



Ref	Comment	Action	Applicant Response
<b>Oak Tree</b>			
1	Details of Arboricultural impact on Oak tree required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trial dig to provide confirmation that the subbase/level detail has been constructed as shown on the drawings and to determine impact arising from proximity of junction with tree</li> </ul>	<p>Trial digs took place on 5 May. Relevant data has been collected and this has been issued by the highways officers, to the tree officer who was on site to oversee the digs.</p> <p>Please see the 'Water Lane Trial Dig Photos' for images.</p>
2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Details of impact – both roots and canopy – and the removal of the bench</li> </ul>	<p>As there were no roots found in the trial digs, there is no anticipated impact on the roots of the Oak tree. The detail of this, and the detail of the pruning strategy for the canopy of the Oak are included within the arboricultural report</p>
3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CAVAT and potential mitigation (in case the tree fails to survive) which will be secured</li> </ul>	<p>A CAVAT report is included for review, however it should be noted that as there will be no impact on the roots of the tree, and the pruning strategy is acceptable to and has been discussed with the tree officer, there is a high chance of survival for this tree.</p>
4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide confirmation that the junction cannot be moved to the east as it then becomes unsafe</li> </ul>	<p>This is correct. Through review of the junction, moving the access further east would impact on the swept-path for larger vehicles egressing Water Lane, which we would deem a safety concern. Swept-path analysis from the alternative and preferred proposed arrangement whereby the junction remains further west has been subject to a Stage 1 RSA and swept-path analysis assessment as is deemed to work and facilitate two-way vehicle movement.</p> <p>Please see tracking diagram 70059704-TP-SK-76-TR2_P01.</p>
<b>Access along Embankment</b>			
5	<p>Cannot stop a vehicle turning up to service Eel Pie Island. There then may be a situation that such vehicles cannot turn and will need access along the Embankment.</p> <p>Any access will diminish quality of this public realm.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide evidence of the surveys that have been undertaken to determine how many vehicles will need access along The Embankment outside the hours of 7am – 10am.</li> </ul>	<p>Larger articulated HGV's are ultimately the vehicles which would require occasional and very infrequent access across the Embankment. All smaller HGV's and LGV's would be able to turn and travel back up Water Lane without crossing the Embankment. With regards survey data provided by SYSTRA on behalf of the Council, the video and traffic count surveys did not record any articulated HGV trips across the survey periods (beyond the acknowledged daily delivery to King Street unit early in the morning), further demonstrating the infrequency. The Council are in ownership of this survey data. In summary, the survey information collected does not detail any articulated vehicle trips egressing via the Embankment and Wharf Lane within a typical week, aside those noted for the King Street units.</p> <p>Through regular and extensive consultation with the Eel Pie Island Association through Stage 2 and 3 of design, it is understood that the boatyards / activity associated with the Island from larger vehicles (potentially articulated) takes place an estimated 3 to 4 times a year. There is no clear survey data / evidence available to demonstrate this.</p> <p>As the Council have detailed, they would certainly work cohesively with the EPI residents and boatyards to ensure these infrequent trips were managed and scheduled. To reiterate, the existing and future number of HGV trips requiring use of the Embankment is infrequent, and these occasional trips will be managed and expected to take place between 7am to 10am. A summary of vehicle trips associated with Eel Pie Island (for whom a formalised servicing area is being created through the proposals) is detailed in paragraphs 4.8.2 and 7.2.4 of the Transport Assessment, extracted below for ease of reference.</p> <p>In an analysis of the submitted Transport Assessment from Paul Mew Associates (note 12th October 2021) – transport consultants acting on behalf of Eel Pie Island, it is noted that access along the Embankment is important for the bespoke requirements of Eel Pie Island, most notably the boat yard and slipways business, but no reference is made to daily, monthly or annual servicing numbers or HGV trips associated with this.</p>

			<p>In summary of previous information received, there is no clear reference or mention of numbers in the previous correspondence with the EPIA. Photographs were provided by Paul Mew Associates on behalf of the EPIA and copied across to the wider TRS Design team in July 2020, but there was no quantification on numbers beyond this, more a photo record of some construction delivery photos which were understood to have been taken over recent years. It is clear from the appearance of the tree to the west of the footbridge alone that these photos were not taken during the same period.</p> <p>It is understood that the need for larger vehicles (in excess of those which can turn and go back up Water Lane) will occur infrequently, around 3-4 times per year according to numerous discussions held with the Eel Pie Island Association. The Council will work with EPIA to ensure that bookings for these larger vehicles are made within the 7-10am timeslot. However, if occurrences are outside of the hours available (7-10am), for any reasons outside of the control of EPIA and the Council, there needs to be a mechanism to make available emergency access across the Embankment to enable the vehicle to leave the site. This emergency access would need to be arranged by the EPIA in liaison with the Council, so that the Council could remove the bollards and allow access for the vehicle to exit.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with Eel Pie Island from operation of the masterplan to ensure that access is facilitated for larger vehicles to move across the Embankment, should there be a requirement outside of the hours available for reasons that cannot be controlled. As noted - it is understood that trips from vehicles which are too large to turn and go back up Water Lane take place 3-4 times per year.</p> <p>Regarding daily servicing by smaller vehicles, the Stage 3 Transport Assessment detailed an average of 19 servicing trips to EPI across a two day period (9 throughout a 24-hour period) with almost all daily deliveries being undertaken in a car or LGV. The proposals include 6 large bays to facilitate car and van parking, therefore ensuring that the existing level of servicing for the island will be accommodated whilst not impeding upon the vision for public realm along the Embankment. For regular daily deliveries, the formalisation of a loading area for EPI will give EPI a designated servicing and loading area (which is</p>
--	--	--	---

			not currently available), and the two-way working arrangement here along Water Lane will reduce the need for vehicles to travel west along the Embankment.
6		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detail the predicted traffic that will need access outside the 7-10am slot</li> </ul>	<p>The requirement for larger servicing trips are understood to be very infrequent at 3-4 times per year (as noted above), and therefore do not form part of a consideration for daily or weekly trips, irrespective of the access time constraints in place.</p> <p>The other trips along the Embankment would be for the events taking place, therefore trips which are directly linked to the purpose of the new Embankment space and would be managed by the Council.</p>
7		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detail what provisions can / will be put into contracts with refuse operators.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council will ensure that their residential waste contractor will collect only within the timeframe that the Embankment is open and will build this formally into the contractual arrangements with the current contractor (Serco) and any future new contractor. The Council will also explore the possibility of reducing the vehicle size that services the area, so that they do not need to use the Embankment in any event.</p> <p>This is a more difficult task and cannot be guaranteed as being possible at this stage but it will be actively pursued.</p> <p>In terms commercial waste collection, the Council as landlord will include provisions in the leases of the new properties that collection needs to be in the morning window when the Embankment is open. Collection could also be made from smaller vehicles than can access the site from Wharf Lane.</p> <p>We can agree to an appropriately worded condition securing a detailed refuse/waste strategy.</p>
8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detail what planning mechanisms are proposed to provide the necessary controls for the above.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council as highway authority has within its gift the ability to impose a Traffic Management Order to impose a restriction on servicing outside of the three hour 7am to 10am slot. This could provide the means to enforce against third party servicing vehicles that do not comply with the servicing restriction in a way that a planning condition cannot. There is flexibility within a TMO to ban all vehicles moving across the Embankment outside of those hours, which could be enforced via cameras. If necessary, this could also be supported by some CEO presence in the very early stages. Notwithstanding, we note that the arrival of larger vehicles outside of the 7-10am slot is likely to be a seldom occurrence.</p>
<b>Disabled parking</b>			
9	Justification needed for there being no dedicated disabled parking for residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RP's views on lack of any allocated/communal disabled parking specifically for the development (please note that the replacement bays on the public highway will be for public use).</li> </ul>	<p>The Applicant received the following response Response from PA Housing:</p> <p><i>We have entered into Heads of Terms with the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames for the purchase of the Water Lane residential units which are to be for affordable housing. We are aware that the whole scheme is a car free development and as a result there will not be specifically allocated disabled parking spaces for the accessible units, and that replacement disabled parking spaces provided on the highway will be for public use. Our offer, which assumes grant, was based on this.</i></p>
10		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm that the lack of parking will not adversely impact on any grant funding which has been/will be secured</li> </ul>	<p><i>As part of the agreement with the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames it allows them full nomination rights and so it is for the Council to determine whether there remains sufficient demand for wheelchair adaptable units. From our understanding the Council do not see this as an issue.</i></p>
11		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether the RP is satisfied there remains a demand for wheelchair housing without parking provision being secured on site.</li> </ul>	<p>The LPA has control of nominations from the housing waiting list and can also confirm that housing without parking can still meet identified need.</p>
<b>Wharf Lane Servicing for Iceland</b>			

12		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide details of the number of vehicles turning in during the loading period to service Iceland.</li> </ul>	<p>There will be one HGV delivery servicing Iceland each day and during the permitted hours of the loading period. Vehicle tracking and swept-path analysis undertaken by WSP has confirmed that southbound vehicle traffic can continue to travel along Wharf Lane and the service road whilst an articulated vehicle is parked and servicing Iceland. Two-way movement can therefore be maintained throughout the servicing period.</p>
13		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set out the controls via Planning to ensure that current and future occupiers of the same unit won't materially increase vehicular traffic or change the size of vehicles servicing this unit.</li> </ul>	<p>The LPA cannot impose a planning condition restricting Iceland's/a future occupier's use of the highway as the unit falls outside of the red line. Any condition would be unlikely to meet the necessary tests set out in Paragraph 55 of the NPPF and paragraph 003 (red ID 21a-003-20190723) of the Guidance. Such a condition would in our view not be relevant to this development, enforceable or reasonable.</p>
<b>Service Road</b>			
14		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land ownership – submit plans correctly showing the application site does not encroach onto private land ownership – ensure all plans are consistent with the land ownership plan</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to the below overlay of the red line boundary and topographical survey. As you can see the red line boundary follows the edge of the Iceland parking bays/back of pavement line (please also refer to the Google Street View mark-up below). As discussed, the previous proposed road edge clashed with this boundary but the junction has now been adjusted to avoid this clash. LDA's and WSP's drawings have been amended accordingly to reflect the change to road edge and hard landscaping.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">   </div>
15		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Footway is retained on the north side which will be secured by planning condition, if planning permission is granted</li> </ul>	<p>This is agreed.</p> <p>Please see General Arrangement Plan (ref. 6975_100) prepared by LDA Design.</p>

16		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide new plan showing the loading bay is 2.5m in width, allowing 2.9m passing width on the carriageway.</li> </ul>	<p>We can confirm the loading bay is 2.5m in width.</p> <p>Please see General Arrangement Plan (ref. 6975_100) prepared by LDA Design.</p>
<b>Embankment Cycle Parking</b>			
17		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Show single yellow line waiting restrictions.</li> </ul>	<p>SYL are not marked on the road adjacent to the cycle parking, given the nature and vision of the masterplan area as a public realm space. If SYL were to be marked here, this would:</p> <p>(1) Not be enforceable as a restriction across a 24-hour period in the same way that DYL would be;</p> <p>(2) Would be at odds with other kerb and footways within the masterplan area which are not marked or restricted given the nature of the use and limited vehicle access; and</p> <p>(3) There is no conceivable reason why vehicles would park immediately inside the bollards and opposite the cycle parking as this would directly block the access across the Embankment which would be apparent to all road users. In that respect, the area should be self-policing;</p> <p>(4) Signage on the western approach to the Embankment area immediately east of the bollards would be more suitable for emphasising loading / parking restrictions for the occasional trips of vehicles associated with events on within the masterplan area.</p>
18		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Following meeting, highway colleagues have requested that as part of the S278 Agreement, No U-turn signs are placed in King Street – (this is to stop vehicles trying to make a short cut to Wharf Lane). Please confirm agreement.</li> </ul>	<p>This is agreed.</p>
<b>Arboricultural Report</b>			
19		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update condition details of all retained trees</li> </ul>	<p>Information is all detailed within the Arboricultural Survey and Report, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement, and the CAVAT Report.</p>
20		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detail the percentage incursions within the root protection areas</li> </ul>	
21		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Check for consistency – number of trees to be felled, retained, and planted (also ensure other documents forming part of the submission are consistent)</li> </ul>	
22	<p>Further detail required.</p> <p>Note that the CAVAT payments secured cannot then be applied to the landscaping required to be implemented to make the development acceptable in planning terms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CAVAT valuation of all trees on site</li> <li>CAVAT valuation of trees to be felled</li> </ul>	
<b>Tree Transplantation</b>			
23			<p>Tree transplantation is no longer appropriate or required as set out in detail within the Arboricultural Reports.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require full method statement for tree transplantation, details of their storage during construction programme, and details of aftercare (and who this will be managed by).</li> </ul>	
24		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fallback mitigation strategy <b>or</b> commitment to re-planting should the transplanted trees not survive, replanting with trees of similar size and species in the next available planting season</li> </ul>	Please see comment above. Tree transplantation is no longer required.
<b>Pin Oaks</b>			
25		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree a condition that prior to commencement of development, a strategy for an investigation into the failure of the Pin Oaks shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA, and any landscaping along The Embankment to be finalised once the outcome of the investigation has been concluded.</li> </ul>	This is agreed.
<b>Black Poplar</b>			
26	Discussed the suitability of keeping the tree on site, broadly agreed that the tree would mature to such a size as to make its retention on site unsuitable or indeed in close proximity to the site also unsuitable	<p>To support the transplanting of the trees off site the applicant to provide the narrative on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detail the issues, concerns, maintenance requirements of this tree specie</li> <li>Detail the suitability of this tree in its current location – any issues / problems that may arise</li> <li>Detail why the tree is not suitable for this site/ in an alternative location on this site</li> <li>Detail potential alternative sites for the tree’s relocation – at the meeting Orleans Park, Radnor Gardens and Eel Pie Island were mentioned – <b>this should first be discussed internally by planning officers and the Parks team.</b></li> <li>Have discussions with colleagues from Trees Department over the suitability of alternative locations. Then discuss the potential with the active groups.</li> <li>Detail transplantation methodology for the tree (see above).</li> </ul>	The Black Poplar tree is not suitable for transplantation for reasons detailed within the Arboricultural reports. This has been discussed on site with the tree officer and details included within the report.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detail aftercare / maintenance to ensure survival or replacement if it does not.</li> </ul>	
<b>Embankment</b>			
27		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a further tree, south of the event space, to ensure coverage along The Embankment. <b>This will be secured by planning condition unless the submitted details are updated to show it.</b></li> </ul>	<p>The tree along the embankment has been provided.</p> <p>Please see General Arrangement Plan (ref. 6975_100) prepared by LDA Design.</p>
<b>Lighting</b>			
28		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide horizontal and vertical lux plans for existing and proposed lighting – up to high tide and showing height of columns.</li> </ul>	<p>It was agreed that vertical lux plans will not be calculated – we have calculated horizontal illuminance on the river surface at low and high tide levels and compared this against the calculated existing condition. Drawings show:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing illuminance levels on river surface at high tide</li> <li>Proposed illuminance on river surface at high tide</li> <li>Proposed illuminance on river surface at low tide</li> <li>Lighting schedule</li> <li>External lighting layout showing location of post-mounted lights</li> </ol>
<b>Urban Greening Factor</b>			
29		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-calculate as there are errors within the submission – noted the challenge of a mixed-use scheme not being covered by the policy.</li> </ul>	<p>Revised Urban Greening Factor score provided.</p> <p>Please see LDA drawing 6975_150.</p>
30		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend an increase in landscaping / biodiversity that has a higher value to maximise the opportunity to meet the target</li> </ul>	See above
31		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Show the UGF for the site as a whole (you can also provide an additional sheet excluding the highways).</li> </ul>	Please see LDA drawing 6975_150. This illustrates an overall UGF score across the site as 0.32 (rounded figure). Once the relevant highways are removed the UGF score increases to 0.39 (rounded figure), which is the figure that should be used.
32		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide explanation as to why the required target cannot be met.</li> </ul>	<p>A UGF Score of 0.4 is not achievable for this type of project given the public realm, highways, servicing, waterfront and commercial needs. However, the applicant has strived to improve the site from its current form in terms of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposal improves upon the existing in both UGF scores noted in response 31 above. Accessible green Infrastructure has been increased from a total of 1012m<sup>2</sup> to 1520m<sup>2</sup>. This includes herbaceous planting, lawn space, rain gardens, trees, green roofs, climbing plants and a floating wetland ecosystem.</p>
<b>Floating Ecosystem</b>			
33		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide clarification of the species to be planted – provide planting plan with key of species.</li> </ul>	A comprehensive planting list has been provided and all species therein are being proposed. A detailed planting plan can be appropriately conditioned.

34		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Future management and maintenance arrangements should be set out including the mechanism by which this will secured should permission be granted with any additional funding needed.</li> </ul>	Please refer to Biomatrix Floating Ecosystem Maintenance, Monitoring & Engagement document.
35		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All users can move around the site and play areas</li> </ul>	We can confirm all users can around the site and play areas.
36		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm all ramps are 1:20 gradient or less</li> </ul>	We can confirm all ramps are 1:20 gradient or less.
37		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide details of accessible benches – i.e. those with hand rails / higher install heights for ease of use.</li> </ul>	All benches are required to be designed in accordance with BS:8300, which is the relevant standard for accessible furniture.
<b>Event Space</b>			
39	<p>No details have been provided with submission on the number of events that may take place in the event space / DJGs, and the timings of such events. Other consultees have advised the LPA that this may be in the region of 50 per year. Whilst not discussed at the workshop, further details must be provided to ensure the potential impact of such is considered and if necessary, mitigation conditions secured on any consent.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of events that may take place within the event space per year</li> <li>• Number of events that may take place within DJG per year</li> <li>• Confirmation whether there will be any ‘combined’ events – utilising the DJG and event space or events in both spaces at the same time.</li> <li>• Number of people that could occupy the spaces (DJG / Event space / combined)</li> <li>• Type of activities that are proposed – i.e concerts, cinemas, markets etc.</li> </ul>	<p>It is the Council’s hope that the Twickenham Riverside Trust will continue to negotiate regarding the new public realm and its management. As such the below responses are in line with the Heads of Terms proposed to the Twickenham Riverside Trust in relation to the negotiated process/agreement and also in line with the recommendations set in the noise assessment. However should an agreement with the Trust not be reached, the Council will ensure that the following recommendations are adhered to. The events area may include all of the upper gardens and the event space on the Embankment. It should be noted that no events will run past 11pm.</p> <p><i>Number of events that may take place within the event space per year</i></p> <p>The Council requires an Event Strategy to be established and agreed following the completion of the works. The Strategy will be annually reviewed with the Council. The Strategy requires consultation with residents in the wider community within 6 months of the completion of the Works and thereafter no less than every 5 years to ensure that it meets the needs of the local community. The events space has been calculated as both the Upper Gardens and lower Embankment space.</p> <p>As set out in the noise assessment completed by TetraTech – there will be a total maximum of 12 concerts or cinema screenings per year in the events space. As the noise levels of other modelled events – markets, funfair and ice skating – are not expected to result in significant changes to ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the development site the Council would like to retain flexibility as to the number of events, to be agreed as part of the Events Strategy.</p> <p><i>Number of events that may take place within DJG per year</i></p> <p>As shown in the capacity studies and set out in the response above, there is not a differentiation between the upper and lower spaces. It is one coherent public space.</p> <p>Confirmation whether there will be any ‘combined’ events – utilising the DJG and event space or events in both spaces at the same time</p> <p>Please see response above. The noise assessment has considered the Upper Gardens and the lower Embankment space as the total events space as a worst case scenario. Events may use all of this space, or may utilise a smaller space.</p>



			<p><i>Number of people that could occupy the spaces (DJG/Event space/combined)</i></p> <p>Please see capacity studies within section 7 of the Design and Access Statement and the updated capacity studies (drawing ref. 6975_Capacity).</p> <p><i>Type of activities that are proposed – i.e. concerts, cinemas etc</i></p> <p>It is anticipated that many events similar to those already held on the DJG may continue to be delivered, alongside better use of the specially designed events space which could accommodate an outdoor cinema, small music event, markets, fun fair or ice skating rink as included within the capacity studies and the noise assessment. The Council would like to retain the flexibility to decide what future events may be held on this space subject to the noise and environmental health requirements set out in the noise report. The Council will be aware of any events in advance via the annual Event Strategy.</p>
--	--	--	---

40		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise assessment of such activities, to demonstrate these will not harm the amenities of future occupiers and existing residents surrounding the site. (The existing noise report only considers the noise from patrons and music outbreak of commercial premises, and service plant).</li> </ul>	Please see submitted Noise Assessment prepared by TetraTech.
<b>Play Area</b>			
41		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst not discussed at the workshop, there is a need to consider the impact of noise from the play area. Please provide an addendum for the noise assessment. (The existing noise report only considers the noise from patrons and music outbreak of commercial premises, and service plant).</li> </ul>	Please see submitted Noise Assessment prepared by TetraTech.
<b>Water Supply</b>			
42		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Show location of water points for event space.</li> </ul>	Please see LDA drawing 6975_100, where we have clouded the water point for ease.
<b>Furniture</b>			
43	<p>Refer to character areas within the Public Space Design Guide to more detail, however, in summary, this requires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seating – Festival steel; all timber on riverside/parks; Twickenham Embankment and riverside: special design</li> <li>Bollards – cast iron type in urban locations and timber elsewhere</li> <li>Tree grilles – Twickenham tree grille</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide examples of seating, bin style, bollards, barriers, lighting) and confirm furniture will comply with the Adopted Public Space Design Guide - <a href="#">Public Space Design Guide - London Borough of Richmond upon Thames</a>. This can then be conditioned.</li> </ul>	Please see LDA drawings 6975_401 to 407. Also see the 'Planning Furniture Response' contained within the wider LDA folder.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Litter bins – Pierhead Twickenham town centre; A24 some riverside locations</li> <li>Lighting – Twickenham town centre: Woody; Twickenham Embankment and Riverside: Oxford</li> </ul>		
44		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrate the suitability of the furniture in the floodable areas – barriers, bollards, seating, lighting etc</li> </ul>	<p>An appropriately worded condition can secure details of street furniture.</p> <p>All products specified will be considered for their suitability to the floodable areas. For example, lighting switches will be higher than usual, and benches will be easy to clean with the ability to sweep underneath them.</p>
<b>Hard Surfacing</b>			
45		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm if you intend to use granite setts for Water Lane and York Stone for pavement.</li> </ul>	<p>This is confirmed. Please see LDA drawing 6975_100.</p>

