



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 14 November 2023

Site visit made on 14 November 2023

by E Dade BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/W/23/3323392

J And W Fencing Ltd, Pecks Hill, Nazeing, Waltham Abbey, Essex EN9 2NY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Paul Dadley on behalf of Wheatley Group Developments Ltd against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
- The application Ref EPF/2170/22, dated 13 September 2022, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 2 of a planning permission Ref EPF/3059/18, granted on 29 March 2022.
- The application was refused by notice dated 20 December 2022.
- The development proposed is described as follows: 'the submission contains the proposed site layout (LAYOUT), full details of all proposed house types and garages and the proposed construction materials (APPEARANCE and SCALE), details of internal roads and footpaths, and private driveways (LAYOUT) and details of the proposed hard and soft landscaping and the landscape management plan (LANDSCAPING). These details are also supported by a Planning, Design and Access Statement, a Highways Technical Note and details of the surface water drainage design. The outline application was NOT an environment impact assessment application'.
- The details for which approval is sought are: layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the reserved matters are approved, namely layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping details submitted in pursuance of condition No 2 attached to planning permission Ref EPF/3059/18 granted on 29 March 2022, and subject to the conditions contained within the attached Schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since its Decision Notice was issued, the Council has adopted the Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011-2033 Part One (LP1) and Part Two (LP2). I have determined the appeal against the policies of the development plan in place at time of my decision. Notably, the site is allocated for development by LP1 Policy P10, with site-specific requirements set out at LP2 Policy NAZE.R2.
3. Following the Council's refusal of the reserved matters scheme, the appellant has provided a suite of revised plans. Notably, plan no LS731 P10 has been revised to show those dwellings within affordable tenures disseminated across the site. On this basis, the Council has confirmed it is no longer pursuing reason for refusal 3 as cited on its Decision Notice, regarding the location of affordable housing.

4. In addition, following revisions to plan no LS731 P01 to include a speed table to reduce traffic speeds into and out of the site in accordance with Essex Highway Authority safety standards, the Council is no longer pursuing reasons for refusal 5 and 6. Through accepting those revised plans, I need not consider these matters further.
5. The hard and soft landscaping plans were amended to provide additional tree planting. Revisions to proposed plans LS731 03 to 09 were made available in advance of the hearing.
6. In response to the Council's concerns regarding a lack of information on the appearance of the development, the appellant has provided coloured site plan and street scene plans nos LS731 P11, P12 and P13. Those additional plans are provided for illustrative purposes and do not materially alter the design or layout of the scheme.
7. At the hearing event, the appellant provided a refuse vehicle swept path analysis plan to demonstrate compliance with the highway authority's standards and to replace plan no 19040-NAZE-5-SK003 Rev C.
8. Annex M of the Procedural Guide Appeals – England advises that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority and on which interested people's views were sought.
9. However, the plans that have been submitted would not materially alter the nature of the application and would not prejudice interested parties. I have included reference to those plans within the relevant condition contained within the attached Schedule.

Main Issues

10. The main issues in this appeal are:

- whether the proposal would achieve good design, with particular regard to the efficiency of the proposed layout;
- whether the proposal provides adequate and appropriate details in respect of materials, landscaping, and resilience to climate change;
- whether the proposal would promote active travel, with particular regard to pedestrian connectivity; and
- the effects of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of 40 Pecks Hill, with particular regard to privacy and outlook.

Reasons

Efficiency of layout

11. The Council's first reason for refusal asserts the scheme would have an 'inefficient layout' and would thus fail to achieve good design. To my mind, matters relevant to the efficiency of the layout include the arrangement, placement and orientation of buildings, open spaces and other features, such as the public highway. To be efficient, the layout should enable the development to function well and be legible to occupants and visitors.

12. The Council's submissions provide an extensive critique of the architectural design of the proposed dwellings. This includes the arrangement, size and proportion of fenestration and roofs, the depth of floor plans, use of materials, and the appearance of front elevations. Such architectural design matters do not affect, nor are a consequence of, the efficiency of the proposed layout. During the hearing, the Council made clear that it did not consider that such matters amounted to an additional reason for refusal and therefore in my decision I have attached limited weight to matters relating to the architectural design of proposed dwellings.

Efficiency – density, house types and height

13. The appeal site is located at the eastern side of Pecks Hill at the northern end of the settlement of Nazeing. The site is previously developed land, formerly known as The Fencing Centre which comprised a range of buildings, timber sheds, storage areas and hardstanding. At the time of my site visit, most buildings and structures had been removed or demolished.
14. To the north and east of the site are commercial and horticultural uses, with large glasshouses appearing prominent within the landscape beyond the appeal site. However, the area is principally residential in character with rows of dwellings fronting onto either side of Pecks Hill.
15. The surrounding area comprises predominantly 20th century semi-detached and detached dwellings which are typically generous in size, occupying deep plots, and thus of low or medium density. Whilst the Council suggests the proposal lacks sufficient analysis of the local context, the traditional appearance of the proposed dwellings would appear in keeping with surrounding development.
16. Travelling down Pecks Hill, dwellings along the eastern side follow a building line which gradually steps back further from the highway edge. Notably, no 40, adjacent to the appeal site, is set back significantly from the highway. However, garage buildings sited at the front of nos 34 to 36 breach the building line, and vegetation along front garden boundaries obscures complete views of front elevations. In addition, dwellings opposite the appeal site and along the western side of Pecks Hill have a more uniform building line, with shorter front gardens and with dwellings sited closer to the highway edge.
17. Whilst the proposal would be forward of the established building line as I have described above, it would be an estate type development with dwellings oriented to face the internal access road and shared spaces whilst also providing a frontage to Pecks Hill. The dwellings at plots 1 to 4 would be set back from the highway edge by a private driveway and soft landscaping and therefore would not appear overly dominant within the street scene. The proposed layout would not appear out of character with surrounding development and would not therefore harm local distinctiveness.
18. Plots 3 and 4 would be 2.5 storeys with prominent front gables, and at plot 25 would be a large dwelling with an attached 1.5 storey double garage providing a wide frontage. By virtue of their height and scale, the dwellings at the front of the site would be visually prominent within the street scene, and the form and appearance of the dwellings would contribute visual interest to the site's frontage.

19. It has been put to me that there is a lack of variation in density and height leading to an overly homogenous site plan which fails to provide active frontages. The proposed house types would include detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings, thereby providing variation in density and would comprise a range of storey heights, from two and two and half storey, with garages being single and one and half storey. Furthermore, architectural features, such as front gables, storm porches, and dormers would provide variation in the appearance of dwellings.
20. All dwellings would have a frontage to either the internal access road or to the shared spaces. Therefore, windows and doors would face onto the development's streets, creating interest and activity within the street scene and providing surveillance and a sense of enclosure. The combination of shared spaces and internal road provide a hierarchy in the road layout. Therefore, the proposal would include visual references to aid legibility.
21. Parking provision would be in front or beside dwellings. The Council would prefer parking to be tucked between dwellings with the front of the car no further forward than the front of the built form. However, whilst parked vehicles and areas of hardstanding would be clearly visible within the street scene, this arrangement would not appear out of keeping with the character of the area. Notably, nos 49 to 51 located opposite the appeal site's frontage have hard surfaced front gardens providing vehicle parking. Moreover, the layout would not be illegible as a result of the location of parking.
22. Therefore, the proposed development would achieve an active frontage to users of the public highway, achieve a good level of variation in terms of density, house types and height and provide a layout which is legible.

Efficiency – Public Right of Way

23. Public right of way Nazeing 3 (PROW) runs through the site beside its northern boundary. From my site visit, I found the PROW to be a narrow route between a watercourse and metal security fencing which was impassable due to overgrown vegetation. It is my understanding that the development plan does not specify the amount of open space to be provided on a site of this scale. However, the proposed development would provide informal open space beside the route of the PROW.
24. The PROW would be alongside the flank elevations of the proposed dwellings. However, as indicated on the landscaping plans, the grassed area of open space between the PROW and built form would be landscaped with tree and hedge planting, wildflowers, and an ornamental pond. Therefore, the amount and location of the proposed open space within the proposed layout, and the inclusion of landscaping, would enhance the quality of the PROW for the benefit of its users.
25. The Council suggests that the relationship of the layout to the PROW carries an associated risk of burglary and vandalism. However, the Council made clear that it does not consider the safety and security risk would be so severe as to amount to an additional reason for refusal. Whilst the proposed dwellings would not front onto the PROW, there would be some opportunities for surveillance from those dwellings located closest to the PROW, and the evidence before me does not suggest the proposed development would be inherently unsafe or vulnerable to crime.

Efficiency – Veteran Tree

26. The Council raised concerns regarding the effects of the location of the path and proposed drainage on the integrity of the veteran oak tree which lies on the site's northern boundary. Whilst I note Policy NAZE.R2 requires a buffer be provided to protect the tree, as set out above, it is my understanding that the location of the PROW is protected by the Highways Act 1980. Significant changes to the routing of the PROW would be subject to a separate consent process and are therefore outside the scope of this proposal. The surface treatment of the PROW would comprise a no-dig crushed limestone path which is not expected to harm the veteran tree.
27. To protect the integrity of the veteran tree during installation of the drainage, the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) proposes mitigation measures including directional drilling within the root protection area, trench casements for inspection chambers, and works carried out in the presence of the Arboricultural Clerk of Works. Consequently, the AIA concludes that the overall impact of drainage installation on the veteran tree is likely to be low, with no significant or long-term damage likely to be caused. In addition, the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) includes a suggested condition to secure additional evidence to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage would not impede on the root protection zone of the veteran tree. Subject to these measures, the layout of development would not harm the integrity of the veteran tree.

Efficiency – Other matters

28. The Council has indicated that the proposed drainage strategy would be acceptable, subject to providing additional information secured via a planning condition. Therefore, I am satisfied that the proposed layout would provide suitable open space and drainage.
29. The site's internal road does not include turning heads. However, drawing no 4150 SK01 REV E provides a swept path analysis for a refuse vehicle. Therefore, the proposal adequately demonstrates the internal road layout would be accessible to large service vehicles.

Efficiency - Conclusion

30. The number of dwellings to be provided through the development is stated within the outline planning permission and the proposed development would achieve a moderate density of 30 dwellings per hectare, thereby making efficient use of land.
31. The Council suggests that increased density of development within the site would provide greater area for landscaping, amenity space, and sustainable drainage, resulting in a more attractive, layout with more opportunities for residents to socialise. However, for the reasons set out above, the proposed development would not have an inefficient layout, and thus would achieve a suitable standard of design.
32. The proposal would therefore comply with LP1 Policy DM9 which encourages development which relates positively to the context in terms of building lines, height, form, and density. In addition, the proposal would comply with LP1 Policies SP2 and T1 which require developments to provide well-connected open space provision with opportunities for physical activity, and to promote

transport choice through safe, attractive and direct cycling and walking networks. The proposal would accord with LP1 Policy DM5, which requires the enhancement of existing footpaths and retention of veteran trees.

33. The proposal would therefore satisfy the requirements of chapters 11, 12 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the National Design Guide which together require the layout of development to make effective use of land and fit into and enhance the character of the local area.

Whether adequate and appropriate details in respect of materials, landscaping, and resilience to climate change

34. The Council's first reason for refusal indicates the proposal does not provide appropriate details in respect of materials, landscaping, and resilience to climate change.
35. The Council's critique of materials appears to relate principally to their application within the architectural design of dwellings, rather than the materials selection. The SoCG indicates there is agreement between the parties regarding the brick selection, and the Design & Access Statement provides further details of proposed materials. However, in the interests of certainty, the Council requested further details, namely photographs of material samples, be secured through a planning condition. The appellant expressed support for such a condition on the basis that if certain materials cease to be available, the condition would provide a mechanism through which alternative materials could be agreed. Therefore, I am satisfied that the proposed materials would be acceptable.
36. Notwithstanding the Council's concerns regarding the layout of amenity space, during the Hearing the Council confirmed the proposed scheme of hard and soft landscaping, as set out on the revised plans, is suitable and provides appropriate details. Notably, the landscaping scheme would provide a defensible boundary to the Green Belt edge, as required by LP2 Policy NAZE.R2.
37. The Council's memo dated 7 September 2023 suggests the proposed drainage strategy is acceptable, subject to providing additional information secured via a planning condition.
38. During the Hearing, the Council confirmed that the details provided through the sustainability statement adequately demonstrate the proposed development would be resilient to climate change. I am therefore satisfied the proposal would comply with the guidance contained within the Council's Sustainability Guidance Checklist 2021.
39. Subject to the materials condition, the proposal provides adequate and appropriate details in respect of materials, landscaping, and resilience to climate change. The proposal would comply with LP1 Policies SP2, DM5, and DM9 which together require proposals to relate positively to their context, incorporate sustainable design and construction principles, positively respond to sustainable water management, and demonstrate they have been designed to incorporate appropriate provision of new green infrastructure.

Whether the proposal would promote active travel

40. Footways would be provided within the site along either side of the access road and would adjoin the shared spaces which run north-south through the site. A pedestrian footway would be constructed adjacent to the site's frontage along the public highway where no footway presently exists. The proposed development would therefore be accessible to pedestrians.
41. Currently, connectivity to the PROW is poor with pedestrians having to skirt around the existing pumping station, cross a busy corner and then head south before re-joining the pavement on the west side of Pecks Hill before connecting into the neighbouring PROW, Nazeing 1. As set out above, the proposed landscaping would enhance the quality of the PROW through the site, both in terms of its function and appearance, which would be of benefit to pedestrians.
42. The new pedestrian footway along the highway edge would connect to the PROW at the north-west corner of the site. Paths crossing the open space near plots 7 and 8, and 13 and 14 would connect to the PROW. The proposal would therefore enhance pedestrian connectivity through providing multiple connections to the PROW within the site, and provision of the new footway along the site's frontage would improve connectivity between PROW Nazeing 3 and PROW Nazeing 1.
43. The Council asserts the shared spaces would appear uninviting to walk through due to a vehicle dominated appearance, thereby discouraging active travel. However, the shared spaces would be relatively short stretches passing dwelling frontages from which the amenity space and paths to the PROW would be visible. Traffic movements along the shared spaces would generally be low. Therefore, I do not consider the shared spaces would form a barrier to pedestrian movement.
44. The proposed speed table would reduce vehicles speeds at the junction. The dropped kerbs would enable pedestrian connectivity with the public footpath and within the site itself. The proposed development would provide bus stop flags sited adjacent to the site's frontage on either side of Pecks Hill, and therefore the development would be served by public transport.
45. For these reasons, the proposal would provide suitable pedestrian connectivity and would promote active travel. The proposal would therefore comply with LP1 Policies SP2 and T1 which require proposals to support sustainable movement in terms of walking and cycling and promote transport choice through improvements to public transport services and supporting infrastructure and provide coherent safe attractive and direct cycling and walking networks to create a genuine alternative to private vehicles.
46. The proposal would satisfy chapters 8 and 9 of the Framework which prioritise active travel and access to public transport, and support development which pursues opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use.

Living conditions

47. The southern boundary of the appeal site adjoins the side boundary of existing bungalow, no 40 Pecks Hill. The dwelling at plot 25 would be set forward of and oriented perpendicular to no 40, with the rear elevation positioned close to the shared boundary. At ground floor level, views of no 40 would be obscured by the proposed 2m tall close boarded fence boundary treatment.

48. From the first-floor bedroom windows, parts of no 40's front garden and driveway would be visible above the height of the boundary treatment and through gaps in vegetation. However, views toward windows at the front elevation of no 40 from bedrooms 3 and 4 would be at an oblique angle. This angle, together with the distance between the dwellings would provide adequate separation to prevent overlooking of habitable room windows.
49. Opportunities for overlooking would therefore be confined to the front garden and driveway of no 40. Since these areas are also visible from the public highway there is a lesser expectation of privacy relative to other parts of the plot. For this reason, I do not consider the proposal would amount to a harmful loss of privacy to the occupants of no 40.
50. No 40 occupies a sloping plot. Plot 25 would be set down from the level of no 40, reducing the perceived height of the building. Nonetheless, it would be visible above the height of the fence from no 40. However, no 40 is both set in from the side boundaries and the public highway, and the width and depth of the front garden contribute a spacious character to the plot. As a result, the proposal would not have a harmful sense of enclosure for occupants of no 40 and therefore would not have an adverse impact upon outlook.
51. Having particular regard to privacy and outlook, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of no 40. The proposal would therefore comply with LP1 Policy DM9 which requires proposals to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy detrimental to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

52. A local resident raised concerns regarding the capacity of local infrastructure and the location of the proposed access. The principle of development of the site is established by the Local Plan which allocates the site for development, and the location of the access was approved through the granting of outline planning permission. Therefore, infrastructure capacity has already been considered acceptable.
53. In addition, the respondent also queried what measures would be put in place to protect the living conditions of neighbours during the construction phase. The outline planning permission includes planning conditions requiring approval of a Construction Management Plan and Construction Method Statement, along with installation of wheel washing or other cleaning facilities to protect highway safety and living conditions within the local area.
54. The appeal site is within the zone of influence of the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC), a European Designated Site afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 as amended (the Habitat Regulations). The SAC is designated for the purpose of protecting its qualifying habitats, namely Beech forests on acid soil, European dry heaths and North Atlantic wet heaths with cross-leaved heath and one qualifying species, the stag beetle. Where the competent authority is minded to give consent for the proposal which is likely to have a significant effect on European sites, Regulation 63 of the Habitats Regulations requires the competent authority to carry out an Appropriate Assessment (AA).
55. AA was carried out at the outline application stage. Since the proposed development relates to reserved matters and does not materially alter the

outline scheme, the main parties confirmed that the AA remains relevant to the appeal proposal. I have no evidence to indicate otherwise and am therefore satisfied the AA does not require revision.

56. The AA concluded the proposal would result in likely significant effects on the integrity of the SAC. However, a financial contribution to be paid to the Council in accordance with the Epping Forest Interim Air Pollution Mitigation Strategy has been secured through a planning obligation to mitigate the effects of the development on the SAC. Therefore, I am satisfied that the mitigation measures have been secured and would be used for their intended purpose. On this basis, I am satisfied the proposal would not have significant effects on the integrity of the Epping Forest SAC.

Conditions

57. There are 23 planning conditions attached to the outline planning permission which remain in effect until discharged. The SoCG suggests the imposition of additional conditions which have been agreed by the main parties. In the interests of certainty, I have attached the suggested condition specifying the approved plans, including those revised plans as discussed above.
58. To ensure the risks from land contamination to the environment and future users of the land are minimised, I have attached the suggested condition requiring remediation of contaminated land. To secure the appropriate management of surface water, I have attached the suggested condition relating to surface water drainage. This also includes a requirement for evidence to demonstrate that the proposed drainage does not impede on the root protection zone of the veteran tree. The appellant has confirmed their written agreement to these pre-commencement conditions through the SoCG.
59. To prevent flooding on site and elsewhere, the parties suggested a condition requiring development be carried out in accordance with the flood risk assessment. To promote sustainable building design as per the requirements of the development plan, the main parties put forward a suggested condition requiring the design and construction of the proposed dwellings to be carried out in accordance with the sustainability statement. However, in the interests of brevity, I have included both the Flood Risk Assessment & Management Plan and the Sustainability Statement as approved plans. Therefore, those suggested conditions are not necessary.
60. To provide certainty regarding the materials to be used in the development, I have attached a condition requiring submission and written approval of details of proposed materials. As discussed above, during the Hearing the appellant expressed support for the inclusion of such a condition.

Conclusion

61. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan taken as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

E Dade

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

LS731 P01 Rev K – *Proposed Site Plan*;
LS731 P02 – *Location Plan*;
LS731 P03 Rev D – *Proposed Plans – Plots 1&2, 17-19*;
LS731 P04 Rev D – *Proposed Plans – Plots 12 & 13, 14-16, 20-22*;
LS731 P05 Rev E – *Proposed Plans Plots - 8&9, 10&11*;
LS731 P06 Rev G – *Proposed Plans – Plots 3&4*;
LS731 P07 Rev G – *Proposed Plans – Plots 5,6,7*;
LS731 P08 Rev G – *Proposed Plans – Plots 23, 24*;
LS731 P09 Rev F – *Proposed Plans – Plot 25*;
LS731 P10 Rev C – *Proposed Site Plan Tenure Mix*;
LS731 Drawing P11 – *Proposed Site Plan*;
LS731 Drawing P12 – *Proposed Street Scenes*;
LS731 Drawing P13 – *Proposed Street Scenes*;
JBA 22-059-03 Rev E – *Detailed Soft Landscape Proposal for Plots*;
JBA 22-059-04 Rev C – *Detailed Hard Landscape Proposals for RM Hybrid*;
JBA 22-059-LMP1 Rev A – *Landscape and Ecological Management and Maintenance Plan*;
19040-NAZE-5-SK001 Rev J – *Levels and Drainage Strategy*;
19040_NETWORK 1.PFD 07-09-2022 – *Drainage Calculations*;
19040-NAZE-5-SK002 – *Flood Flow Routing Plan*;
19040 FRA-C – *Flood Risk Compliance Report and Maintenance Plan Rev C*;
4150 SK01 REV E – *Refuse Vehicle Swept Path Analysis*;
19040-NAZE-5-SK004 Rev C – *Fire Appliance Tracking Plan*;
EAS Highways Technical Note – Former J&W Fencing Site, pecks Hill, Nazeing
EN9 2NY (EPF/3059/18) 06 September 2022;
841_AIA_Construction_2023-08-31 – *Arboricultural Impact Assessment*;
Daedalus Environmental Sustainability Statement v3 August 2023
Planning Statement November 2018;
Design & Access Statement September 2022.

- 2) No work on any phase of the development shall take place until a detailed land remediation scheme has been completed. The scheme will be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an appraisal of remediation options, identification of the preferred option(s), the proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, and a description and programme of the works to be undertaken including the verification plan. (The remediation scheme shall be sufficiently detailed and thorough to ensure that after remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990). The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme. Following the completion of the remediation works and prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report by a suitably qualified contaminated land practitioner shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 3) Prior to preliminary ground works taking place, details of surface water disposal shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The details shall include:

- Evidence to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage does not impede on the root protection zone of TPO T14 which is situated between chambers S7 and S11.
- Final modelling and calculations for all areas of the drainage system, ensuring that urban creep is included in the design.
- Appropriate level of water treatment for all areas of the development for runoff leaving the site.
- Detailed engineering drawings for each component of the drainage scheme.
- A Maintenance Strategy setting out who is responsible for different elements of the surface water drainage system and the maintenance activities/frequency, ensuring that yearly logs of maintenance are carried out.
- A final drainage plan which details exceedance and conveyance routes and location and sizing of any drainage features.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be provided on site prior to the first occupation and shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.

- 4) No development above ground level shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

END OF SCHEDULE

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Frazer Hickling BA (Hons) DipUD MRTPI	Director, Phillips Planning Services Ltd
Paul Shadarevian KC	Appellant's lead advocate
Rob Farr BA (Hons) DIP arch RIBA	Principal Architect, Lines and Squares
Ben McKeown BSc (Hons) MSc	EAS Transport Planning
Paul Dadley MCIOB Dipl	Development Manager, Wheatley Homes
Andrew Dutton BA (Hons) MRTPI	Managing Director, Wheatley Group Developments Limited

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Sukhi Dhadwar BA (Hons) DipTP	Senior Planning Officer, Epping Forest District Council
Jason Yates BA (Hons) PgDip MA RIBA RTPI (Licentiate)	Principal Urban Designer, Place Services

DOCUMENTS

1. Excerpt of Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011-2033 Part One, Adopted March 2023 – "Policy SP2 Place Shaping".

PLANS

1. Drawing no. 4150 SK01 REV E Refuse Vehicle Swept Path Analysis