CHECKLIST AND REPORT

APPLICATION NO.	CASE OFFICER	DATE
24/01280/FUL	Nick Brookman	24 March 2025

DETERMINATION DATE (EXTENSION OF TIME)

28 March 2025

Address: Land Adjacent to 70 Kirkway Middleton M24 1EL

Proposal: Erection of 2 no. 2 bedroom detached bungalows with associated parking and landscaping.

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?	Y

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

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

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

CHECKED AND SIGNED OFF BY: RK

DATE: 25/03/2025

SITE

The application site is located beside number 70 Kirkway, Middleton. The application site currently comprises an unused area of land in between semi-detached bungalows and semi-detached dormer bungalows on Kirkway, Middleton. There are mature trees on the site which is set back from the existing building line on Kirkway as shown below:



Opposite the site is St Peters Roman Catholic School.

There is an informal pathway that runs behind the bungalows to Farmway Park but this path has no status.

The application site is within the Defined Urban Area and within a Development High Risk Area.

PROPOSAL

The application proposes the erection of 2 no. 2 bedroom detached dwellings. Parking is proposed to the front of the dwellings with a garden being located at the rear of each dwelling. The dwellings are proposed to be set back from the highway and further back than the existing building line.

The materials are brickwork on elevations to match existing neighbouring dwellings and red concrete roof tiles to match existing neighbours.

Both plots 1 and 2 are identical in floor space, design and appearance. The prevailing difference is notably that plot 2 has a larger driveway to the front and both rear gardens are different shapes and sizes.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Sub-Regional

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:

JP-S1 Sustainable Development

JP-G8 A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity

JP-P1 Sustainable Places

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS):

SO1 Delivering a more prosperous economy

E1 Establishing thriving town, district and local centres

SO2 Creating successful and healthy communities

C1 Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places

C3 Delivering the right type of housing

SO3 Improving design, image and quality of place

P3 Improving design of new development

SO4 Promoting a greener environment

G6 Enhancing green infrastructure

G8 Managing water resources and flood risk

G9 Reducing the impact of pollution, contamination and land instability

SO5 Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport

T2 Improving accessibility

DM1 General development requirements

SD1 Delivering sustainable development

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

Application 23/00875/FUL – Refused 24th January 2024.

1. The proposed development, by reason of the siting of the dwellings behind the established building line and cramped plots on the site the development is considered poor design and will have a negative impact on the surrounding character of the area. On this basis the proposed development is contrary to policies P1, P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed development through the size of the rear gardens is considered to provide a poor standard of amenity. This is as rear gardens are small, especially Plot 2 and do not reflect the character of the area. . On this basis the proposed development is contrary to policies P1, P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. Insufficient information has been provided within this submission. The 'Coal Mining Risk Assessment' is not considered acceptable. The report fails to sufficiently consider the risks posed by the recorded mine entry. The proposal will not comply with G9 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Planning Appeal 3342849 - The application was dismissed on appeal on the 16th August 2024.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

United Utilities (UU)

United Utilities have no further comment to make on the application beyond the scope of their generic advice.

The Coal Authority (TCA)

TCA have set out that they would reiterate their comments on the 15th July 2024 (which relates to planning appeal 3342849. Accordingly, TCA would raise no objection subject to condition.

Lead Local Flood Authority/Drainage

No comments received.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU)

GMEU have commented:

Bats

A condition should be used to secure a method statement for bats for the removal of Tree 1. Once approved this method statement must be followed in full.

Any new external lighting must be designed in line with best practice guidelines (e.g. <https://www.bats.org.uk/our-work/buildings-planning-and-development/lighting>) to avoid impacts on nocturnal animals such as bats by ensuring features used by foraging and commuting bats remain un-lit.

A bat box plan is included in figure 3 of the ecology report and should be delivered via any planning application on the site.

Nesting Birds

There is habitat suitable for nesting birds present on the site which includes hedgerows, trees and other vegetation.

A condition should be secured to ensure site clearance, tree works or vegetation removal takes place outside the main bird nesting period (March – August inclusive)

unless it can otherwise be demonstrated that no active bird nests are present. Pre-commencement checks for nesting barn owl need to be included in this as a precaution.

A compensatory nest box scheme has been provided in Figure 3 of the ecology report and should be secured via condition.

Other Protected Species

No other protected species or evidence of protected species were record on the site, although suitable habitat is present which could be suitable to species such as hedgehog.

A number of precautionary working methods for species such as hedgehog have been identified in the ecology report should be followed during the works.

An informative should be used so that the applicant is aware of the legal protection that certain species receive and that the granting of planning permission does not negate the need to abide by the laws that are in place to protect biodiversity. If at any time any protected species are found or are suspected of being present on the site and adversely affected by the development, work should cease immediately and an ecologist/LPA should be contacted.

Invasive Species

Himalayan Balsam and variegated yellow archangel (both listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981) were identified on site.

A condition for a Method Statement to deal with the control of invasive species is therefore recommended.

Biodiversity Net Gain

A small sites BNG metric has been submitted with this application and appears to be a reasonable representation of the baseline and post development habitats. This has identified that there will be a small habitat (-0.6241) and hedgerow (-0.0130) loss. Due to the nature of the development, it is not possible to achieve a 10% net gain on the site, and the ecology report states that offsite units will be required. The LPA can be reasonably confident that it will be possible for this small unit value to be purchased off site, and that the applicant will be able to discharge the Biodiversity Gain Plan condition, if planning permission is granted.

The Biodiversity Gain Condition will be apply to any permission granted for this site, and should detail that a Biodiversity Gain Plan should be submitted and agreed in writing by the LPA, prior to the commencement of any development. This should include an updated Statutory Metric with an off-site baseline and post-development plan if required, and the process by which a finalised number of off-site units will be secured, or a commitment to purchase statutory credits only as a last resort.

Highways and Engineering

Highways have set out that they have no objections to the proposed development.

Public Rights of Way Officer

The Councils Rights of Way Officer has set out that there are no definitive rights of way identified that would impact on the proposal, however, there appears to be

substantial route running from Kirkway to Farmway, I note from the associated papers that this is to be retained, if you could ensure that it continues to be available for use by the general public as any obstruction may cause a delay with the development should a potential claim of footpath be made to the Council to add the route to the definitive map and statement. The works may be prohibited pending decision of a claim should any member of the public with supporting evidence claim to have used a route where the buildings are proposed to be situated.

Environmental Protection

The Council's Contaminated Land Officer has no objection subject to condition.

Environmental Health

Environmental Health have no objection in principle to the proposed development subject to condition.

Tree Officer

No comments have been provided.

REPRESENTATIONS

The application was publicised by sending letters to adjoining neighbours on 22nd January 2025 and a site notice was posted on 28th January 2025.

One letter of objection was received which stated that the site is a right of access on common land known as Sunk Lane.

In response to this comment Officers can confirm that the informal footpath adjacent to the application site remains unaffected and whilst any disturbance to it would be temporary, it would not be permanent.

ANALYSIS

Principle of Development.

The application seeks permission for the erection of two detached dwellings each with two bedrooms. The site lies within the defined Urban Area where Policy G/D/1 of the UDP seeks to concentrate development. New development, wherever possible and appropriate, should be concentrated within the urban area in order to support urban regeneration and to protect the countryside.

Places for Everyone establishes the need for at least 616 net additional dwellings per year in Rochdale to meet the housing needs of the borough. Policy C1 of The Core Strategy seeks to ensure that sites are sustainable with good access to local services, facilities, green infrastructure, shops, jobs, schools and public transport. In the south of the borough, the Council will seek to maximise the opportunities that exist to provide new housing in sustainable locations.

CS Policy C3 goes on to state that in the south of the borough, amongst other things, the focus will be on widening housing choice and delivering housing that better suits the needs of existing and future residents.

Further to those relevant policies as identified in the Rochdale Core Strategy, relevant policies in Places for Everyone (PfE) have been identified. PfE Policy JP-S 1 sets out that development should seek to maximise economic, social and

environmental benefits. PfE Policy JP-H2 states that there should be a significant increase in the supply of new housing, including, specifically, the supply of low-cost market housing. Furthermore, as set out in PfE Policy JP-H4, new housing should be delivered at a density appropriate for the location and taking into account the site's accessibility.

Paragraph 124 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that *"Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses"*.

In this instance, it is considered that the proposal would lead to the provision of two detached dwellings in a sustainable location. The proposed dwellings created would assist the Borough in meeting its housing requirements albeit marginally.

Further planning considerations are set out below but the proposal is acceptable in principle and in accordance with adopted Rochdale Core Strategy Policies, C1, C3 and Places for Everyone Policies JP-S 1, JPH 2 and JP-H 4, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework.

Design, Character and Appearance

The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities

Paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, which is largely reflected within Policies DM1 and P3 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy, which requires development proposals to demonstrate high quality design.

CS Policy P1 sets out that high quality design will be required in all new developments, requiring that under-used land and buildings are re-used and creating people-friendly and safe environments. CS Policy C3 requires new development to adhere to high standards of design, respecting context (scale, density, massing, height, layout) and contributing positively to the townscape. CS Policy DM1 states that all development proposals should be of a high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area.

Recent revisions to the NPPF are clear that development that is not well designed should be refused, and conversely, significant weight should be given to development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design. In support of this, the Government have produced a suite of guidance documents including Building for a Healthy Life, the National Model Design Code and the National Design Guide which form a material consideration in the assessment of the design of development proposals, and aid Local Authorities and developers alike in understanding what 'good' and 'bad' design looks like.

As was established under planning application 23/00875/FUL and the subsequent Planning Appeal, the siting of the two dwellings are pushed back to the rear of the plot. This results in a cramped design that does not reflect the established building line. The proposed dwellings will not have a front garden or amenity space at the front of the dwelling.

Parking is proposed at the front of both plots. This does not represent the surrounding dwellings as the bungalows either side have front amenity space. The surrounding dwellings are not cramped to the back of their plots. Overall the design is harmful to the character and appearance of the area because it is not consistent with existing dwellings and the lack of consistency constitutes poor design that is harmful and conflicts with local and national design policy.

The dwellings are proposed to be finished in brickwork to match neighbouring properties and the roof is proposed to be finished in concrete tiles to match neighbouring properties.

The proposed layout has not changed substantially since that refused and dismissed at appeal under planning application 23/00875/FUL. The Planning Inspector who dismissed the appeal concluded that *“due to the proposed siting and layout I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not conform with Policies P1, P2, P3 and DM1 of the Rochdale Adopted Core Strategy (2016) (CS) which together, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development is of high-quality design, conserves and enhances the townscape character and respects context having regard to the layout of surrounding buildings. Additionally, it would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which highlights that development should be sympathetic to local character”*.

Given the clear similarities in the layout of the previously dismissed proposals and the application proposals, including the positioning of the proposed dwellings with their associated car parking, it is still considered that the proposed dwellings by reason of their siting and layout design would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the street scene and the development is not in accordance with requirements of CS Policies P2 and P3, and policy contained within the NPPF.

Occupier and Neighbour Amenity

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should always seek to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. Further to the above are the considerations of the Councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) ‘Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development’ which states that new developments *“should be carefully designed to protect the amenity of the occupants of adjoining properties.”*

Neighbour Amenity

Section 4.1 of the Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development SPD sets out minimum distance standards which all new residential developments should adhere to in order to ensure a satisfactory standard of amenity for surrounding, existing and future occupiers. The proposals are satisfactory in respect of their impact on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings and the

Occupier Amenity

In terms of occupier amenity, the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) is a technical standards document produced by the Government to ensure internal space within new dwellings is sufficient for future occupiers. Additionally, in accordance with PfE Policy JP-H3 (Type, Size and Design of New Housing), it is a requirement for all new dwellings to comply with the nationally described space standards and be built to the accessible and adaptable standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable. These standards can be

found here and any future development must adhere to the space standards: Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

Utilising the methodology within the NDSS, the GIA of each plot is broadly 70sqm, discounting areas of low headroom at first floor level, which meets the minimum standard for a 2b3p 2-storey dwelling. The ground floor bedroom measures 11.4sqm and therefore is counted as a single bedroom, and the proposals therefore comply with the NDSS.

Each dwelling's main bedroom would only be served by a single rooflight to the east facing front roof slope, and would therefore deprive each bedroom of direct sunlight for much of the day. Each bedroom is of a generous 25sqm but would only be served by a 0.75sqm (assumed to be inclusive of framing) rooflight which would mean that the main bedroom would heavily rely on the use of artificial lighting from midday and through the afternoon even through the summer months. The provision of natural light in the main bedroom of each dwelling would therefore be insufficient and contrary to the requirements and expectations of the aforementioned planning policies.

Whilst not strictly forming a single storey elevation, the boundary treatments within the rear garden of each plot are of a comparable scale and visual impact and the guidance contained within Section 4.1(iii) is relevant. Taking this into account, it is clear that the 1.5m and 4.8m outlook from the rear facing habitable room fenestration of plots 1 and 2 respectively would fall far short of the expectations of the SPD and would not allow sufficient natural light or outlook within the main living areas of each dwelling.

With regards to outdoor amenity space for future occupiers, as defined within the Council's Residential Development SPD residential amenity is; *'The benefit enjoyed from physical external space which is part of the private home. The level of enjoyment is dependent on a number of factors, including location, size, orientation, sounds, noise, accessibility and enclosure, and general quality of space.'*

Under paragraph 7.33 of PfE, the provision of appropriate outdoor amenity space is defined as being *'vital in delivering high quality homes that support good health'*. With regard to any proposed development, the reasonable needs of occupiers would need to be met and these needs are considered to cover both functional and recreational requirements proportionate to the size of the household, taking into account the surrounding context.

With this in mind, Officers do not dispute that since the dismissed appeal on application 23/00875/FUL, the application now before Officers to determine has increased the size of the rear amenity space to the rear of plot 2. However, the provision of this is facilitated by what will need to be a solid boundary treatment dividing the curtilages of both plots 1 and 2 which comes at the detriment to the occupier amenity of both plots.

The boundary treatment would create a funnel affect leading to the very rear garden area of plot 2 which would not be characteristic of the design of the surrounding area and the neighbouring rear gardens. Any future boundary treatment would be a necessity for the development to facilitate the proposed curtilages and ensure privacy between both plots. But, Officers do not consider that any form of solid boundary treatment in this location could be appropriately designed to achieve its desired outcome given the design of the proposed layout accompanied with the significant lack of space in this location.

Amenity Conclusion

Overall, as proposed, the development results in a poor standard of occupier amenity. It is considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity for both plots and the proposed development does not accord with Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF.

Coal Mining

The proposed development falls within the defined Development High Risk Area. Core Strategy Policy G9 states that 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.

The Coal Authority have been consulted as part of the application and they have confirmed that they have no objection subject to condition.

Accordingly, the scheme is considered acceptable in accordance with CS Policies G9 and the NPPF in this regard.

Drainage

Policy G8 requires that new development does not lead to any increased form of flooding locally or further downstream, does not impede natural water and flood risk management, is not detrimental to existing or potential flood storage areas, contributes where possible to alleviating existing flood risk and is itself well protected from flood risk and ensures prudent use of water resources.

Policy JP-S4 (Flood Risk and the Water Environment) of PfE expects developments to manage surface water runoff through sustainable drainage systems and development should achieve greenfield run-off rates unless it is demonstrated to be impracticable.

The site is located within Flood Zone 1, having a less than 1 in 1,000 annual probability of flooding.

Subject to appropriately worded conditions, Officers consider that the development accords with Policy G8 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-S4 of PfE and the NPPF.

Ecology

Core Policy G8 requires that sites and features of biodiversity and geodiversity importance are given full and appropriate recognition and protection and that opportunities for enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity will be supported. It is expected that development proposals will protect and include existing biodiversity and take opportunities to promote biodiversity and create new habitats using landscaping and building and construction features wherever possible. CS Policy G7 requires that no development should result in a net loss of biodiversity and geodiversity.

PfE Policy JP-G8 seeks to deliver a net enhancement of biodiversity resources through a collective of measures which are broadly aligned with the approach to BNG outlined within the Environment Act (2021), the NPPF and supporting guidance documents. The provisions of the Environment Act in respect of BNG are now a statutory requirement for planning applications and so the proposed development should achieve net gains for biodiversity via species enhancement as guided by the

NPPF (paragraphs 187d and 192 b) to achieve demonstrable net gain for biodiversity.

When determining planning applications paragraph 193 of the NPPF sets out that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. Opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should also be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measureable.

As of 2nd April 2024, BNG of 10% for minor planning applications is mandatory for development in England under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

GMEU were consulted on this application and raised no objection subject to conditions relating to a method statement for bats, site clearance, tree works or vegetation removal outside of the main bird nesting period and a method statement to deal with the control of invasive species. Informatives were also recommended.

The application is accompanied by a small sites BNG metric which has identified that there will be a small habitat (-0.6241) and hedgerow (-0.0130) loss. Due to the nature of the development it will not be possible to achieve a 10% net gain on site. Accordingly, the applicant would need to explore their options for off-site habitat creation and enhancement. At this stage this has not been determined but this could be achieved by paying for habitat credits with a relevant organisation.

Accordingly, in respect of the above subject to condition the proposed development is considered to acceptable and would comply with G6 and G7 of the Core Strategy, PfE and the NPPF.

Trees

The NPPF recognises the important contribution of trees to the character and quality of urban environments, and their role in mitigating and adapting to climate change. Policy JP-G2 of the adopted PfE identifies trees and woodland as vital elements of the green infrastructure network and key features of urban green spaces, which Policy JP-G8 seek to protect and enhance through conserving and managing existing trees of heritage and/or aesthetic value. Policy G6 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy sets out provision for enhancing green infrastructure and requires regard to local landscape character and contribute to its conservation or enhancement. Developments should avoid the loss of existing urban greenspace or features e.g. trees unless suitable alternative provision is made, it has limited value and its development or change of use will help meet other sustainability or local regeneration objectives.

CS Policy G6 requires a replacement planting ratio of at least 2:1 and Policy G7 requires developments to protect existing biodiversity including trees and vegetation.

The application is accompanied by an Arboricultural Report which sets out that a number of trees were surveyed on site with five trees proposed for removal either due to development (4) or due to condition (1). The Councils Tree Consultee has not provided comments on the application and Officers note that the propose development does not include the provision of a soft landscaping scheme which demonstrates that adequate mitigation can be achieved to replace the trees needed to be lost.

Whilst the proposed development does not currently mitigate for tree loss, it is considered that this matter could be adequately controlled by an appropriately worded condition in the event of an approval.

Accordingly, subject to condition the proposed development is considered to acceptable and would comply with G6 and G7 of the Core Strategy, PfE and the NPPF.

Highways

Policy T2 of the adopted Core Strategy seeks to improve accessibility by locating development where good access to public transport is available or can be provided and in all circumstances, prioritises the safety, accessibility and amenity of those who live or have business in the area. Policy DM1 also states that all development proposals should provide satisfactory vehicular access with adequate parking, manoeuvring, and servicing arrangements taking into account of the proposed use and location. Paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The development is not considered to have an adverse impact on highway safety and would not generate a level of additional traffic which would have a detrimental impact on the safe and efficient operation of the immediate local highway network, or strategic routes. Highways Services have raised no objections subject to condition and the development is considered acceptable in accordance with CS Policies T1 and T2, Policy JP-C8 of PfE and the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of the layout and the siting of the proposed dwellings behind the established building line would appear cramped and poorly related to existing forms of development which would not be well-designed, giving rise to a harmful impact on the surrounding character and appearance of the area. On this basis the proposed development is contrary to policies P1, P2, P3 and DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 of the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development by reason of its cramped and contrived arrangement, would fail to provide a satisfactory rear garden space and would subsequently be harmful to the living conditions for the future occupiers of both Plots 1 and 2. Furthermore, owing to the arrangement of boundary treatments, the main living areas within each dwelling would be oppressed and deprived of access to natural light and outlook, with the first floor main bedrooms also deprived of natural light and outlook by only being served by a single roof light. The proposals are in clear conflict with the aims and aspirations of Policy DM1 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, Policy JP-P1 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:

For the avoidance of doubt the decision relates to the following plans:

Location Plan

Existing Site Plan

Proposed Site Plan

Proposed Plot 1 Elevations and Floor Plans Drwg No 3297-03

Proposed Plot 2 Elevations and Floor Plans Drwg No 3297-04

Report Author Nick Brookman