

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Jennie Townsend	Date of report: 09/05/2025	Ref: 71354/FUL
Registration: 26/03/2025	LDFC: 25/04/2025	Expiry Date: 21/05/2025
Site Visit:	Site Notice: N/A	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 9	Con Area: N/A	Adv Type: N/A
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Erection of 6 no. semi detached dwellings and associated driveways

Location: 72 Park Road, Prestwich, Manchester, M25 0FA

Description

The application relates to a corner plot of land in a residential area. The site is bounded by No 70 Park Road, a semi detached house to the south and No 71 Brooklands Road, a semi detached house to the east (rear) and is located close to a 4-way junction and mini-roundabout.

The site is generous in size and formally accommodated a large 2 storey single dwelling which has since been demolished and the site cleared.

The site is bounded by a brick wall and there is an existing driveway to the south off Park Road and a pedestrian gated access from Brooklands Road.

The application proposes the erection of 6 no semi-detached dwellings.

For the purposes of the report, the layout of the houses will refer to plots 1-6, with plot 1 located to the north of the site on the corner of Park Road and Brooklands Road and plot 6 to the south, adjacent to No 70 Park Road.

The proposed dwellings and site frontage would face Park Road, with plots 1-4 set in a linear row and plots 5 and 6 forward of their building line by approx 6.8m.

Each property would have a driveway at the front with two parking spaces.

Plot 6 would be accessed directly off Park Road.

For plots 1-5, a one way in/out system would be provided, where cars would enter the site from Park Road via a new dropped kerb onto a shared driveway which would run parallel to plots 1 and 4 and exit onto Park Road via a new dropped kerb next to the driveway with plot 5.

At the rear of each property would be the garden areas, which given the irregular boundary line to No 71 at the rear, would vary in depth for each property. Bins would be stored at the rear.

The proposed plans appear to show the existing front and side wall would be retained with a new fence erected on top.

The properties themselves would be 2 storey in height and provide living accommodation at the ground floor and 3 bedrooms and bathrooms at the first floor.

In terms of design, the dwellings would incorporate piked roof projections at the front first floor and front bay windows. The dwellings would be constructed of red brick at the ground floor and a rendered finish at the first floor elevations with grey roof tiles.

Relevant Planning History

DELEGATED REPORT

01924/E - Demolition of existing house and garage with provision for 4 no. dwellings - Enquiry completed 20/12/2016

02206/E - Erection of 11 no. flats - Enquiry completed 14/11/2018

02734/E - Erection of one detached house and two semi-detached houses. - Enquiry completed 18/07/2022

02960/E - Three pairs semi detached dwellings, creating six new dwellings - Enquiry completed 12/8/24

62178 - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 4 no. dwellings (2 no. detached and pair of semi-detached) - Approve with Conditions 16/01/2018

64642 - Erection of 4 no. storey block of 9 no. flats with basement car parking and landscaping - Approve with Conditions 18/12/2019

67039 - Variation of condition 02 (approved plans) of planning permission 62178 for demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 4 no. dwellings (2 no. detached and pair of semi-detached) -

to add single storey extensions to dwelling types B & C and minor amendments to the external levels. - Approve with Conditions 26/08/2021

68707 - Creation of one detached house and two semi detached houses - Approve with Conditions 27/10/2022

Publicity

Letters sent on 3/4/25 to 44 properties.

9 objections received with the following issues -

- If six properties are built on this plot it would make the mini roundabout more dangerous than it is now, Park Road is a major cut through and the 20mph signs together with mini roundabout are at least 95% ignored.
- Increase traffic and parking immeasurably.
- Much less street parking for all, including their visitors.
- Congestion in the area already causes issues for access for emergency services
- The area is extremely busy at the morning and evening rush hour times as the road is used as a cut through.
- Six houses with 12 extra cars trying to enter and exit will cause further havoc & endanger drivers, cyclists & pedestrians.
- The last application for 6 houses had entrances on Brooklands & Park Rds and received no objections as it spread the traffic impact.
- The plan states there will be no loss of parking spaces, but 5 spaces outside the plot will be lost and there is no provision for additional cars to these large houses or visitor parking.
- A quiet street corner will become busy, noisy and over-parked
- The project will have impact on the environment, including air and noise pollution and reduction of habitat (given the very limited green space included).
- I don't object to the building of homes here per se, but like the previous applications, the sensible course is to have some houses facing on to Brooklands Road ie at the side, to stop dangerous over-congestion on this part of Park Road.
- The turning radi of the entrance/exit seems to tight, especially if the driveways not kept clear. A barrier system should be put in place to ensure entrance/exit systems are used correctly.
- Less houses would be better

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - Recommend refusal on access and parking arrangements

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No objection subject to conditions

Waste Management - No response received.

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - No response received.

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - No objection subject to conditions.

United Utilities (Water and waste) - No objection subject to condition

Pre-start Conditions - Not relevant

Development Plan and Policies

H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-H1	Scale of New Housing Development
JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development

Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (PfE) and the saved policies within the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP), together with other relevant material planning considerations.

The policies of the UDP that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations. For simplicity, just the UDP and PfE Policies will be referred to in the report, unless there is a particular matter to highlight arising from the NPPF where it would otherwise be specifically mentioned.

Equality Act 2010: All planning applications are considered in light of the Equality Act 2010 and associated Public Sector Equality Duty, where the Council is required to have due regard for:

The elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimisation;

The advancement of equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it;

The fostering of good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it; which applies to people from the protected equality groups.

Human Rights: All planning applications are considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Under Article 6 the applicants (and those third parties who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end full consideration will be given to their comments.

Article 8 and Protocol 1 of the First Article confer a right to respect private and family life and a right to the protection of property, ie peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions which could include a person's home, and other land and business assets.

In taking account of the Council policy as set out in the Bury Unitary Development Plan 1997 and all material planning considerations, it is concluded on balance that the rights conferred upon the applicant/ objectors/ residents/ other interested party by Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol may be interfered with, since such interference is in accordance with the law and is justified in the public interest. Any restriction of these rights posed by refusal/ approval of the application is legitimate since it is proportionate to the wider benefits of such a decision, is based upon the merits of the proposal, and falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town & Country Planning Acts.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes (without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it) a duty upon the Council to exercise its functions and have due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of its functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area. In so doing and on making planning decisions under the Town and Country Planning Acts, the material Planning considerations shall have due regard to the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and its implications in the exercise of its functions.

Housing land supply and Principle of residential development

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material planning consideration in planning decisions, and emphasises the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. The Framework states that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing, with either a 5% buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market for land, or a 20% buffer where there has been significant undelivery of housing over the previous three years. As set out in NPPF paragraph 78, the supply of housing must be assessed against the housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies where these are less than five years old.

The joint Places for Everyone Plan was adopted with effect from 21 March 2024 and sets the up-to-date housing requirement for Bury against which the deliverable supply of housing land must be assessed. PfE Policy JP-H1 sets the following stepped targets for Bury:

- 246 homes per year from 2022-2025;
- 452 homes per year from 2025-2030; then
- 520 homes per year from 2030-2039.

Bury's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment sets out the latest housing supply position, which is made up of sites that have an extant planning permission and sites that have potential to obtain planning permission in the future. This shows that there are a number of sites within the Borough with the potential to deliver a significant amount of housing. However, not all of these sites will contribute to the deliverable land supply calculations as many sites will take longer than five years to come forward and be fully developed. The joint Places for Everyone Plan allocates significant strategic sites for housing within Bury and will accelerate housing delivery within the Borough to meet housing needs.

Following the adoption of Places for Everyone, the Council is able to demonstrate a deliverable 5 year supply of housing land with a 20% buffer (as currently required in Bury due to past under delivery) when assessed against the adopted PfE housing requirement.

The National Planning Policy Framework also sets out the Housing Delivery Test (HDT), which is an assessment of net additional dwellings provided over the previous three years against the homes required. Where the test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75%) the housing requirement over the previous years, this needs to be taken into account in the decision-taking process. The latest results published by the Government (the 2023 measurement published on 12 December 2024) show that Bury has a HDT result of less than 75%, and therefore, this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential development.

Therefore, paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless:

- i. The application of policies in the Framework that protect areas, or assets of particular importance, provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

As a result of the latest published HDT result the 'tilted balance' applies and planning permission should be granted unless the above points Para 11(d) i or ii apply.

NPPF paragraph 80 requires the latest published HDT results to be used. However, the Government is currently operating to a delayed publication timetable for the HDT, and although the latest published results for 2023 are below 75%, based on the current HDT rulebook Bury's result for 2024 will be above 75% and the tilted balance will no longer be triggered by the housing delivery test result.

UDP Policy H1/2 states that the Council will have regard to various factors when assessing a proposal for residential development, including whether the proposal is within the urban area, the availability of infrastructure and the suitability of the site, with regard to amenity, the nature of the local environment and the surrounding land uses.

UDP Policies H2/1 - The Form of New Residential Development and H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development takes into consideration factors relating to the height and roof type of adjacent buildings, the impact of developments on residential amenity, the density and character of the surrounding area and the position and proximity of neighbouring properties. Regard is also given to parking provision and access, landscaping and protection of trees/hedgerows and external areas.

Supplementary Planning Document 6 - Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties provides useful guidance in terms of acceptable aspect standards between dwellings and design criteria.

The site is located in an urban and residential area, sits outside the Green Belt and would not conflict with the local environment in terms of surrounding land uses and character of development for residential purposes. There is existing infrastructure in place to facilitate the development.

The site formally accommodated a single dwelling and approval has previously been granted for residential developments on the site.

As such the site has an established residential use and the principle for a residential development has been previously accepted.

The proposal for a residential development is therefore considered to be acceptable and would comply with the principles of the NPPF and UDP Policy H1/2.

Layout

Policy JP-H3 - PfE Policy JP-H3 also states that all new dwelling must:

1. Comply with the nationally described space standards (NDSS); and
2. Be built to the 'accessible and adaptable' standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations unless specific site conditions make this impracticable.

The applicant has provided a space standard table to demonstrate the dwellings would

comply with Nationally Prescribed Space Standards.

The applicant has also stated that each dwelling would be built to accessible and adaptable standards in accordance with Part M4(2) of Building Regulations.

The proposal would therefore accord with JP-H3.

Policy JP-H4 - Requires new housing development to be delivered at a density appropriate to the location, reflecting the relative accessibility of the site by walking, cycling and public transport and the need to achieve efficient use of land and high quality design. Policy JP-H4 sets out minimum densities that should be considered.

In accordance with JP-H4, regard should be had to a minimum net density of 50 dwellings per hectare. The total area of the site is 0.15 hectares which would require a density of 7.5 dwellings on this site. Lower densities may be acceptable where they can be justified by site specific issues such as the design context.

The development would under provide the level of housing required on this site but only by one. Although there has been an approval on site for 9 flats which would exceed density for this site, there has also been an approval for 4 no dwellings which is an extant permission given pre-commencement conditions have been discharged and a start on site made by the demolition of the existing building. This would be a fallback position.

In this instance, it is therefore considered that in terms of density, the proposal for 6 no dwellings on this site would be acceptable due to the above circumstance

In terms of the layout of the development, the 6 dwellings would front Park Road with plots 1-4 positioned along the same building line and plots 5 and 6 set forward by approx 6.8m. Park Road and the general character of the area is defined by a strong and defined building line, with properties set in a regimented row. The proposed development would interrupt the rhythm of the streetscene and as such considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of this area.

In terms of amenity space, due to the irregular rear boundary, each property would have varying levels of garden space. SPD6 advises that 7m should be retained between a 2 storey habitable room window and a directly facing boundary, with additional separation required where there would be a difference in levels or additional storey.

Plots 4 and 5 would have relatively small gardens and there would be a distance of 6m from the rear elevation of plot 4 to the boundary which would be sub-standard and fail to comply with SPD6.

Plots 1,2, 3 and 6 would have the larger gardens and would be policy compliant.

Parking for the 6 dwellings would be provided in front of each dwelling with plots 1-4 accessed via a shared entrance and driveway which would run the length of these 4 houses, exiting onto Park Road. The proposed development would result in an expanse of tarmac and hardstanding which would appear sterile and out of character with the existing streetscape and surrounding area and would be of a poor and inappropriate design solution for a residential development in this locality.

It is therefore considered that given the position of the dwellings, expanse of parking and access to it and the siting of the dwellings within the existing street scene, it is considered that the proposed development would be unacceptable and would be contrary to policies H2/1 and H2/2.

Design and appearance

The properties adjacent to the site are semi-detached hip roof styles, with uniform eaves

levels and roof heights.

The roof height of the proposed dwellings would be lower than the adjacent houses, but only marginally so, and as there would also be a gap between the site and the established houses, the proposed development would not look out of keeping in the streetscene.

The eaves levels of the properties would also be similar and the properties would incorporate pike fronted elevations and bay type windows which would also be similar to the surrounding housing stock.

The proportions, scale and massing of the proposed dwellings would not be dissimilar to the character of the area and materials of a mix of red brick and render elevations and tiled roofs would reflect the other houses in the area.

It is therefore considered that the design and appearance of the proposed development would be acceptable and comply with policies H2/1, H2/2 and EN1/2.

Impact on residential amenity

SPD6 provides guidance on aspect standards between residential properties and would be relevant in this case.

To No 71 Brooklands Road, there would be a distance of 6m from the rear of plot 4 to the boundary with this neighbour.

There would be habitable room windows on the rear elevation of this plot and as such aspect standards would be sub-standard.

To the adjacent property, No 70, plot 6 would be more or less in line with the front of this house and as there would be no habitable room windows on the side elevation of the new build, there would not be issues of overlooking or privacy.

In terms of impacts on the occupiers of the proposed development, the staggered arrangement of the dwellings would result in the footprint of plot 4 set much further back than plot 5 which would result in an overbearing relationship to plot 5, and due to the orientation of the sun would result in significant overshadowing of their garden.

Similarly, as plot 5 would be forward of the front elevation of plot 4, by approx 6.8m the siting of plot 5 would encroach the 45 degree line when taken from the ground floor habitable room window of plot 4.

As such, the proposed development is considered to be harmful to residential amenity would be contrary to policies H2/1, H2/2 and SPD6.

Highway issues

Parking

SPD11 states that for 3 bed houses, maximum standards would require 2 parking spaces in a high access area.

The site is in a relatively sustainable area and it is considered that given the location 2 spaces would be sufficient for each property.

However, the access arrangements to provide a shared in/out driveway (see below) would result in the loss of on-street parking facilities, which not only serve existing residents but also visitors to the area, and visitors to a future development on this site.

Access

Instead of individual driveways to plots 1-5, it is proposed to create a one way in/out system with the 'in' route accessed via a drop kerb in front of plot 2 which would lead to a shared driveway which would run across the frontage of plots 1-4 and directly to each private drive. From the shared driveway in front of plot 4, cars would exit via a dropped kerb onto Park Road.

The driveway for plot 5 would be located at the end of the shared drive where cars would

pull straight into the drive and reverse out, which would be orientated side-on to Park Road. Plot 6 would have its own driveway access from Park Road.

Not only is this access arrangement odd for a residential development within this particular locality, but the Highway Authority have commented that the proposed one-way arrangements would compromise highway safety, particularly as the access points would be located so close to the mini roundabouts which serves the crossroads of Park Road and Brooklands Road. There could also be conflicts within the site from cars manoeuvring on and off the drives into the shared drive when cars are turning into the site. The development would also not provide adequate visibility at the back edge of the footway when exiting the site.

The Highway Authority have also commented that the development would fail to provide adequate arrangements for the storage of bins on collection day which would be detrimental to pedestrian and highway safety.

To also note, the proposed site section and streetscene plan (dwg 506 rev 1, annotated on plan as Site section key and - 3D frontage) show a different access/egress and driveway layout comparative to the proposed site plan arrangements and as such conflicting and insufficient information has been submitted.

The Highway Authority have recommended refusal of the application on the above grounds and as such the proposed development would be contrary to policies H2/1, H2/2, HT2/4, JP-C5 and JP-C8.

Ecology

Summary

Potential ecological issues include nesting birds and biodiversity net gain

Protected Species

GMEU are satisfied that it is very unlikely that there will be any protected species issues associated with this development. Whilst bats could theoretically roost in the mature tree, the tree appears healthy and is retained. No further information or measures are required.

Nesting Birds

A length of hedgerow are bramble scrub are proposed for removal potential bird nesting habitat. All British birds nests and eggs (with certain limited exceptions) are protected by Section 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981, as amended. GMEU recommend a condition be applied to any permission to restrict the removal of trees and shrubs.

Contributing to and Enhancing the Natural Environment & Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

Section 187 of the NPPF 2024 states that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. 10% BNG is mandatory under Schedule 7A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021).

The development would result in the loss of early successional habitats on the site of what was previously a dwelling and garden. Wildlife issues are restricted to nesting birds and loss of bat roosting potential associated with the now demolished dwelling.

A biodiversity net gain assessment has been provided. This indicates a shortfall of 0.65 area based units and 0.02 hedge units to achieve 10% net gain. There are no river units for this site. GMEU have no issues with the BNG assessment or metric. As gardens are to be created there is no real potential to increase the on-site value of the site and GMEU assume off-site credits will be purchased, the amount required would unlikely make the development unviable. As the on-site measures only include gardens, no HMMP for the on-site measures would be required and therefore no HMMP condition or legal agreement.

To discharge the statutory condition, the developer would have to demonstrate that the off-site units have been acquired and registered with defra and provide the biodiversity gain plan and final version of the statutory metric.

For wildlife GMEU recommend provision of one bird box per dwelling (swift brick unless it can be demonstrated another species would clearly benefit more) and two bat boxes. The details could be provided via condition.

Air quality

The site is not located within an Air Quality Management Area. Due to the scale of the development, it is considered unlikely that the development would create an increase of more than 500 AADT (annual average daily traffic). Therefore, in line with the Planning Practice Guidance-Air Quality and EPUK Guidance, an air quality assessment will not be required.

Bury Council has been identified by DEFRA as an area requiring to significantly improve air quality. The required measures to do this are currently under discussion. Due to this requirement, and the requirements of the building regulations (The Building Regulations 2010, Approved Document S, Infrastructure for the charging of electric vehicles), this Section recommends a condition for the installation of EV chargepoints for each dwelling.

Carbon and energy

Policy JP-S2 - Carbon & Energy sets out the steps required to achieve net zero carbon emissions. Development proposals should set out how this has been achieved in an energy statement in accordance with the energy hierarchy.

The applicant has not provided a Carbon and energy statement as required by this policy. However, should the application be approved, a condition would be included for the development to incorporate an EV chargepoints for each dwelling and a condition could be included requiring the applicant to submit an energy saving statement for approval prior to commencement of the development.

Digital connectivity

Policy JP-C2 requires development to have full fibre to premises connections unless infeasible or unviable, with multiple-ducting. The policy supports the provision of free, secure, high-speed public wi-fi connections, particularly in the most frequented areas.

The applicant states that the development would benefit from full fibre connections, operational internet connections and accessibility to network providers.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with JP-C2.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

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. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

DELEGATED REPORT

- 1 The proposed development specifically in relation to plots 4 and 5, would be seriously detrimental to the occupiers of these plots by reason of siting and position due to the overbearing relationship, loss of natural sunlight and loss of privacy and outlook for these occupiers. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies H2/1, H2/2 and SPD6.
- 2 The proposed development would, by reason of the siting and position and staggered arrangements of the plots and the extent and position of the access, shared driveways and private driveways, interrupt the established rhythm of the streetscene and considered harmful to the character of the area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies EN1/2, H2/1 and H2/2.
- 3 The proposed development would result in an unacceptable reduction in the level of privacy currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No 71 Brooklands Road by reason of the sub-standard distances between habitable windows on the proposed rear elevation of plot 4 and the amenity space of that property. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Unitary Development Plan Policies H2/1 - The Form of New Residential development and H2/2 - The Layout of New Residential Development and SPD6.
- 4 The proposal would result in the creation of new, additional and unnecessary accesses onto Park Road, which will lead to the unacceptable loss of on-street parking facilities for existing residents on the adopted highway to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and road safety. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies H2/2, EN1/2, JP-C5 and JP-C8.
- 5 The proposed access and egress and one way working arrangements onto Park Road are substandard and not appropriate to serve a residential development and would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and highway safety. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies H2/2, EN1/2, JP-C5 and JP-C8.
- 6 The proposed egress is substandard in terms of visibility at the back edge of the footway, which would be detrimental to pedestrian and road safety. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies H2/2, EN1/2 and JP-C8.
- 7 The proposed development does not incorporate adequate arrangements clear of the adopted highway for the storage of refuse bins on collection day, to the detriment of pedestrian and highway safety. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies H2/1, EN1/2 and JP-C8.
- 8 The application and submitted plans on the proposed site plan dwg 502 and site section and streetscene plan dwg 506 rev 1 contain conflicting information with regards to the proposed siting and layout of the proposed dwellings, access and parking to enable them to be properly assessed. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies H2/2, EN1/2 and JP-C8.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
JT	9/5/25		