

Appeal Decisions

Hearing Held on 16 February 2023

Site visits made on 16 February 2023

by Mrs H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 March 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/U5360/W/22/3293945

1 Fairholt Road, Hackney, London N16 5EN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Tiferes Meshulam Feiyish D'Tosh against the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2021/2106, is dated 29 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is part single, part three storey rear extension; with a single storey basement excavation; associated elevational changes; and the removal of residential use on site (C3), with sole use as synagogue (Use Class F1 (f)).
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/U5360/W/22/3308440

1 Fairholt Road, Hackney, London N16 5EN

- 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 Tiferes Meshulam Feiyish D'Tosh against the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application Ref 2022/1597, dated 28 June 2022, was refused on 25 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is part single, part three storey rear extension; with a single storey basement excavation; associated elevational changes; and the removal of residential use on site (C3), with sole use as synagogue (Use Class F1 (f)).
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed and planning permission is refused.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

3. Appeal A was submitted against the failure of the Council to determine the application within the prescribed period. Following that, the Appeal B application was submitted and was subsequently refused by the Council for six reasons. Save for a small platform lift addition within the front garden area in Appeal B, the proposals under Appeals A and B are identical, and, consequently, the six stated reasons for refusal have been taken as the main issues common to both appeals. I deal with the Appeals together below.

Applications for costs

4. Applications for costs were made by the appellant against the Council in writing in advance of the hearing. These applications are the subject of separate Decisions.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in the appeals are:

- the effects of the proposal on the number of residential units and policy considerations in relation to such;
- the effects on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to noise and disturbance;
- the effects on the local highway network and demand for parking;
- the effects on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area;
- the effects on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to outlook, enclosure and privacy; and
- the effects on the biodiversity value of the site.

Reasons

6. The appeal premises is an extended end-of-terrace Victorian house in a predominantly residential area of Stamford Hill on the junction of Fairholt Road and Fairholt Close. It is currently in mixed use as a synagogue on the ground floor and residential uses to the rear and upper floors and the parties were not in dispute about the lawfulness of this situation. The residential units take the form of 2 self-contained units across the upper floors, each with 2 bedrooms and a bedsit unit on the ground floor of the rear closet wing. There are no off-road car parking spaces on site but there are small, enclosed front and rear gardens.
7. The proposal is to demolish much of the existing building fabric with the exception of the front façade, side wall and roof and to replace it with an adapted and extended synagogue, subsuming all of the existing residential units into the single use of the building as a religious institution (use class F under the Use Classes Order¹). The extensions to the building would be across three levels, largely to the rear but also including additional floorspace within an enlarged split-level basement.
8. The stated rationale behind the proposal is to increase the capacity of the synagogue to accommodate the number of congregants in the area that wish to attend more regularly but are unable to, due to the synagogue's limited size, to accommodate growth of the existing members' families and welcome new members.

Residential units – losses/gains

9. The proposal would involve the loss of two self-contained flats, which, despite some shortcomings that could feasibly be addressed with some investment, are habitable in their current form.
10. The bedsitting unit, comprising a kitchen, shower room/WC and separate bedroom totalling around 22 sqm, offers a single window in the bedroom which offers an outlook, with the other side window situated in very close proximity to a wall. Whilst it is currently occupied, it offers a substandard form of residential accommodation.

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes Order) 1987, as amended

11. The Council refused the scheme, in part, based on an absence of justification for the loss of residential uses to accommodate the religious use of the building, claiming a lack of clarity about the capacity issues and demand for the proposal.
12. The London Plan, adopted in 2021, is the document which most recently became part of the development plan for the area. Policy H8 of the London Plan states that the loss of existing housing should be replaced by new housing at existing or higher densities with at least the equivalent level of overall floorspace. This strategic London-wide Policy is unequivocal in its terms, it does not offer any caveats where a loss may be justifiable, and thus, given that there would be no replacement housing, the proposal conflicts with London Plan Policy H8.
13. The development plan document more specific to Hackney, the Hackney Local Plan 2033 (Local Plan), was adopted in 2020. At the hearing, I was informed that the Local Plan was being prepared alongside the London Plan to ensure its policies were consistent with it, but that the adoption of the London Plan was delayed. This has resulted in the local policies, which add detail on the implementation of the strategic policies in the London Plan, having been adopted a short time before the London Plan. Despite this, the parties considered that significant weight should be afforded to the policies of the Local Plan and that there were no material inconsistencies to suggest otherwise.
14. Policy LP24 of the Local Plan seeks to resist the loss of residential floorspace unless at least one stated condition set out in A i) to vi) is met. The appellant puts forward two particular conditions that it considers are relevant; A i) and A vi) which respectively set out that "(i) *The land or buildings are no longer suitable for residential use and it is considered inappropriate to re-provide residential accommodation*", and, "(vi) *The proposal is for an essential community use or infrastructure for which there is demonstrable need, and it can only be provided by the loss of existing residential floorspace*".
15. In terms of LP24 A (i), I have already indicated my view that the bedsitting unit is not an appropriate unit of residential accommodation to retain. As such, its loss is justifiable under this condition of the Policy. However, with some investment and upgrading of aspects such as acoustic insulation, the two upper floor flats could continue to provide two units of two bedroom accommodation of a size and quality that would afford adequate living environments. Though I accept that the noise from the residential uses above may, at times, disturb worship or quiet activities within the synagogue, the uses have coexisted for a substantial period of time in what was originally a dwelling, and there is no clear reason why they should not continue to do so.
16. In terms of LP24 A (vi), I have been directed to numerous threads in the Council's own development plan and its supporting evidence base which recognises the need for synagogues within Stamford Hill as part of the community infrastructure in an area which is populated by a significant and growing Charedi community. Paragraph 4.34 of the Local Plan recognises this where it states that "... *the community in Stamford Hill is also distinctive with a large Jewish Orthodox community which is reflected in the community services, shops and housing in the area*". Policy PP4 which specifically relates to Stamford Hill seeks, amongst other things, to "... *provide new opportunities for adult learning and to ensure that people who live and work in Stamford Hill*

have access to local educational, training, health and community facilities to meet their day-to-day needs". This is relevant on two levels as a synagogue is also a place of learning for particular members of the community, rather than solely for worship. Policy PP4 also seeks to support the development of cultural and religious facilities, arts, leisure and entertainment opportunities for all.

17. At the hearing, I was provided with a copy of the '*Stamford Hill Area Action Plan – Draft for Consultation*', (draft AAP) published in November 2021. I was advised that this was still at Regulation 18 stage² and could only be afforded limited weight as a consequence, but it does illuminate some more information that the Council understands about the area's demographic and built environment that is relevant to the proposal. The draft AAP acknowledges the religious reasons for members of the Charedi community wishing to live within walking distance of their place of worship, shops and local services. It goes on to acknowledge the desire of the Charedi community to reside within a tightly defined geographic area and large family sizes, leading to pressures for development, particularly with regard to social infrastructure and large family-sized housing.
18. Page 34 of the AAP sets out that the needs for faith-based schools and places of worship are unique and urgent and that a locally based policy approach is needed to facilitate meeting this need. Consequently, draft AAP Policy AAP5 (e) sets out that the redevelopment, conversion or change from a residential use to education facilities, places of worship or health facilities will be permitted where all of the listed criteria are met, relating to cumulative effects on neighbours, highway safety, active travel and design.
19. Within the submitted documentation and as clarified at the hearing, the numbers of congregants at the most popular services is limited to around 45, although the number at most services is often much lower. The proposal is intended to meet a demand of up to around 120 congregants for its regular services, but with potentially up to around 175 for particular services, as detailed in the submitted Operational Management Plan. I agree to an extent that the quantitative need figures are a bit difficult to locate and fluctuate between the documents, particularly when compared to the figures that were offered verbally at the hearing.
20. However, I have considered the information presented to me, which, more recently, included a supporting petition of more than 300 signatories for the proposal. Given the acknowledgement in the Local Plan and draft AAP to meet the needs of the Charedi community, I consider that, on balance, there is sufficient justification for the loss of the relatively modest residential floorspace within the existing building specifically to facilitate the increase in scale and improvement of an existing well-used synagogue to meet condition A (vi) of Local Plan Policy LP24. Similarly, the need for the proposal is sufficiently demonstrated so as to accord with Policy S1 of the London Plan and Policy LP8 of the Local Plan in this particular regard.
21. Drawing together this main issue, the proposal would result in the loss of residential floorspace that is currently divided into two self-contained units and would thus conflict with London Plan Policy H8, however, the loss is justifiable considered in the context of Local Plan Policy LP24. For the reasons stated, this conflict is to be resolved in favour of Local Plan LP24 in this instance.

² Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012, as amended

Noise and disturbance

22. Despite that the appellant alleges that the Council's pre-application advice did not raise issues of noise or disturbance, I note that this was raised in the response as an aspect that demanded consideration, including reference to the potential requirement for a noise test of any plant. It does not appear that any assessment has been made of the nature of the plant or its potential to generate any noise disturbance to neighbouring residents.
23. During the Sabbath, the use of private vehicles is prohibited. Whilst there would be no restriction on the use of mechanical modes of transport outside of this time, it is common for congregants to live within easy walking distance of their synagogue to enable such regular and convenient visits to be made, as detailed in the postcode sample of congregants in the Transport Statement (TS). As the site is car-free and on-street parking in the area is limited, arriving to the site by means other than vehicle is likely for most attendees and consequently, I do not consider that there would be any material increase in noise or disturbance specifically from vehicles associated with the scheme.
24. One of the other main considerations in relation to noise is the intensification of comings and goings from the site. As was explained verbally, whereas the existing building is considered to be cramped with around 40 to 50 maximum congregants, the submitted Operational Management Plan (OMP) refers to a typical attendance of 120 people, with up to 175 people expected for particular services including the 20:00 Saturday services (either midwinter or midsummer) and other particularly important festivals. Conversely, the appellant's Appeal Statement refers to a current maximum capacity of around 70 to 75 with the proposals seeking to accommodate up to 150 congregants.
25. The appellant offers a range of means to offset any impacts of additional noise and activity on and around the premises, including: better noise attenuation properties within the modernised building fabric, an increase in the number of entrances to 4 in order to disperse arrivals and departures from the same, and adherence to the submitted OMP by condition to encourage considerate attendee behaviour. I also note that there would only be limited occasional amplification of sound or music within the building, and invariably, some periodic singing and chanting. It has also been highlighted that the congregants live by principles that require them to be considerate neighbours.
26. It has been drawn to my attention that the Council's Environmental Protection Officer did not object to the scheme subject to relevant conditions being imposed. However, one of those suggested conditions would prevent the use of the synagogue between midnight to 07:00 hours from Sunday to Monday and on Public/Bank Holidays, which would not be suitable given that the Charedi community do not observe the same Public or Bank Holidays to which the condition is intended to refer. The appellants indicated that this would be addressed through adherence to the OMP instead.
27. The disparity between the current and future capacity figures presented to me in the evidence gives me concern, as too does the potential that the scheme could triple the number of regular congregants to around 175 people, which appears a vast number without contextualisation amongst other venues of comparable size in the surroundings. In coming to this view, I am aware that the site is an established synagogue in an area where there is a high concentration of the Charedi community that understand the patterns of

attendance at synagogues and would readily tolerate an increase in such in the area. However, I cannot assume that all neighbouring occupiers would expect such an intensive use and its associated comings and goings. Additionally, in my view, there is a lacking robustness to the submitted OMP, in terms of how the increased number of entrances would actually be managed to disperse the arrivals and departures. Though I acknowledge the absence of an objection from the Council's Environmental Protection Officer, it is not sufficiently clear to me that their comments were made in the knowledge of the high number of congregants or the significant role that an OMP would play in limiting disturbance to neighbours. Furthermore, I cannot be certain that the suggested condition requiring the submission and approval of a new OMP based on this number of congregants would sufficiently address my concerns.

28. However, for the above reasons, the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers from increased noise and disturbance, contrary to, in particular, Policy LP2 of the Local Plan and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan. These Policies seek to ensure that new development is appropriate to its location and should be designed to mitigate and minimise the existing and potential adverse impacts of noise on, from, within, as a result of, or in the vicinity of new development.

Highway and parking considerations

29. The area has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 2, although PTAL ratings of 3 and 4 apply to areas very close to the site which suggest that overall, the site is moderately well connected to public transport. I saw for myself the relatively convenient proximity of bus and tube stations in relation to the appeal site.
30. The site has no on-site vehicle parking spaces to serve either the synagogue or residential units. The established synagogue at the appeal site has operated without on-site car parking for the duration of its existence and it is intended, despite the intensification proposed, that it would continue to do so. Only within recent months has a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) restriction been placed on available on-street parking spaces to limit parking between 10:00 and 12:00 Mondays to Fridays.
31. The area around the appeal site is home to a large Charedi Community, who place a great value on living within walking distance of social infrastructure, such as schools, synagogues and Kosher shops. The prohibition of the Charedi community from using motor vehicles for a key period each week also limits the number of vehicles that a synagogue use will attract. The appellant asserts that this is particularly relevant to the appeal proposal and justifies the rejection of widely-used TRICS data to compile the TS on the basis that it would involve using incomparable development types to predict additional car movements generated by the proposal.
32. As an alternative, the TS includes post code data for a 'sample' of around 50 synagogue members which has been transposed onto a map and listed against the main mode of travel of the respective members. At the hearing I sought to clarify what the size of the sample was relative to the total number of members and it was suggested that it was actually all members, i.e. a 100% sample. It sets out that, bar a small minority of members that may use the bus or a car, the vast majority walk to the synagogue from their home to the synagogue. This correlates to the pattern of movements in connection with other local

synagogues that I observed whilst visiting the area. The TS summarises that although there may be an increase in attendees, it can be taken that many will be from the same household and the increase will still be limited to the walking catchment area and not the overall size of the synagogue. It was also emphasised at the hearing that there would be only a marginal increase in traffic flows associated with the proposal which could not be held to be material or harmful, nor capable of adding to parking stress in an area which already has a CPZ and where the parking standards generally focus on car-free and maximum restrictions, rather than minimum requirements.

33. In addition to the above, the proposal would offer dedicated cycle parking where there is none at present. Details of the 10 spaces could be secured by planning condition to better facilitate sustainable travel. This physical provision would also work alongside a Travel Plan, required by planning condition, to promote the use of public transport and active travel through measures detailed therein.
34. Drawing together the above points, the proposal would not place undue burden on the local highway network and thus accords with, in particular, Policy LP43 of the Local Plan and T4 of the London Plan. These Policies, taken together, seek to locate development where its transport needs can be met in a sustainable manner to align with capacity and connectivity, minimising the demand for car trips and enabling journeys to be made by active modes and public transport.
35. However, the aspect which appears unresolved is whether a dedicated disabled parking bay should be provided as part of the proposal in accordance with the requirements of the London Plan Policy T6 and Local Plan Policy LP45. Though I noted the existence of a single on-street disabled bay close to the site, it is also close to another well-used synagogue and other public buildings that also generate a demand for such.

Character and appearance

36. Residential streets surrounding the appeal site are largely characterised by period terraces of varying scale and appearance, although interspersed with some public buildings. Fairholt Close is a low rise mid-C20 housing development which is separated from the site by a row of garages.
37. The appeal property fronts Fairholt Road and has a side elevation to Fairholt Close. It is a Victorian dwelling, constructed from red brick and its adjoining neighbour from buff London stock bricks. This pattern is repeated on the adjoining dwellings so that there is a rhythm across the terrace of four. There are some consistent features across the terrace, like the double height canted bay window, arched door porticos, banding and bracketed eaves and window cills. The hipped roof over the double height bay windows on Nos 1 and 3 differ from the flat roofs on the bays of the adjoining dwellings, which coupled with the recess between them, gives the impression of paired dwellings. Overall, the dwelling and the terrace of which it forms a part have distinctive character and contribute positively to the streetscene.
38. Fairholt Close runs alongside the dwelling and opens up to the rear which means that both the side and rear elevations are also widely visible. At the rear, the outer dwellings in the terrace have their rear 2/3 storey closet wings on the outer edge, and the mid-terrace dwellings have adjoining closet wings in

the middle. Despite that there is some variation at the ground floor level, this pattern gives a degree of harmony to the rear arrangement. The existing closet wing has a hipped roof form lower than the main ridge and its eaves height continue that of the main dwelling. Due to its lower height and smaller width and depth, it reads as a subordinate part of the dwelling.

39. The principal front and side elevation and overall form as part of the terraced group are the key contributions made by the appeal building. The appeal scheme would retain these elements and the roof of the original dwelling but would strip away all of the other building fabric, internal and external, to allow an excavation for the basement and reorder the accommodation with a lowered floor level.
40. The Council indicate that aside the sustainability credentials of such a largescale removal, the loss of historic building fabric would be harmful, despite that it is not a statutorily designated or even locally listed heritage asset. There are no particular policies of the development plan which specifically seek to protect building fabric of undesignated buildings of such an age. Internally, whilst acknowledging the age of the main structure, there were very few particular features associated with the building's age that were of any particular merit. Moving through and up the building, much of the fabric has been adapted and what exists appeared to be of relatively mediocre quality. In my view, I consider that the main components of the building would be protected as an essential starting point of the scheme and any works to the structure should avoid undermining their structural integrity.
41. In terms of the building to plot ratio, the proposal would result in the loss of more than half of the remaining garden which differs from most examples in the surrounding area. However, taking into consideration the precedent for such where synagogues exist on corner plots, i.e. such as at No 67 Heathland Road, I consider that this would be acceptable on this particular site. Similarly, the extensions at basement and ground levels would not appear so out of scale owing to the manner in which they would be either set away from, or at the height of the shared boundary.
42. The two storey element of the rear extension would be lower, insofar as the hipped roof would be replaced with a flat roof, but it would extend from eaves level across the full width of the property and project further out beyond the existing closet wing by around 2.3 metres. The rear wall would be angled from the shared boundary with the neighbour so as to avoid breaching the 45-degree line from the centre of the neighbour's window. Whilst I do not regard the additional bulk on the outer edge of the property as being of concern given the existence of the closet wing, the bulk on the inside would be, and the angled wall on the inside would appear an unusual solution for which there is no obvious reference in the surrounding area. In this sense, designing specifically to meet a rule rather than follow a context-led approach would result in a poor outcome. In my view, the additional bulk that would be added from ground level to eaves height in close proximity of the shared boundary and its contrived design would contribute to the totality of the extensions overwhelming and poorly relating to the existing building.
43. I have given due consideration to the '*Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document*' (2009) and which, despite its age, can still have relevance to both residential and non-residential buildings that are now in

an alternative use. The proposal would comply with some aspects of it, but would fail to accord with others. Its guidance cannot be followed slavishly, particularly here where the existing building is already non-compliant in some respects, and where the type of use differs so materially from the original residential use.

44. Despite that, in my view, there would be a number of acceptable aspects of the scheme, including the materiality and detailing, for the reasons outlined, the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, contrary to, in particular, Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan and Local Plan Policy LP1.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

45. Though it would achieve compliance with the 45-degree rule in terms of protecting light to the windows in the neighbouring dwelling at No 3, in my view, the bulk of the extensions spanning from ground to eaves level on the shared boundary would be bulky and over-dominant. The effect would be to create an unwelcome sense of enclosure for occupiers of the adjoining property.
46. I note that two existing windows in the closet wing inside elevation face towards No 3, but the proposal would result in a total of 6 no windows facing over towards the garden of No 3. Whilst I am mindful that all of these windows would be obscure glazed, the presence of people within the rooms and perception of being overlooked by them would still occur. The 3 no second floor windows would be more harmful in this regard, as the presence of people and activity would be more apparent behind the obscure glazing, rather than in the first floor gallery, but the overall number, orientation and design of the windows would give rise to a level of harm which the existing two, more discreetly positioned windows do not. In my view, the obscurity of the glazing would not fully alleviate the potential for harm and it is not the case that only direct overlooking is harmful to adjoining occupiers. Similarly, an absence of objections cannot be taken to infer acceptance of such effects given the potential for occupiers to change over time.
47. For the above reasons, the scheme would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to outlook, enclosure and the perception of being overlooked, contrary to Policy D4 of the London Plan and Policies LP1 and LP2 of the Local Plan. Amongst other things, these Policies seek to ensure that development is designed to ensure there are no significant adverse impacts on the amenity of occupiers and neighbours in terms of visual privacy, overlooking, overshadowing and outlook.

Biodiversity effects

48. The Council indicate that the loss of the garden space would harm the biodiversity value of the site without sufficient compensatory measures being offered. Though the appeal site only comprises a modest area of lawn, its biodiversity value was not specifically assessed.
49. London Plan Policy G5 relates to major development proposals and is not relevant to this proposal. London Plan Policy G6 requires that impacts on biodiversity are managed and that all developments should aim to secure net biodiversity gain. Similarly, Local Plan Policy LP47 requires that all development

should protect and where possible enhance biodiversity leading to a net gain and Policy LP1 requires that developments incorporate landscaping, which enhances biodiversity and maximises opportunities for greening.

50. Whilst there are inevitably gardens that have some biodiversity value, perhaps where they are larger, better connected to other areas of green space, host trees or other habitat types, in my view, the value of the appeal site in biodiversity terms is relatively negligible. Even without compensatory measures, the loss would be very limited in scale.
51. As part of the proposals, there would be three areas of green flat roof, of which two would also be 'blue', insofar as they would incorporate surface water attenuation measures. The area of green roof would amount to around 140 sqm. The appellant has also indicated a willingness to incorporate swift nesting boxes, bee bricks and other such measures within the building fabric by condition if required.
52. Whilst it is preferable to address such matters from the start of the development process, I can understand how the absence of any direction on this point in the pre-application response may have led to an assumption of there being no issue to address. My view, based on the evidence and findings on site, and the agreement on mitigation means to be secured through planning condition, is that the scheme could at least protect the overall biodiversity value of the site through specific design features to achieve compliance with London Plan Policy G5 and Local Plan Policies LP1 and LP47.

Other Matters

53. In reaching this decision, I have exercised the Public Sector Equality Duties (PSED) contained in the Equality Act 2010 which are to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations. Religion is the protected characteristic of particular relevance to these appeals. Whilst I have sought to advance equality of opportunity through the application of the PSED, the proposal before me would result in harm to the built environment and to those who may not share the particular protected characteristic. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I cannot conclude that the appeal proposal is the only way to meet the particular needs of the community.
54. I have considered the many references to the pre-application response of the Council, not authored by the Council's representative at the hearing, which may have been taken as either read or as encouraging of the proposal in a form not dissimilar to that proposed. Not all of the submitted pre-application documentation has been submitted for my consideration. In any event, it has been necessary for me to reach my decisions based strictly on the scheme before me on the face of the evidence and the respective merits.

Planning Balance

55. The identified harm to the character of the host property and to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers bring the development into conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole.
56. There would be public benefits from either proposal from delivering social infrastructure in an area of Stamford Hill where there is a recognised need for such. There would also be some economic benefits from the construction

phase, albeit of a temporary duration. However, neither these benefits, nor any other points advanced in relation to the schemes, amount to considerations of sufficient materiality to indicate that decisions should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusions

57. For the foregoing reasons, Appeal A is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

58. For the same reasons, Appeal B is also dismissed.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Stephen Hinsley BA Hons MRTPI
Mr Barney Walker BA Hons
Mr Mark Allen BA Hons MRTPI MCIHT

Mr Samuel Gratt
Mr Abraham Gratt

Planning Consultant
Architect – John Stebbing Architects
Highway Engineer - Create Consulting
Engineers Ltd
Appellant representative
Appellant representative

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Gerard Livett
Ms Andrada Calin

Senior Planning Officer
Senior Urban Design Officer

DOCUMENTS

Document 1	Stamford Hill Area Action Plan – November 2021 (draft for consultation)
Document 2	Signed Statement of Common Ground

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE HEARING

Document 3	Revised list of suggested agreed planning conditions
------------	---