

**PLANS LIST
ITEM C**

24 St James's Street, Brighton

**BH2012/03367
Full planning consent**

03 APRIL 2013

BH2012/03367 24 St James's Street, Brighton.



**Brighton & Hove
City Council**



Scale: 1:1,250

<u>No:</u>	BH2012/03367	<u>Ward:</u>	QUEEN'S PARK
<u>App Type:</u>	Full Planning		
<u>Address:</u>	24 St James's Street Brighton		
<u>Proposal:</u>	Creation of fourth floor to form two bedroom flat.		
<u>Officer:</u>	Jonathan Puplett Tel 292525	<u>Valid Date:</u>	16/11/2012
<u>Con Area:</u>	East Cliff	<u>Expiry Date:</u>	11/01/2013
<u>Listed Building Grade:</u>	Setting of Grade II.		
<u>Agent:</u>	Garrick and Team, 36 Edburton Avenue, Brighton		
<u>Applicant:</u>	Mr Stuart Chalk, Exchange Plaza, 58 Uxbridge Road, London		

1 RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 11 and the policies and guidance in section 7 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission for the reason set out in section 11.

2 SITE LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application relates to a site located on the western corner of the junction of St James's Street and Dorset Gardens. The site lies within the East Cliff Conservation Area and forms part of the setting of the Grade II Listed terrace nos. 107 to 111A St James's Street which is located opposite the site to the south.
- 2.2 Until recently the site was occupied by a single storey retail unit, this building has been refurbished and an additional three storeys of residential accommodation has been constructed above the ground floor (granted planning permission under applications BH2010/02674 and BH2010/02677).
- 2.3 At present a number of steels protrude from the roof, these steels have possibly been installed in preparation for the construction of an additional storey should permission be granted. This matter has been passed to the Planning Enforcement Team for investigation.

3 RELEVANT HISTORY

BH2011/02334: Creation of fourth floor to form two bedroom flat. Refused 07/10/2011. Dismissed on appeal 16/02/2012.

BH2011/01282: 'Application for Approval of Details Reserved by Conditions 2 and 3 of application BH2010/02677.' Approved 31/05/2011.

BH2011/00287 (Advertisement Consent): 'Display of 2no halo illuminated fascia signs and 1no internally illuminated projecting sign.' Approved 28/03/2011.

BH2010/02674: 'Alterations to ground floor façades including installation of new shopfront. (Part retrospective).' Approved 29/10/2010.

BH2010/02677: 'Erection of additional three storeys to create 3no one bedroom flats and 3no two bedroom flats. Alterations to ground floor façades including installation of new shopfront. (Part retrospective).' Approved 04/03/2011.

BH2005/02457/FP: Erection of 6-storey (including basement) building comprising retail and restaurant on ground and basement floors and 8 residential units on 1st-4th floors. (Amendment to previous approvals under references BH2004/02509/FP and BH2004/02512/FP). Refused March 2008.

BH2004/02585/FP: Variation to approval BH2003/01805/FP by way of layout of 5 flats and 1 cottage, approved June 2005.

BH2004/02512/FP: Change of use of basement and ground floor from A1 to A3 (restaurant) with access onto Dorset Gardens. Retain a portion of the ground floor as A1 (Retail) unit fronting St James Street. Approved April 2005.

BH2004/02509/FP: Erection of 3 no. 1 bedroom flats and 3 no.2 bedroom flats on upper floors (Amendment to BH2003/01805/FP and BH2003/02357/CA Approved 23/07/2004). Approved April 2005.

BH2003/01805/FP: Demolition of existing building. Erection of a 4 storey building comprising A1 retail use at basement and ground floor level at front. 3 x 3 bedroom flats above A1 unit. 3 studio flats, 1 x 3 bedroom cottage, 2 x 2 bedroom flats to rear. Approved July 2004.

BH2003/12357/CA: Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the existing single storey shop and store rooms. Approved October 2003.

No.s 25-28 St James's Street

BH2010/02012: Redevelopment of first floor and airspace above to form residential development of 33 flats (including 13 affordable flats) over four floors above existing retail at 25-28 St James's Street Brighton. Approved October 2010.

BH2008/03121: Redevelopment of first floor and airspace above to form residential development of 34 flats including 13 affordable flats over 4 floors above existing retail at 25-28 St James's Street, along with the erection of an additional storey of accommodation at 24 Dorset Gardens. Approved February 2010.

4 THE APPLICATION

- 4.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of an additional storey which would result in a 5-storey building. The additional storey would contain a further residential unit in the form a two-bedroom flat with a roof terrace area to the front of the building.
- 4.2 The ownership certificate on the original application form submitted was incorrectly completed. This has since been rectified; a corrected ownership certificate has been completed and notice served on all parties with an ownership interest in the site.

5 PUBLICITY & CONSULTATIONS

External

5.1 **Neighbours: Ten (10)** letters of representation have been received from **57 Wanderdown Road Brighton (2 letters), 5 Charles Street Brighton (2 letters), 10 Nutley Avenue Brighton, 22A St James's Street Brighton, Reverend Robin Selmes on behalf of the Dorset Gardens Methodist Church, 71 Brentwood Road Brighton, 'Shirley Veater (address not supplied) and a 'Mr Selwyn Veater' (address not supplied) objecting** to the application for the following reasons:

- The proposal would be of an excessive scale / height; the resulting building would be excessively dominant.
- The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site.
- The proposal would sit oddly with the adjoining terrace.
- The proposal would be to the detriment of the St. James's Street and Dorset Gardens Street scene and the East Cliff Conservation Area.
- The proposal would block views of the Dorset Gardens Methodist Church. The Church was designed and constructed at considerable expense to appear as an attractive, visible, landmark building. The existing building at no. 24 partially blocks views of the church, the proposal to construct an additional storey will worsen this impact; the Church will be less visible.
- The proposal would overshadow / block light to the Dorset Gardens Methodist Church, and would harm the outlook from the Church.
- 'I agree with the findings of the previous appeal decision'.
- The proposal will make no impact upon the need for affordable housing in the area.

5.2 **The Kingscliffe Society object** to the application for the following reasons:

- A previous application for an additional storey, to which the Society objected, was refused by the council and dismissed on appeal.
- The current proposal does not address the concerns the Planning Inspector raised in relation to the previous scheme.
- The proposal, due to its height / scale, would have a damaging impact upon the conservation area.
- The proposal would be out of keeping with the adjoining terrace and the surrounding roofscape.
- The location is not appropriate for a roof terrace.
- The proposal would block views of the Dorset Gardens Methodist Church. The Church was designed and constructed at considerable expense to appear as an attractive, visible, landmark building. The existing building at no. 24 partially blocks views of the church, the proposal to construct an additional storey will worsen this impact; the Church will be less visible.

5.3 **Six (6)** letters of support have been received from **Flat 3, 24A St James's Street Brighton, Flat 5, 24A St James's Street Brighton, 87 Green Ridge Brighton, 28 Wilbury Grange Wilbury Road Hove, 30 Petworth House Hove, 'Katherine Sanders' BN3 2RW (full address not supplied), supporting** to the application for the following reasons:

- The proposed extension would not be visible from the road and will therefore have no impact on the street scene.

- The proposed additional floor would fit well in the street scene.
- There are similar height buildings in the vicinity.
- The proposal represents a suitable and attractive addition to the building.
- There is a growing demand / need for the type of accommodation which is proposed.
- Future occupants of the proposed flat would be able to make full use of the facilities of the city centre and good transport links.
- Regeneration in this area is needed.

Internal:

- 5.4 **Sustainable Transport:** Comment. The proposed unit would create additional travel demand, to address this matter a financial contribution of £500 is required to improve sustainable transport infrastructure in the vicinity of the site. The cycle parking at ground floor level is not of a high standard, it was however considered acceptable in regard to application BH2011/02677 and space required in relation to the additional unit is proposed within the same storage room. A condition is recommended to secure the development as 'car-free' should approval be recommended.
- 5.5 **Heritage:** Object. The proposal for an additional storey is considered unacceptable in principle. Furthermore, the proposed design would be at odds with the existing building which is of a contemporary appearance.
- 5.6 **Environmental Health:** No comment.
- 5.7 **Access Officer:** Comment. Concerns are raised regarding the proposed stairway and bathroom layouts. A lift is shown at fourth floor level but not on the ground, first and second floor layouts; it is therefore unclear whether a lift is in fact proposed.

6 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that "If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."
- 6.2 The development plan is:
- The Regional Spatial Strategy, namely The South East Plan (6 May 2009);
 - Brighton & Hove Local Plan 2005 (saved policies post 2007);
 - East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan (Adopted February 2013);
 - East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Minerals Local Plan (November 1999); Saved policies 3,4,32 and 36 – all outside of Brighton & Hove;
 - East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Waste Local Plan (February 2006); Saved Policies WLP 7 and WLP8 only – site allocations at Sackville Coalyard and Hangleton Bottom and Hollingdean Depot.

- 6.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration which applies with immediate effect.
- 6.4 Due weight should be given to relevant policies in the development plan according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.
- 6.5 The Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document) is an emerging development plan. The NPPF advises that weight may be given to relevant policies in emerging plans according to their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies to the policies in the NPPF.
- 6.6 All material considerations and any policy conflicts are identified in the “Considerations and Assessment” section of the report.

7 RELEVANT POLICIES & GUIDANCE

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Brighton & Hove Local Plan:

TR1	Development and the demand for travel
TR14	Cycle access and parking
TR19	Parking standards
SU2	Efficiency of development in the use of energy, water and materials
SU10	Noise nuisance
SU13	Minimisation and re-use of construction industry waste
QD1	Design – quality of development and design statements
QD2	Design – key principles for neighbourhoods
QD3	Design – efficient and effective use of sites
QD10	Shopfronts
QD14	Extensions and alterations
QD27	Protection of amenity
HO3	Dwelling type and size
HO5	Provision of private amenity space in residential development
HO7	Car free housing
HO13	Accessible housing and lifetime homes
HE3	Development affecting the setting of a listed building
HE6	Development within or affecting the setting of Conservation Areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

SPGBH1:	Roof extensions and alterations
SPGBH4:	Parking standards

Supplementary Planning Documents:

SPD02:	Shop Front Design
SPD03:	Construction and Demolition Waste
SPD08:	Sustainable Building Design

Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document)

8 CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 The main considerations in the determination of the application include the principle of the enlargement of the existing building, impact upon the surrounding street scene, the setting of neighbouring listed buildings and the East Cliff Conservation area, the standard of accommodation which would be provided, impact on neighbouring amenity, sustainability and highways issues.

Principle of development

- 8.2 A proposal to provide an additional unit of residential accommodation above an existing building does not in principle conflict with national and local planning policy and guidance, the impacts of each specific proposal must be considered on their own relative merits in the context of such policy and any other material considerations, as detailed below.

Visual impact / impact upon the East Cliff Conservation Area

- 8.3 The alterations and enlargement granted planning permission under applications BH2010/02674 and BH2010/02677 are now substantially complete. The resulting building is considered to have a satisfactory relationship with the adjoining terrace to the west; the flat roof of the enlarged building is at a level which creates an appropriate 'step up' from the eaves level of the building alongside (no. 23 St. James's Street). The building was carefully designed to create a scale and appearance in keeping with the surrounding street scene, and was at the time considered to represent the maximum scale of building which would be acceptable.

- 8.4 A proposal for an additional storey was submitted under application BH2011/02334. This application was refused planning permission on the 07/10/2011 for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed additional storey would result in a building of an excessive scale which would have an awkward and overbearing relationship with the adjoining terrace to the west and the adjoining building to the north (Dorset House, no. 30 Dorset Gardens). The proposed enlarged building would dominate views down Dorset Gardens from the north, from the east when viewed in comparison to the building in situ at nos. 25-28 St. James's Street, and from the south when viewed from Madeira Place. The roof terrace, balustrade and planting proposed would appear as alien features in the context of a roofscape of a predominantly traditional character. The proposed additional storey would harm the appearance of the recently constructed building, and would cause significant harm to the appearance of the street scene and the character of the East Cliff Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies QD1, QD14, HE3 and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, and the guidance set out in PPS5.*
- 2. Policy TR1 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan requires that development proposals should provide for the demand for travel they create and maximise the use of public transport, walking and cycling. The development makes inadequate provision for the increase in demand for travel which would be created and is therefore contrary to policy TR1.*

- 8.5 An appeal was lodged against this decision; the appeal was dismissed 16/02/2012. The Inspector in this case considered the main issues of

consideration to be whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the East Cliff Conservation Area. Key sections of the Inspector's report in this regard are as follows:

'.. the proposal would appear as a long box shape on the roof and, due to its form and flat roof, would be more dominant and obtrusive than the pitched roofs on the attached terrace. This, added to the width of the appeal site compared to neighbouring attached terrace on the St James's Street frontage, would result in a building that would dominate views, create an alien and imposing skyline and have an overbearing impact on the attached terrace. Thereby harming the visual amenities.'

- 8.6 *'.. the proposed additional floor set in about 1m from the side elevation would result in a building that would not only dominate the attached Dorset House but views down Dorset Gardens of the neighbouring Methodist Chapel. Apart from the tower, the Chapel would appear lower than the proposed extended building as the higher part of the Chapel is set well back from the frontage and not 'read' with the corner building.'*
- 8.7 *'Overall, by reason of its scale and form, the proposed development would unacceptably compromise the character and visual amenities of this part of the conservation area. It would visually diminish the value of the terrace to which it would be attached and dominate nearby buildings fronting Dorset Gardens. For the reasons given the additional floor on the existing building would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. It would be contrary to Brighton & Hove Local Plan (LP) policies QD1, QD14a and HE6.'*
- 8.8 *'On the opposite corner of St James's Street and Dorset Gardens, planning permission has been granted for a flat roof building with development at roof level set back behind the parapet. That site adjoins different buildings, is on higher land and would appear not to project to the same extent, if at all, above the attached pitched roof building. It does not justify the appeal proposal.'*
- 8.9 This previous proposal was an additional storey of block form, set in from the front, rear and side of the floorplate of the building below. It was established at the application stage and at appeal that such an addition would result in a scale, height and appearance of building which would be out of keeping with its immediate and wider surroundings, to the detriment of the street scene and the East Cliff Conservation Area. The current application seeks consent for a very similar proposal; an additional storey, set in from the front, rear and side of the floorplate of the building below that would contain an additional unit of self-contained accommodation.
- 8.10 Whilst the scheme previously proposed was of an appearance which would have been out of keeping with the surrounding roofscape which is by and large of traditional character and consist predominantly of pitched roof forms rather than large additional bulks at roof level, the proposed design did at least constitute an addition which would have been in keeping with the character and appearance of the host application building itself (i.e. a contemporary design and detailing with a flat roof form).

- 8.11 The current application seeks consent for an additional storey with sloping tile hung elevations to the front and rear and western side. Three lead-clad dormers are proposed to the western elevation with sliding sash windows, two lead clad dormers are proposed to the front of the proposal with doors with provide access out on to a roof terrace area. The annotation of drawing 05A indicates that the proposed sash windows would be of timber construction, the submitted application form, however, details that window and door frames would be powder coated aluminium. The form proposed is described as a 'mansard'. The proposed form is not however of a traditional mansard which would have an upper and lower slope and a form designed within a circular guide (as detailed in pages 6 and 7 of SPGBH1), rather it is a predominantly flat roof form, with pitched sides which attempt to provide a more traditional appearance. A traditional form, appearance and detailing would be completely out of keeping with the contemporary design and appearance of the building below. The proposed storey represents a 'faux traditional' design which would appear highly incongruous sitting atop a contemporary building. Traditional detailing such as timber sliding sash windows would only serve to emphasise this clash of architectural styles.
- 8.12 The proposed extension is therefore established as a fundamentally inappropriate addition to the existing building; the character and appearance of the building would be harmed. It must next be considered how the proposed development would sit alongside the existing buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site.
- 8.13 A faux mansard form can in some cases sit reasonably comfortably if sited above a mid-terrace property with buildings / roof forms to either side which largely block views of the main flat roof form. In such cases a faux mansard, when viewed from street level, can have an appearance similar to a traditional mansard design. In this case however the large flat roof form would be highly prominent as the property is a corner site. The contrived nature of the proposed design would therefore be clearly apparent.
- 8.14 As was the case at the time of the previous application, it is considered that the addition of another floor will increase the scale of the building beyond the general built form in this location, and the result would be overbearing in its relationship to the rest of the terrace to the west (emphasized by the broader plot width), and Dorset House to the North. It would dominate the view down Dorset Gardens from the north, and would also appear of an excessive scale when viewed from Madeira Place to the south. Although set back from the front faces of the building, the raised parapet, enlarged stack and 4th floor will be visible in most views.
- 8.15 The scale of the existing two storey building to the East (nos. 25-28 St James's Street) would be put into dramatic contrast by an additional storey on this site, and the existing height of this neighbouring building allows clear views of the application site from the East along St James Street, and a 5th floor addition would appear excessive in these views. It is noted that this neighboring building may in the future be enlarged and permission has been granted for such a development. In any case the scale and detailing of the proposed building must

be considered primarily in relation to the terrace to which it is attached, the visual step between nos. 23 and 24 being the most visible and important.

- 8.16 The building, setting of the listed buildings to the south, and the surrounding conservation area would be harmed by the proposed development and the application warrants the refusal of planning permission on these grounds. Views towards the south and north of the site (from Madeira Place and Dorset Gardens) would be dominated by the resulting building; the setting of neighbouring buildings including the Dorset Gardens Methodist Church would be harmed. The concerns raised by the Inspector in relation to application ref. BH2011/02334 have not been addressed. If anything, it could be argued that the current proposal would have an even greater detrimental visual impact and a more incongruous appearance than the previously refused scheme.

Standard of accommodation

- 8.17 The proposed flat is a two-bedroom unit with open plan living room / kitchen and an outdoor terrace area. The proposed layout provides broad compliance with Lifetime Homes Standards and could be controlled by condition to ensure full compliance with such standards and Policy HO13 had approval been recommended.
- 8.18 Proposals for new residential units should provide adequate storage facilities for refuse and recycling, and cycles in compliance with Policies QD27 and TR14. Cycle storage is already provided at ground floor level for 9 cycles in compliance with SPGBH4 as detailed below. Space for refuse and recycling storage is provided within the kitchen area, at present refuse is collected via communal street bins. Overall it is considered that the proposed flat would provide an acceptable standard of accommodation.
- 8.19 It is unclear whether a lift within the building is proposed as a lift is shown on the proposed fourth floor plan but not on the floors below.

Neighbouring amenity

- 8.20 The proposed additional storey would cause some additional overshadowing of the properties to the north; Dorset House (no. 30 Dorset Gardens), and the Dorset Gardens Methodist Church. It is however considered that in comparison to the existing situation significant harm would not be caused in this regard.
- 8.21 The proposed roof terrace and glazing would provide views out across St James's Street and Dorset Gardens towards neighbouring properties, similar views are, however, available from the existing front facing windows and balconies of the building, therefore no significant harm to neighbouring privacy would be caused.
- 8.22 The development may cause some additional disturbance to neighbouring residents due to an increased occupancy level; this would not however be beyond the level expected in an urban setting of such density; significant harm would not be caused by one additional residential unit.

Sustainability

- 8.23 Policy SU2 of the Local Plan requires development to be efficient in the use of energy, water and materials. SPD08: Sustainable Building Design, states that a new build residential development of the scale proposed should meet a Code For Sustainable Homes rating or Level 3 and a Sustainability Checklist should be submitted. A checklist has been submitted detailing sustainability measures and it is proposed that a Level 3 rating will be met. This matter could be secured by planning condition were approval to be recommended. Overall it is considered that the requirements of policy SU2 and SPD08 have been sufficiently addressed. A Construction and Demolition Waste Minimisation Statement has been submitted in compliance with SU13 SPD03.

Transport

- 8.24 Policies TR1 and TR14 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan which require that development provide for the demand for travel that it creates, and that secure cycle storage be provided.
- 8.25 Application BH2010/02677 was accompanied by a legal agreement which secured a financial contribution of £3,000 towards sustainable transport infrastructure in the vicinity of the site. It was also secured by planning condition that future residents of the development, other than those residents with disabilities who are Blue Badge Holders, would have no entitlement to a resident's parking permit. These measures were considered necessary to ensure compliance with policy TR1.
- 8.26 The proposal would result in an increased transport impact in comparison to the approved scheme, with the proposal resulting in a total seven units rather than the six approved under application BH2010/02677. It has been calculated that a further contribution of £500 towards sustainable transport infrastructure in the vicinity of the site would be required to address the impacts of the proposed development ensure compliance with policy TR1. Were approval to be recommended such a contribution could have been secured by planning legal agreement.
- 8.27 In regard to parking, to ensure the acceptability of the scheme in this regard it could again be secured by planning condition that future residents of the development, other than those residents with disabilities who are Blue Badge Holders, would have no entitlement to a resident's parking permit. The Sustainable Transport Team have confirm that a traffic regulation order exists that excludes the occupants of the scheme approved under BH2011/02677 (which has been constructed) from applying for residents parking permits. A condition would be required in relation to the additional unit proposed to ensure that occupants of the additional unit are also excluded from applying for such permits.
- 8.28 The guidance set out in SPGBH4 requires that 1 secure cycle parking space per dwelling plus 1 secure space per 3 dwellings for visitors be provided. The scheme approved under applications BH2010/02674 and BH2010/02677 included a ground floor cycle storage room to accommodate 9 cycles. Were this proposed additional unit of accommodation to be constructed this would equate

to one space per dwelling plus two visitor spaces. This would be broadly in compliance with the guidance set out in SPGBH4.

9 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The application building, the setting of the listed buildings to the south, the street scene and the surrounding East Cliff Conservation Area would be harmed by the proposed development, contrary to policies QD1, QD14, HE3 and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, and the objectives set out in NPPF, Chapter 7 in particular. Refusal is therefore recommended.

10 EQUALITIES

- 10.1 The proposed residential unit provides broad compliance with Lifetime Homes Standards and full compliance could be secured by planning condition were approval to be recommended.

11 REASON FOR REFUSAL / INFORMATIVES

11.1 Reason for Refusal:

1. The proposed additional storey would result in a building of an excessive scale which would have an awkward and overbearing relationship with the adjoining terrace to the west and the adjoining building to the north (Dorset House, no. 30 Dorset Gardens). The proposed enlarged building would dominate views down Dorset Gardens from the north, from the east when viewed in comparison to the building in situ at nos. 25-28 St. James's Street, and from the south when viewed from Madeira Place. The proposed additional storey is of a faux traditional design; the large flat roofed bulk would appear as an incongruous addition to the roofscape, and the faux traditional form and detailing of the proposal would clash with the contemporary appearance of the existing building resulting in an inappropriate appearance. The proposed additional storey would harm the appearance of the recently constructed building, and would cause significant harm to the street scene, the setting of the listed buildings to the south of the site, and the character of the East Cliff Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies QD1, QD14, HE3 and HE6 of the Brighton & Hove Local Plan, and the key objective of securing good design which is set out in the NPPF.

11.2 Informatives:

1. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy SS1 of the Brighton & Hove City Plan Part One (submission document) the approach to making a decision on this planning application has been to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Local Planning Authority seeks to approve planning applications which are for sustainable development where possible.

PLANS LIST – 03 APRIL 2013

2. This decision is based on the drawings listed below:

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Location Plan & Existing Floorplans	1210-01		23/10/2012
Existing Elevations	1210-02		23/10/2012
Existing Elevations & Sections	1210-03	A	05/11/2012
Proposed Floorplans	1210-04		23/10/2012
Proposed Elevations	1210-05A		05/11/2012
Proposed Elevations & Sections	1210-06	A	05/11/2012