

# Addendum

## Planning Committee

Dear Councillor,

### Planning Committee - Wednesday, 27 September 2023, 7.30 pm

I enclose, for consideration at the meeting of the Planning Committee to be held on Wednesday, 27 September 2023 at 7.30 pm, the following reports which were unavailable when the agenda was published.

**Mari Roberts-Wood**  
Managing Director

4. **Addendum to the agenda(Pages 3 - 26)**

To note the addendum tabled at the meeting which provides an update on the agenda of planning applications before the Committee.

**For enquiries regarding this addendum;**

**Contact:** 01737 276182

**Email:** [democratic@reigate-banstead.gov.uk](mailto:democratic@reigate-banstead.gov.uk)

Published 27 September 2023



This page is intentionally left blank

## ADDENDUM

### MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 27<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2023

#### ITEM NO: 5

**PLANNING APPLICATION: a) 22/02444/F & b) 22/02460/LBC Change of use of existing from public house to single dwelling and the erection of two semi-detached houses. As amended on 24/08/2023.**

The marketing report supporting the application is included at **APPENDIX A** in order to assist with Committee's understanding of the marketing undertaken, to supplement the Committee Report.

#### **Representations:**

Further to the publication of the report a further 95 responses have been received raising the following issues:

- Alternative location/ proposal preferred
- Out of character with surrounding area
- Harm to listed building
- Inadequate parking
- Harm to Conservation Area
- Overdevelopment
- Harm to Green Belt/countryside
- Increase in traffic and congestion
- Loss of buildings.
- Drainage/sewage capacity
- Noise & disturbance
- Property devalue (a non planning matter)
- Inadequate parking
  
- Support - Economic growth / jobs
- Support - Benefit to housing need
- Support - Community/regeneration benefit
- Support - Visual amenity benefits

Many of the above issues have been addressed within the officer report. With regard to harm to the Green Belt/ Countryside, the site is located within the urban area and as such there would not be a need to consider impact on the Green Belt. Impact of the development on property values is also not a material planning consideration that can be taken into account in the assessment of the application.

# Agenda Item 4

## **Design and heritage assessment**

To provide clarity with regard to the assessment of the impact of the proposed new development on the character and setting of the Grade II listed building and that of the Linkfield Street Conservation Area, the Councils' Conservation Officer has been consulted throughout the application. Objection was raised to the proposed semi-detached dwellings as initially submitted as well as to the siting of the proposed car parking, which was considered too close to the listed building. Objection was also raised to the design and scale of the new houses, with the eaves too high and the ridge height too low. The dwellings were also considered to be too deep, and overall out of scale and the eaves not subservient to the listed building.

To address this the eaves of the dwellings have been substantially lowered, the ridge height increased, and depth reduced. Much of the proposed parking has been moved away from the pub building, allowing for a greater amount of soft landscaping implementation, resulting in an improved setting to the listed building. With regard to these amendments the Conservation Officer has stated that: 'I consider that the design issues in relation to the conversion of the listed building and the two houses in the grounds has now been satisfactorily resolved by the applicant, so I have no objection from a design point of view subject to the conditions.'

## **Flooding and Drainage**

The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is not prone to any level of surface water flooding. Therefore it is not considered that the development would exacerbate any existing flooding or drainage issues. A further condition requiring the submission of a drainage scheme for approval prior to commencement of development would be included in the event of permission being granted.

## **Ecology**

With regard to ecology matters, given the age of the listed building it was considered that bat surveys of the building would be appropriate. Preliminary Roost Assessments (PRA) were carried out on the 22nd of April 2022. The survey found no evidence of roosting bats found on the exterior of the building. An inspection was also carried out of the loft space of the building. Whilst mouse and rat droppings were found, no evidence of bats was found during the loft inspection. Despite the apparent absence of bats, because of the age of the building there is high roost potential for bats. Therefore a condition (40) requiring the provision of biodiversity enhancement measures, including bat boxes, is included. Existing car park trees were considered to have low roost potential.

Emergence/ re-entry surveys were carried out for both the building and trees, from which no bats were detected emerging from either. Bat activity around the site was very low, limited to approximately five bat passes per survey on the south and east side, the majority of which were the result of one Common Pipistrelle briefly foraging within the garden area and the garden of the adjacent property to the east. A single Brown Long-eared bat was detected once flying along the tree line along the south site boundary. However, as no bats were detected emerging from the building it is determined likely that roosting bats are currently absent. As such it is not considered

that the development would result in harm with regards to bat species, with the potential being low. A further condition requiring the submission of a sensitive lighting management plan (SLMP) would be included in the event of permission being granted.

## **Conditions**

43. Prior to commencement of development, a Sensitive Lighting Management Plan (SLMP), scheme of wayfinding and any ancillary structures such as benches, bins etc shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to maintain the character and appearance of the area, manage the use of the space and to ensure that the development does not result in harm to the existing biodiversity of the site and in the interests of retaining and enhancing other valued priority habitats and features of biodiversity importance with regard to Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 policies DES1, NHE2 and NHE3.

44. No development shall commence until a strategy for the disposal of surface and foul water is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the site is satisfactorily drained and in order to protect water and environmental quality with regard to Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy 2014, Policy CCF2 of the Development Management Plan 2019 and the NPPF.

45. The Grade II listed building shall be used as a single dwellinghouse only and for no other use, nor sub-divided into additional units without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development hereby permitted maintains the historic and architectural character of the listed building and the visual amenities of the area with regard to Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan 2019 policies DES1 and NHE9.

# Agenda Item 4

**ITEM NO: 6**

**PLANNING APPLICATION: 23/00615/F Kimberley Clark Europe Douglas House  
40 London Road Reigate Surrey RH2 9QP**

## **Additional information**

### **Energy Strategy**

Following the publication of the committee report the applicant has provided an updated Energy and Sustainable Strategy report. This report confirms that the total carbon savings of the scheme would now be 10% against the Target Emission Rate (TER) through the use of an Air Source Heat pump and 200m<sup>2</sup> of solar panels on the roof, rather than the previously identified 4%. This is now in line with the requirements of policy CCF1 and therefore condition 27 can be amended to be a compliance condition. This change is detailed below.

### **Updated viewpoint CGIs**

The CGI viewpoints showing the proposed office development have now been updated to reflect the changes made to the scheme during the application process. The pack of update CGIs are attached at **Appendix B**.

### **Surrey County Council Highway Authority (CHA)**

Further comments have been provided by the CHA with regarding to parking and the car club.

“SCC is working with Enterprise Car Club to expand car club provision county-wide, and is looking at different options for the location of Reigate’s first Car Club, but the preferred location is an on-street parking bay within the vicinity of the railway station.

For this town centre location, the key benefit for a business of having access to a car club during the day, is that some staff may be able to commute by public transport, freeing up valuable parking space and contributing to reducing congestion. It also saves businesses time and money by replacing expensive and time-consuming company cars, taxis and mileage reimbursement with access to self-service vehicles.

With regard to parking demand, the applicant has undertaken a TRICs trip generation assessment for offices in town centre locations, and the data demonstrates that the resulting parking demand/accumulation likely to occur is within the proposed capacity of the on-site car park. The CHA is therefore satisfied the proposed development will not exacerbate existing demand for on-street parking, and certainly would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

With regard to parking on-street/vs public car parks, it is important to note that on-street parking within the vicinity of the site is tightly controlled and enforced. Other than the station car-park which office staff could use (although it is appreciated this car park is relatively small), the long stay Upper West St Car Park is 7 mins walk from the site, which is certainly a reasonable and attractive walking distance. This is well within the accepted 'Park and Stride' distance and SCC would expect the occupier to promote this option as part of their Travel Planning measures."

## **Additional representations**

Since the completion of the committee report one further representation has been received raising the following objections:

- Hazard to highway safety
- Inadequate parking
- Increase in traffic and congestion
- No need for the development
- Overdevelopment

These issues are addressed within the committee report.

## **Changes to recommended conditions**

Some minor changes are recommended to the following conditions. The below changes to the conditions are highlighted in **bold** and *italics*.

23. Prior to first occupation of the development a scheme detailing the following electric vehicle and cycle charging provision, ***unless justification for an alternative provision is provided***, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
- (a) 50% of available parking spaces to be fitted with a fast charge socket (7kw Mode 3 with Type 2 Connector).
  - (b) 50% of available parking spaces to be fitted with feeder pillar of equivalent permitting future connection.
  - (c) 20% of all available cycles should be able to be charged at any one time (using standard three-point plug sockets).

The approved details shall then be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development and thereafter shall be permanently maintained for their designated purpose.

Reason: In recognition of Section 9 "Promoting Sustainable Transport" in the National Planning Policy Framework and to accord with Section 9 of the NPPF

# Agenda Item 4

(2001) and Policy TAP1 of the Reigate and Banstead Development Management Plan September 2019

***27. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the Be Lean and Be Green measures set out in the submitted Energy and Sustainability Strategy Report (Version Planning issue, V3-0) prior to first use of the development so that renewable or low-carbon energy generation provide at least 10% of the expected energy usage. Thereafter the scheme shall be maintained in accordance with the agreed details.***

Reason: To ensure that the development supports the efficient use of resources and minimises carbon emissions and protects the visual amenities of the area with regard to Policy CS11 of the Reigate & Banstead Core Strategy 2014 and Policy CCF1, DES1 and NHE9 of the Reigate & Banstead Development Management Plan 2019.

## **ITEM NO: 7**

**PLANNING APPLICATION: 23/00822/F Land At Partridge Mead Banstead Surrey SM7 1LW**

### **Clarification on proposed materials**

At paragraph 6.18 of the committee report makes reference to the use of weatherboarding on the gables. To clarify the proposed elevations do not include any weatherboarding, they are just proposed to be brickwork.

### **Additional representations**

Since the completion of the committee report the Council has received a further letter from the owner of 6 Parkwood Road. This letter is written by a solicitor, addressed to Raven Housing Trust, and relates to the legal right of the owner to access their property through the application site.

The letter advises that the proposed layout is considered by the owner to be incompatible with their legal rights. As set out in the report at paragraph 6.50 such legal matters are not a material planning consideration and even if permission is granted this does not override any existing legal agreements and both parties will need to overcome any disagreements prior to commencement.

### **Additional Surrey County Council Highway Authority (CHA) comments**

The CHA has provided some additional comments regarding their assessment of the application to aid members with their consideration of the application.



## Agenda Item 4

*“Further to my response of 28 July 2023 I have the following comments to support why I have recommended approving the application with my suggested conditions.*

*The proposed development is for four three bed dwellings with 9 car parking spaces which is the equivalent of 2.25 spaces per unit which is slightly more than the minimum of 2 car parking space per unit in this low accessibility area of Reigate and Banstead.*

*The application involves the demolition of 23 garages, 12 of which are let out according to the submitted Transport Statement. The developer has not carried out a survey of the garages at this site due to the absence of structures to secure observation camera so they have used another of their site’s as a proxy. The proxy site is Ferriers Way where a survey identified that two garages (out of the 23 currently let out) were used for parking equating to a ratio of 8.69%. If this is applied to the Partridge Mead site the redevelopment of the site would cause one vehicles to be displaced onto the highway. As a result of this low level of displaced parking the developer has not carried out an on street parking survey arguing that the highway would be able to accommodate one vehicle.*

*I have read Manual for Streets which states from research that 45% of garages in Oxfordshire are used for parking. If this is applied to the application site then 6 vehicles could be displaced onto the highway because 6 out of the 12 let out garages would have been occupied by a vehicles.*

*Ideally the applicant should have carried out a parking survey. However having looked at the accident record for Partridge Mead and the roads that lead off it, there have been no reported accidents in the previous five years suggesting the asserted use of the garages is not causing a highway safety problem. As a result of this finding and the developer assertion that one vehicle would be displaced to park on the highway I did not ask the developer to carry out a parking survey.*

*In terms of the access route into the site, I note that a refuse collection point is proposed within 25 metres of the highway. The refuse collection point would reduce the width of the access route to 3.1 metres which would be suitable for a lorry to pass albeit with giving way according to Manual for Streets. If the bins are used as designed then there would be no obstruction to the access route.”*

# Agenda Item 4

## **Sustainable construction**

As set out at paragraph 6.46 of the committee report the development achieves an in-use Net Carbon Zero and an Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) rating of A, which is achieved through the fabric-first approach as well as the use of ASHPs which goes well beyond the Council's 19% requirement. This represents a benefit of the scheme which must be considered in the overall planning balance.

# Appendix A

14a Bell Street, Reigate, Surrey RH2 7BG  
Tel: 01737 245 886  
Email: enquiries@crowwatkin.co.uk  
www.crowwatkin.co.uk

Ref: MS/DW/WhiteLion

Aaliyah Developments  
40 Linkfield Street  
Redhill  
Surrey RH1 6BY

6<sup>th</sup> October 2022

Dear Sirs

**Re: White Lion Public House, 40 Linkfield Street, Redhill RH1 6BY  
Crow Watkin Marketing Report**

We write to report on the steps we have taken to market this vacant public house over the past 18 months along with the details of viewings we have arranged, stated uses and the outcome of our marketing to date.

We confirm for the record that the writer has worked as a surveyor valuer and estate agent with Crow Watkin in Reigate for over 45 years and has undertaken many marketing exercises for planning purposes over the years.

We would report as follows:-

1. **Background**

In summary, the property comprises a vacant detached Grade II listed public house with beer garden and surfaced car park for about 20 vehicles. It is located in a built up mainly residential area to the south west of the town centre on a good sized corner plot of about 0.27 acre. The premises are understood to date from the 16<sup>th</sup> century and to be the oldest public house in Redhill.

The pub closed for trade in September 2018 when the property was sold to the current owners for £525,000 and has since been vacant. A subsequent planning application to convert the building into 3 flats and to construct 2 semi-detached houses on the car park area was refused in May 2019. Reasons included loss of community asset of historic value, out of keeping with character of area and lack of suitable marketing report. An appeal against this refusal was subsequently dismissed.

We understand that the property had been marketed to let during 2020 and early 2021 by Christie, pub agents, at £39,000 per annum without effective interest from pub or gastropub operators.

# Agenda Item 4

## 2. **Marketing**

In accordance with your instructions, we commenced marketing of the property on 6th April 2021. We attach a copy of the sale particulars which we then circulated to our database of applicants. Details were posted on our firm's website and on the national CoStar website on 6th April.

A 4ft x 3ft signboard was attached to the front retaining wall of the property on 12th April with the inscription 'All Enquiries' and has remained over the 18-month period. Copies of our marketing details, website postings and signboard are attached to this report as appendices A, B, C & D.

## 3. **Asking Price**

As regards pricing we recommended placing the property on the market by private treaty with a guide price of £575,000 which we felt fairly reflected the prominence of a detached building on a corner site of about 0.27 acre with a 20 space car park, internal covers for about 70 and external covers of about 50. The building is however in need of major refurbishment costing probably £200,000 minimum.

None of the applicants who viewed the property commented that the asking price was excessive but most were concerned that there were major complications with the Grade II listing in a Conservation Area with previous planning refusal on application and on appeal, with the designation as an Asset of Community Value (ACV) until July 2024 and the poor condition of the building.

By way of comparable evidence, we set out below details of the three most recent sales of vacant public houses of which we are aware in the Redhill/Reigate area.

The Yew Tree P.H, 99 Reigate Hill RH2 9PJ was sold for £600,000 + VAT on August 2020. This is a 1937 built detached two storey property on the busy A217 occupying a corner site of 0.21 acre with 18 car spaces in the front forecourt and outside seating area at the rear. The ground floor pub comprises about 1292 sq ft, the basement/cellar about 398 sq ft and the first floor residential accommodation about 1798 sq ft internal floor area.

The selling agents Fleurets advised us that they started marketing the property for Enterprise Inns just prior to the first lockdown in February 2020 and that six applicants carried out internal viewings. There was apparently no genuine interest for continued use as a pub.

The Barley Mow P.H, 3 Eastnor Road, Reigate RH2 8NE was sold at auction by Harman Healy in August 2018 for £421,000. This was a detached two storey building in a built up residential area about one mile to the south of the town centre. The ground floor pub had a bar, lounge area, function room, kitchen and separate toilets. There was a two bedroom flat on the first floor with living room, kitchen and shower room. As with the Yew Tree P.H, this was bought with a view to residential development.

The Hatch P.H, 44 Hatchlands Road, Redhill RH1 6AT, fronting the A25 on Shaws Corner between Reigate and Redhill, was sold by Howard Cundey in February 2017 for £410,000. This is an 1860 built detached two storey building of brick/stone with tiled roof and carried



# Agenda Item 4

a Grade II listing. With the ground floor pub is two bedroom first floor residential accommodation and an outside seating area at the front but no on site parking. These premises were retained as a pub from 2017 until re-let as a pub with flat to Pilgrim Brewery in May 2022.

The Joshua Tree P.H. on Redhill Common, a detached public house with about 70 covers – similar to the White Lion P.H. – is currently on the market with a guide price of £625,000.

## 4. Responses to our marketing

We set out below enquiries logged during our marketing:-

2021	Date	Applicant	Stated Use	Use class
	12 <sup>th</sup> April *	M. Patil	Pub/Indian restaurant	Sui generis
	27 <sup>th</sup> April	D. Murch	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	12 <sup>th</sup> May *	C. Mills	Pub/bar	Sui generis
	12 <sup>th</sup> May	N. Edwards	Pub/restaurant	Sui generis
	24 <sup>th</sup> May	L. Lavette	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	26 <sup>th</sup> May	S. Bennett	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	21 <sup>st</sup> June	T. Taylor	Not stated	--
	9 <sup>th</sup> July	R. Turner	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	28 <sup>th</sup> July*	Nick Burchett	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	28 <sup>th</sup> July *	A. Rothera	Pub/brewery	Sui generis
	29 <sup>th</sup> July *	Ms. Alexi Rea	Local resident	--
	26 <sup>th</sup> Aug	B. Cernecca	Public House	Sui generis
	6 <sup>th</sup> Sept *	P. Betchley	Pub/restaurant	Sui generis
	7 <sup>th</sup> Sept *	M. Fielder	Public House	Sui generis
	15 <sup>th</sup> Sept	Ms. Cherry Clift	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	15 <sup>th</sup> Sept	Ms. Chantelle Johnson	Childrens day nursery	E
	17 <sup>th</sup> Sept	M. Carey	Public House	Sui generis
	20 <sup>th</sup> Sept *	D. Crowley	Public House	Sui generis
	21 <sup>st</sup> Sept *	P. Churchman	Public House & development	Sui generis
	23 <sup>rd</sup> Sept	A. Roderick	Church & manse	F1
	27 <sup>th</sup> Sept *	Rahman	Pub/restaurant	Sui generis
	15 <sup>th</sup> Oct	E. Ledwidge	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	1 <sup>st</sup> Nov	J. Curry	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	3 <sup>rd</sup> Nov *	Ms. Kath Brooks	Public House	Sui generis
	11 <sup>th</sup> Nov	Dexters Burgers	Pub/restaurant	Sui generis
<b>2022</b>	5 <sup>th</sup> Jan *	R. McGuire	Pub/restaurant	Sui generis
	7 <sup>th</sup> Jan	Lochplace Ltd	Residential conversion	C3
	14 <sup>th</sup> Jan	Mr Sharp	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	20 <sup>th</sup> Jan	T. Holbrook	Residential refurbishment	C3
	24 <sup>th</sup> Jan	S. Gibbs	Residential conversion	C3
	25 <sup>th</sup> Jan	T. Morley	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	25 <sup>th</sup> Feb*	Ms. Lara Burling	To rent as pub	Sui generis
	25 <sup>th</sup> Feb*	S. McGill	Residential conversion	C3
	20 <sup>th</sup> April	M. Snow	General enquiry	-
	21 <sup>st</sup> April	CDG Leisure	Pub/restaurant	Sui generis
	17 <sup>th</sup> May*	A. Hughes	Investment/development	Sui generis
	23 <sup>rd</sup> May*	S. Gibbs	Owner/occupied house	C3
	26 <sup>th</sup> May	P. Rawden	National Carparks	Car Parking
	10 <sup>th</sup> June*	Curwen Group	Children's nursery	E



# Agenda Item 4

2022	16 <sup>th</sup> June	Mr Sussen	General enquiry	-
(cont)	17 <sup>th</sup> June	Enterprise Rent a Car		Car parking
	30 <sup>th</sup> June*	S Sinden & S McKenna	Local interest	(councillors)
	18 <sup>th</sup> July	P. Jones	Public House	Sui generis
	12 <sup>th</sup> Aug	A. McDonald	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	16 <sup>th</sup> Aug	Mercy	Community social	F2
	19 <sup>th</sup> Aug	R. Maskell	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	20 <sup>th</sup> Aug	M.Weil	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3
	11 <sup>th</sup> Sept	Kartik	Residential conversion/dev'ment	C3

\* = viewings – people who have inspected/viewed internally

Of these 48 enquiries we arranged 17 accompanied internal viewings and 3 enquirers viewed for a second time. 19 were for residential conversion/development of car park and 18 were for public house with or without restaurant.

Many of the applicants expressed interest for a residential conversion but on a conditional basis e.g. subject to planning or option to purchase pending discussions with the local authority. Apart from being subject to structural surveys, the interest would have involved discussions with the local authority as regards the possibility of infill residential development on the car park area and retention of a number of car spaces for the main building.

Two of the applicants made offers of £550,000. The interest from Mr. S. Gibbs as a local resident was in refurbishment of the pub as a home for himself and his family with the intention of converting the car park to a private garden. The offer was subject to survey and would have involved a planning application for change of use to residential. However, the ACV designation remains on the property until July 2024 and he was not prepared to purchase unconditionally.

Mr Hughes offered £550,000 for investment/development with retention of residential upper part but declined to increase his bid to the guide price and there were concerns about the amount of money required for refurbishment of the Grade II listed building.

There was little interest in taking a lease of the premises. The first viewer Mr Patil offered £26,000 per annum for a new internal repairing and insuring lease but he and his colleague had no previous experience of running a pub on their own account. No further offers were received for leasing the premises, again due to the amount required for upgrading.

## 5. Outcome of marketing

We have been marketing this property on websites and with a signboard outside the pub for the last 18 months at what we consider to be a representative market price. We conclude from our marketing efforts that future viability as a pub is unlikely.

Yours faithfully

*Martin Seymour*

M Seymour FRICS



# Appendix B

15

ON BEHALF OF:



PROJECT NO: 1421

## **DOUGLAS HOUSE, LONDON ROAD, REIGATE** INDICATIVE VIEWPOINTS CGI UPDATES

Agenda Item 4

SEPTEMBER 2023



# CONTENTS

## Executive Summary

### 1 Agreed Views

- 1.01 Agreed View - Castlefield Road - Existing
- 1.02 Agreed View - Castlefield Road - Proposed
- 1.03 Agreed View - London Road (north) - Existing
- 1.04 Agreed View - London Road (north) - Proposed
- 1.05 Agreed View - London Road (south) - Existing
- 1.06 Agreed View - London Road (south) - Proposed
- 1.07 Agreed View - Rushworth Road - Existing
- 1.08 Agreed View - Rushworth Road - Proposed

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document has been submitted in support of an application for Full Planning Permission made on behalf Landid, acting for BNP Paribas Depositary Services Limited and BNP Paribas Depositary Services (Jersey) Limited as trustees of the Metro Property Unit Trust c/o Federated Hermes (the applicant), for the redevelopment of Douglas House, 40 London Road, Reigate, RH2 9QP.

The contents outlines an update to the proposed indicative long distance 'agreed' views alongside the equivalent existing, as previously documented with the Design and Access Statement.



# 1

## AGREED VIEWS

1.01 AGREED VIEWS - CASTLEFIELD ROAD - EXISTING





1.02 AGREED VIEWS - CASTLEFIELD ROAD - PROPOSED





1.03 AGREED VIEWS - LONDON ROAD (NORTH) - EXISTING





1.04 AGREED VIEWS - LONDON ROAD (NORTH) - PROPOSED





1.05 AGREED VIEWS - LONDON ROAD (SOUTH) - EXISTING





1.06 AGREED VIEWS - LONDON ROAD (SOUTH) - PROPOSED





1.07 AGREED VIEWS - RUSHWORTH ROAD - EXISTING





1.08 AGREED VIEWS - RUSHWORTH ROAD - PROPOSED





**dn-a architecture**  
Midmoor House  
1-2 Kew Road  
Richmond  
TW9 2NQ