



Appeal Decision

Hearing (Virtual) Held on 27 April 2021

Site Visit made on 28 April 2021

by A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/W/20/3264723

Focus School, Stoke Poges Campus, School Lane, Stoke Poges SL2 4QA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by the Department for Education against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref PL/19/3143/FA, dated 10 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a multi-purpose space and ancillary rooms, removal of existing modular classrooms, creation of a new footpath link with Khalsa Academy, creation of temporary construction access on School Lane and related landscaping, SUDS and other drainage works and associated works to 6 no. TPO trees.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a multi-purpose space and ancillary rooms, removal of existing modular classrooms, creation of a new footpath link with Khalsa Academy, creation of temporary construction access on School Lane and related landscaping, SUDS and other drainage works and associated works to 6 no. TPO trees at Focus School, Stoke Poges Campus, School Lane, Stoke Poges SL2 4QA, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref PL/19/3143/FA, dated 10 September 2019, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 1 April 2020 South Bucks District Council merged with Buckinghamshire County Council, Aylesbury Vale District Council, Chiltern District Council and Wycombe District Council to become Buckinghamshire Council. The development plans for the merged local planning authority remain in place for the former area of South Bucks District Council until such a time as they are revoked or replaced. It is therefore necessary to determine this appeal with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved South Bucks District Council.
3. The existing building at the site, known as the Focus School, is a grade II listed building. Applications for planning permission and listed building consent for the proposal were submitted to the Council on 10 September 2019. Although the Council refused the application for planning permission it granted listed building consent for the works. Thus, this appeal only relates to the application for planning permission, and I have removed the reference to listed building consent from the description of development.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

- (a) Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies,
- (b) The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt
- (c) The effect of the proposal on the significance of the grade II listed building known as Focus School.
- (d) Whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations. If so, whether these would amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt

- 5. The parties agree that the proposal would not fall within any of the exceptions set out in paragraphs 145 or 146 of the Framework. I have no reason to take an alternative view and therefore the starting point is that the proposal would be inappropriate development which, by definition, is harmful to the Green Belt.
- 6. Paragraph 144 of the Framework establishes that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt, and development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Saved Policy GB1 of the South Bucks District Plan 1999 does not make provision for development in the Green Belt where very special circumstances apply. This is contrary to the position established by paragraph 144 of the Framework. I must therefore attach less weight to this Policy.

Openness of the Green Belt

- 7. A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to keep land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The proposal would see a substantial building introduced in an area of the site that is currently free of built form and would therefore have an adverse impact on the spatial aspect of Green Belt openness.
- 8. School Lane runs along the southern edge of the site. The building would be visually contained by existing well established perimeter planting around the site to the south and east, which would significantly limit views of the extension from the Lane. There would be some direct views of the building when viewed from the west, alongside the front of the existing building towards the gap between it and the roadside vegetation. However, this would be a modest glimpse in the context of the significant built form of the existing school.
- 9. Although not a public vantage point, there would be some visibility of the building from the adjacent playing field to the east of the site, which currently serves the Khalsa Academy. The white window frames of the existing building stand out through the existing vegetation. However, the proposed building would not have openings facing out in this direction. Instead its external facades would comprise a mute material palette, made up of clay tiles and brick, which would give the facades a fine grain and some texture, that would allow the building to sit comfortably behind the woody site perimeter without

being prominent. I am therefore satisfied that the building would not be visually prominent from the playing field or the road to the south even where it could be glimpsed through the existing well established vegetation or during the winter months when deciduous trees would not be in leaf.

10. In summary, the building would be visible from School Lane when viewed from the west alongside the front of the existing building. However this would be a modest glimpse and thus I am satisfied that the proposal would have a modest adverse impact on the visual aspect of the openness of the Green Belt.

Listed building

11. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA), which requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The parties agree that the proposal would cause harm to the heritage asset. I agree that large bulky form of the proposed building would be quite different to the traditional form of the existing historic school would be harmful.
12. However, the design has been carefully considered so as to minimise the level of harm. This includes a palette of materials that pick up on the colours and textures of those used in the historic building. Furthermore, locating the extension to one side would respect the linear form of the existing building, and in this location the proposal would be visually distinct from the historic building and separated by a component of the existing building that is of limited historic significance. It would also not be prominent to view.
13. In summary, although the above matters would lessen the proposal's impact, it would still fail to meet the requirements of the LBCA as it would cause harm to special interest of the listed building. It would thus be contrary to Saved Policy CP8 of South Bucks Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 and Saved Policy EP3 of the South Bucks District Local Plan 1999, which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high standard of design in the context of the paramount importance of the protection and enhancement of the local historic environment.

Other considerations

14. The proposal is for a multi-purpose hall that would provide a large single space that the school could use for holding exams, assemblies, and physical education (PE). The Council suggests that since the school opened in 2013 it has managed to successfully carry out these functions within the existing building known as Pioneer House. Therefore, it suggests that the proposed building is not justified
15. At the hearing I heard evidence that holding exams at Pioneer House has been a tremendous struggle to date. The school currently uses the Gurdwara for exams, but this is a place of spiritual significance to those who follow the Sikh faith, used for spiritual assemblies and worship, and for the display of the Sikh holy scriptures. Those using the room are required to remove their shoes and have their head covered. For these reasons it is not suited to the holding of exams. Furthermore, it is not large enough to hold a single year group for an exam, which creates a further logistical challenge for the school in circumstances where a single year group should sit an exam at the same time.

Additionally, where there is a requirement for smaller rooms to be used for exams, suitable rooms are difficult to find within Pioneer House.

16. The proposed building would provide space for 120 students to be seated for an exam, sufficient for a whole year group to sit an exam at the same time. Adjacent smaller rooms to the proposed extension could be used at the same time as required. Based on the evidence before me I am satisfied that there is a significant need to improve the provision at the school for the holding of exams, and this would be satisfied by the proposal. The ability of the proposal to satisfy this need attracts significant weight.
17. Less space is needed to seat pupils for an assembly, and the existing Gurdwara provides sufficient space for 240 pupils to be seated together, which is two year groups. However, for the reasons above, although the Gurdwara is currently used for such it is not suited to secular assemblies. As an alternative a single year group can fit into the drama hall. However, the school has a desire to hold assemblies for up to 3 year groups at once, and a bigger space could be used for school events that would bring large parts of the school together to deliver key messages and aid whole school cohesion.
18. The proposal would provide space for 364 pupils to be seated for an assembly. The large space could be used for a wide range of school gatherings, which would be complementary to the use of the Gurdwara for religious assemblies. I am satisfied that there is a need to improve the provision at the school for the holding of assemblies, and that this would be met by the proposal. The ability of the proposal to satisfy this need attracts significant weight.
19. Although there is some external space at the existing school site for PE, at my visit I could see that Pioneer House has no internal space that is large enough, particularly in terms of ceiling height, to hold PE lessons. The school has managed to provide lessons by transporting pupils to nearby facilities. There are several disadvantages to this, including the time taken out of lessons for travel, the cost of travel, and the logistics and costs associated with booking suitable facilities. As a result, the range of PE activities that the school can currently offer is severely limited, to the extent that it is unable to offer 3 modules of the PE national curriculum.
20. At the hearing the appellant confirmed that, even with the proposed building, there would still be a requirement to travel off site to allow pupils to participate in a limited range of specialist activities. These would include swimming, golf and rock climbing. However, this requirement would be modest, and it would be unrealistic to expect a school to provide on-site facilities for such a wide range of sporting activities.
21. The Council has advised that the proposed hall would be too small to comply with the Department of Education's Area Guidelines for Mainstream Schools Building Bulletin 103 (BB103). As a result, it considers that there may be a requirement for a larger hall in the future. The appellant agrees that the proposal does not accord fully with BB103. However, this document is a guidance document. Furthermore, the provision that the proposed building would offer is a very significant improvement to that provided currently at the school. Additionally, the proposal is for a multi-use space and the space requirements for the school are different than they would be if the building was solely to be used for PE.

22. The proposal would allow pupils across the whole school to participate in a range of indoor PE activities on-site, which would be a significant improvement to the limited range of PE activities that can currently be provided. I cannot of course be sure that a larger building may not be required at a future date. However, I am satisfied that the proposal is sufficient to meet the identified need at the school. It would have a positive impact on the physical and mental wellbeing of pupils at the school. For these reasons I am satisfied that there is a significant need to improve the provision at the school for PE, and that this would be met by the proposal. The ability of the proposal to satisfy this need attracts significant weight.
23. The proposal includes the removal of the existing modular classrooms. The appellant confirms that they were used by the previous occupants of the site and that the Khalsa Academy would not need to use them. They were subject to a temporary planning permission which has expired. They are not in the same location as the proposed building and would therefore not need to be removed to allow the development to proceed. As they no longer benefit from planning permission, they would need to be removed anyway. As such I consider this to be a neutral matter.
24. In weighing up the ability of the proposal to satisfy the identified need it is important for me to consider whether the need could be satisfied elsewhere at the site in a manner that would have less impact on the openness of the Green Belt, taking into account whether any other adverse impacts would arise from alternative options. Several alternative options are considered in the appeal submissions, and these were explored further at the hearing. These are set out across the appeal site and the existing site of Pioneer House. I will refer to each option by using the labelling set out in section 3 of the Supporting Statement by Innes Associates, dated November 2020.
25. Option A would see a building placed to the south of the Pioneer House. It would connect to the existing building in the area of the existing changing rooms and would therefore compliment the existing layout of Pioneer House. However, it would occupy part of the existing area of hardstanding, which is useful for break times and outdoor PE. At the hearing the appellant confirmed that although equivalent space could be found elsewhere at the site it would be separate from the other hardstanding PE areas, and would therefore not provide an equivalent use or function. Option A would be in an open area of the site, on higher ground than the appeal proposal without the benefit of established perimeter screening. In summary, Option A would be likely to have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and would have an adverse impact on the use and function of the existing external space.
26. Option B would see a building neatly slot into the existing courtyard of Pioneer House. Owing to the scale of the existing building it would not be seen from beyond this courtyard area and would therefore have no real impact on the visual aspect of the openness of the Green Belt. However, it would severely compromise the existing building. At the hearing the appellant confirmed that two thirds of the existing classrooms face into this area. At my visit I saw that they benefit from significant levels of natural light from the large window openings that face into the courtyard. Infilling much of this area with an extension would have a significant adverse impact on the quality of these teaching spaces. Furthermore, building here would result in the loss of most of the courtyard area, which I could see at my visit was a useful external space to

- the school. Therefore, although the effect of this option on the openness of the Green Belt would be significantly less than the appeal proposal, this option would have a significant adverse impact on the functionality of the existing building.
27. Option C would be alongside Pioneer House and would be similarly scaled. In this position it would be likely to have a significantly greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt due to its prominent siting alongside the existing building with open views from Hollybush Hill. It would also be close to nearby dwellings, which could have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of these dwellings. It would therefore be no more favourable than the appeal proposal.
 28. Option D would be to the rear of the listed school building and would be sunk down to enable a level connection with the existing building. The impact of this option on the visual aspect of the Green Belt would be similar to the appeal proposal. It would be largely contained behind the existing building and not visible from the lower level of School Lane to the south, but could perhaps be glimpsed in more distant views from the south and would be visible over the top of the existing building from School Lane to the west. However, it would have a more significant impact on the occupiers of the nearest dwelling to the north. It would also obscure the existing view of the rear of the original listed building, which can currently be appreciated over the height of later rearward extensions.
 29. Option D would result in the loss of a large and useful external PE and play area. Although the impact on the openness of the Green Belt would be similar to that of the appeal proposal, this option would have an adverse impact on the functionality of the existing external space. It would also have a greater impact on the significance of the listed building, and the potential to harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the nearby dwelling.
 30. Although not referred to in the appellant's supporting statement, at the hearing we also discussed the merits of extending the listed building by increasing the size of the small hall at the rear. This hall has a low ceiling height. Even if the ceiling was removed and the space opened up into the roof void it would still retain a low eaves level that would limit the internal volume and restrict the potential for it to be extended. It would therefore be likely to provide a building that would be less functional than the appeal proposal and would have a similar impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Replacing it with a new hall similar to the appeal proposal would be likely to have a more harmful impact on the significance of the listed building owing to its position. It would therefore be no more favourable than the appeal proposal.
 31. With regard to comments before me relating to the highways impact, the proposal does not involve an increase in the number of pupils or staff at the site. Parking provision would remain as it is currently, and indeed the existing building is already in a school use, which would not change. The large car park at the front of Pioneer House would remain the principal parking and drop off area for the combined site, and I note that the County Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposal would not result in an increase in vehicular movement.
 32. A new temporary access would be created as part of the proposal, which would be managed by the submitted construction management plan, which includes

appropriate limitations that would manage the effect of construction work on existing users of the lane. On this basis I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the safe operation of the existing highway network, and would not lead to other adverse highway impacts such as additional noise, both during construction and once the proposal is in operation.

Very special circumstances including heritage balance

33. The proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The Framework establishes that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt, and development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. In addition, I have found that the scheme would also have a modest adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the significance of the listed building. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm are clearly outweighed by other considerations.
34. The other considerations before me are substantial and carry significant weight. I am satisfied that the need for the proposal to provide additional accommodation at the school for exams, assemblies and PE has been clearly demonstrated. Paragraph 94 of the Framework gives great weight to the need to expand or alter schools and pupils at the school are currently severely disadvantaged by inadequate facilities at Pioneer House. I am satisfied that there are no alternative locations within the existing building or alternative development proposals that could satisfy this need but result in less Green Belt harm or other material harm.
35. The harm to the significance of the listed building would be less than substantial, with reference to paragraph 196 of the Framework. Paragraph 193 of the Framework establishes that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset. The statement of common ground establishes that the Council is satisfied that the harm to the listed building would be significantly outweighed by the public benefits that the proposal would bring to the Academy as an educational facility, through the improved facilities it would deliver and improvements to how the Academy operates, and the experience it provides for its pupils. I see no reason to take a contrary view. I am therefore satisfied that the benefits of the proposal, which are significant benefits of a public nature, clearly outweigh the less than substantial level of harm.
36. I find that the other considerations in this case clearly outweigh the harm that I have identified. Looking at the case as a whole, I consider that very special circumstances exist which justify the development.

Conditions

37. I have had regard to the planning conditions suggested in the statement of common ground. I have considered them against the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty.
38. I have imposed a condition relating to the timely provision of the temporary means of access. I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the work is carried out in accordance with the construction traffic management plan and a condition to ensure that the temporary means of access is removed following

construction work. These conditions are necessary to also ensure that the works do not have a harmful effect on the safe operation of the local highway network.

39. I have imposed a condition relating to surface water drainage at the site to manage flood risk appropriately. I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the agreed drainage system is maintained properly, to ensure that it continues to manage flood risk at the site for the lifetime of the development.
40. I have imposed conditions relating to protected species, to ensure appropriate measures are in place for their protection, including design details for external lighting to prevent disturbance to light sensitive species such as bats. I have also imposed a condition relating to ecological enhancements, to ensure that the necessary biodiversity net gain is achieved at the site.
41. I have imposed a contaminated land condition to ensure that risks from land contamination at the site are properly understood, for the safety of future users of the site and neighbouring land users, as well as any ecological impacts that may arise from any contamination.
42. I have imposed conditions relating to the external materials of the building, landscaping and arboricultural work at the site to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
43. The Council has suggested a condition that would limit the use of the school building for educational purposes only, to prevent it from being leased or hired to other organisations. At the hearing the Council pointed out that the proposal is not for a community facility, and that such activity over and above the educational use of the building would generate additional activity in the Green Belt which could cause additional Green Belt harm, as a result of additional persons attending the site, additional traffic and general activity. Furthermore, the Council suggested that the use of the proposed building by other groups would also have the potential to harm the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings. The Council also suggested that there is no identified local need to put the building to such additional uses.
44. Pioneer House is a larger building with a greater potential to be put to other uses and has no such restriction. The proposed building would already be a hub of activity during the school day. I am not satisfied that further community uses would constitute significant additional harm to the Green Belt. Furthermore, the proposed building would be distant from nearby dwellings, sufficient to ensure that such uses need not harm the living conditions of nearby occupiers. As a result, I am satisfied that such a condition would not be necessary to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms.

Conclusion

45. For the reasons above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following submitted plans:
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-0002,
FS0172-IA-30-00-GA-A Rev 4C,
FS0172-IA-30-01-GA-A Rev 4C,
FS0172-IA-30-RF-GA-A Rev 4C,
FS0172-IA-30-ZZ-EL-A-0001 Rev 4C,
FS0172-IA-30-ZZ-EL-A-0002 Rev 4C,
FS0172-IA-30-ZZ-EL-A-0004 Rev 4C,
FS0172-IA-30-22-EL-A-0005 Rev 4B,
FS0172-IA-30-ZZ-XS-A-0001 Rev 4C,
FS0172-IA-30-ZZ-XS-A-0002 Rev 4C,
FS0172-IA-30-ZZ-XS-A-0003 Rev 4C,
FS0172-IA-30-ZZ-XS-A-0004 Rev 4C,
FS0172-IA-02-00-SK-A-0001 Rev 4A,
FS0172-IA-02-00-SK-A-0002 Rev 4A,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-1000 Rev P04,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-1001 Rev P08,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-1002 Rev P10,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-1006 Rev P05,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-2001 Rev P06,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-2002 Rev P02,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-2003 Rev P02,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-2004 Rev P04,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-2005 Rev P02,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-3001 Rev P06,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-4001 Rev P04,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-4002 Rev P04,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-4003 Rev P04,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-4005 Rev P04,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-4006 Rev P04,
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-4007 Rev P03 and
FS0172-TF-00-00-DR-L-5005 Rev P05.
- 3) Prior to the commencement of development, the temporary means of access shall be constructed in accordance with the approved drawings and in accordance with Buckinghamshire County Council's guidance note 'Commercial Vehicular Access within Highway Limits' published in 2013.
- 4) No works (other than demolition) shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (ref. 07135, July 2019, 7 Engineering Consultancy) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include:
 - a. full construction details of all SuDS and drainage components,

- b. detailed drainage layout with pipe numbers, gradients and pipe sizes complete,
 - c. calculations to demonstrate that the proposed drainage system can contain up to the 1 in 30 year storm event without flooding. Any onsite flooding between the 1 in 30 year event and the 1 in 100 year event plus climate change storm event should be safely contained on site.
- 5) The development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations provided within the Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Report (The Ecology Consultancy, September 2019). No demolition shall take place until a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence has been granted by Natural England. A copy of the license is to be provided to the Local Planning Authority.
- 6) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- 7) In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.
- 8) The development shall be implemented in accordance with the submitted arboricultural method statement and under the supervision of a retained arboricultural specialist in order to ensure that the phasing of the development accords with the stages detailed in the method statement and that the correct materials and techniques are employed.
- 9) A schedule of materials to be used in the elevations and hard surfacing of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any construction works above ground level. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 10) The development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the submitted landscaping details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 11) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the development hereby permitted or the substantial completion of the development, whichever is sooner.

Any trees, hedgerows or shrubs forming part of the approved landscaping scheme which within a period of five years from the occupation or substantial completion of the development, whichever is later, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the

next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

- 12) Prior to the installation of any external lighting, details of external lighting for the development hereby approved, including external features or areas to be lit, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting scheme shall be designed to prevent disturbance to light sensitive wildlife such as bats. The development shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 13) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, a scheme of ecological enhancements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to ensure that an overall net gain in biodiversity will be achieved. The scheme will include details of hibernacula such as log piles and provision of artificial roost features, including bird and bat boxes. A measurable net gain in biodiversity shall be demonstrated. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 14) Prior to the occupation of the development, a whole-life maintenance plan for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall set out how and when to maintain the full drainage system (e.g. a maintenance schedule for each drainage / SuDS component), with details of who is to be responsible for carrying out the maintenance. The plan shall also include as-built drawings and / or photographic evidence of the drainage scheme carried out by a suitably qualified person. The plan shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 15) Within one month of the completion of the development hereby approved, the temporary means of access shall be removed, and the land re-landscaped in accordance with the details submitted and approved as part of this application.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Lisa Busch QC

Barrister at Cornerstone Barristers

David Murray-Cox BA (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

Director at Turley

James Cording BA (Hons) MSc FRGS MRTPI

Senior Planner at Turley

Simon Innes Dip. Arch MSc MA BA BSc

Founding Director at Innes Associates

Corinna Demmar BA (Hons) DipLA (Hons) CMLI

Senior Director, Landscape at RPS

Chris Drew BA (Hons) PGCE

Headteacher at Khalsa Secondary Academy

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ian Severn

Senior Planning Officer

Alex Armour

Planning Officer

Documents submitted during the hearing

A copy of Saved Policy EP6 of the South Bucks District Local Plan 1999, received by email on the day of the hearing.

An email from the appellant giving agreement to the use of the two pre-commencement conditions set out in the statement of common ground, in the event that the appeal is allowed. This was received on the day of the hearing.