



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 18 June 2024

Site visit made on 18 June 2024

by G Bayliss BA (Hons) MA MA MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y0435/W/24/3339674

64-66 and 70 Simpson Road, Fenny Stratford, Bletchley, Milton Keynes MK1 1BA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Azuka Investments against the decision of Milton Keynes Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01135/FUL.
 - The development proposed is Full application for demolition of existing unit and the erection of 4 apartment blocks comprising 98 units with associated landscaping and parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A Sunlight and Daylight Assessment Addendum, (Aval Consulting Group, February 2024) (SDAA) was submitted with the appellant's appeal statement. This clarified that two earlier lighting reports submitted during the determination of the planning application had not taken account of the correct plans. The Council had the opportunity to comment on the SDAA and I have taken it and the comments made into account in my decision.
3. A draft planning agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 was submitted prior to the hearing. The Council agreed at the hearing that the submitted wording would satisfy its requirements and once signed would resolve this reason for refusal. A signed, completed version of this same Section 106 Agreement has now been submitted in accordance with the timescale agreed and I am satisfied that this resolves the third reason for refusal. I will consider the planning agreement later.
4. Although not raised in the Council's decision notice, comments received from residents to the north of the appeal site, and the Council's lighting consultant, reference concerns regarding overshadowing of green spaces between the proposed buildings and neighbouring gardens. This matter was raised in my pre-hearing note and discussed during the hearing, and I have referred to it in my decision.
5. I have a statutory duty under section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) 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 National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

6. Whilst the Council makes no reference in its reasons for refusal to the effect of the proposal on the significance of Fenny Lodge and its stable, a Grade II listed building, the Council has highlighted harm to the setting of these buildings in its appeal documentation. In view of this and to reflect my statutory duty, I have addressed this as part of my decision.
7. At the hearing, the Council clarified that the reference to optimum viable use in its first reason for refusal was not intended to be a reference to paragraph 208 of the Framework. Instead, it was stated that this comment was intended to suggest that there may be other potential options for developing the land which would not cause harm to the designated heritage assets.

Main Issues

8. The main issues are:

- The effect of the proposed development on the setting and significance of nearby designated heritage assets; and
- Whether or not the proposal would provide suitable living conditions for existing and future occupants with regard to outlook and daylight.

Reasons

Significance

9. The appeal site is a roughly rectangular parcel of land located between Simpson Road and the Grand Union Canal. The site was formerly used for the sale of building materials and has a large warehouse at its southern end with the remainder being mainly concrete hardstanding. To the north of the site the immediate area is generally residential in character with the gardens of mainly traditional two storey dwellings extending down to the canal. To the south of the site, beyond Lock View Lane, the scale and form of buildings is predominantly two storey and of domestic proportions. However, further south, beyond the railway line, the buildings near to the canal typically get taller, more tightly address the canal frontage, and have a much more urban feel. On the opposite side of Simpson Road, the built form is more mixed in character with relatively modern 20th century light industrial uses opposite the appeal site and other residential development nearby. Beyond the canal, to the east, is a thick swathe of trees running alongside the canal towpath which, along with the residential gardens nearby, emphasises a rural character to this part of the canal. The surroundings to the appeal site are therefore quite varied with a noticeable difference in character between Simpson Road and the canal frontage.
10. Lock View Lane extends down to the Grand Union Canal, terminating at a lock and swing bridge with a cluster of Grade II listed buildings associated with it. The listed buildings comprise: Lock (Ref.1125401), Pump House (Ref.1125402), Canalside Cottage (Ref.1310679), Lock View Pine View (Ref.1332233), Canalside Cottage (Ref.1310679), and the Red Lion Public House (Ref.1125440) (the Red Lion). They were all listed in the 1970s and are

collectively identified as having group value. The list description for each explains their form, function and their relationship with the canal together with their historic features.

11. The lock is described as brick lined with stone copings and working lock gates constructed on a section of the canal built in the 1790s. The pump house (formerly the toll house) is a small single storey brick building with low hipped slate roof, and Canalside Cottage is formerly the lock keeper's cottage of two storeys with a low pitch slate roof. Pine View and Lock View are a pair of cottages facing the canal and are described as being of two storeys and built of brick with a slate roof and it suggests that they were originally four cottages. Finally, the Red Lion Public House is of two storeys, constructed of red brick with a roughcast upper floor and gable ended tiled roof and is described as having a simple Georgian style with detailing including corniced chimneys, and corner porch with squat, shaped columns.
12. From the evidence before me, including the list description, and my own observations, I consider that the significance of this group of listed buildings (listed lock buildings), insofar as it relates to this appeal, is largely derived from the age of the buildings, their form and function, historic fabric and features. Whilst individually they have significance due to their historic and architectural interest, collectively they illustrate a particularly well-preserved example of typically small-scale canal-built heritage related to the workings of a lock and they strongly evoke a sense of the activities taking place around the canal during the industrial era.
13. The group provides a focal point along the canal where the buildings can clearly be viewed along the towpath in both directions, as well as more limited views from the approach along Lock View Lane. In this context, the backdrop to these listed buildings has a predominantly rural feel with a significant degree of open space and greenery around them, especially along the canal corridor. Most nearby buildings are of no greater height than them. This immediate context allows the listed buildings to stand out with few competing or distracting elements and for their group value to be readily appreciated and understood. This is the environment in which the listed buildings are experienced and appreciated and each building reinforces the special interest and significance of the group as a whole.
14. Fenny Lodge lies to the north of the appeal site. It is listed as 'Fenny Lodge Former Stable Block to Fenny Lodge' (Ref.133225) with Fenny Lodge fronting Simpson Road and its rear garden extends down to the canal. The gable of the stable range also faces the road, linked to the house by a connecting wall, and extends along part of the boundary of the appeal site. The list description mentions that the house is late 18th century with a later extension and is of two storeys, roughcast with a tiled mansard roof. The stable range accommodates a former coach house and is of painted and roughcast brick and a tiled roof.
15. The significance of this listed building, in so much as it relates to the appeal before me, is largely derived from its age, its narrow, linear plan form, historic fabric and detailing. These attributes, along with its distinctive vernacular appearance, mark it as an important survival of an historic dwelling. The status and significance of this property is apparent in views along Simpson Road where its immediate context is more modern residential development of a similar scale. The light industrial uses to the south are not especially prominent

in views due to their setting back from the road frontage and some filtering of views by mature planting. As the building is located on a slight bend in the road there are distant views of it from both directions with its long, low frontage and white walls serving to emphasise its presence. More distant views of the property are possible from the canal across its garden and from some viewpoints along the canal both the listed lock buildings and Fenny Lodge are jointly visible.

16. As much of the appeal site extends along the canal side and is mainly hardstanding, this open gap assists in reinforcing the visual prominence of the listed lock buildings. Despite the massing and footprint of the warehouse on the site, its position along the Simpson Road frontage means that it is not especially visible in views of these listed buildings from the canal. Its sloping, dark coloured roof also assists with the integration of the building with the nearby more traditional built forms. Its visual presence is only really noted in closer views of The Red Lion where the warehouse rises abruptly from its rear car park. However, it does not significantly impact on the key views of the pub from the canal and views of the warehouse along Lock View Lane are to some extent mitigated by the trees alongside the road and the design treatment of the building which helps to give it some verticality and visually breaks up its massing.
17. Similarly, the relatively open gap between the Fenny Lodge site and the existing warehouse ensures that it does not have a dominating impact on it. The design treatment of the warehouse and the planting along the roadside also help to mitigate its appearance in the longer-range views of Fenny Lodge.
18. I saw on site that the yard area of the appeal site was relatively untidy and unkempt, but this was largely screened by surrounding fencing, albeit that the high fencing adjoining the canal was itself very tatty and in a state of collapse in places. However, all in all, from what I have seen and read, I consider that the appeal site has a neutral impact on the setting of the nearby listed buildings, although the appearance of the boundary fencing along the canal and the site's general untidiness does cause some visual harm.
19. The proposed development would mainly comprise four parallel blocks of buildings of between three and four storeys distributed across the site. One block would be located to the rear of the Red Lion, alongside Lock View Lane, two central blocks would be at right-angles to the canal and the fourth block beyond would be L-shaped in plan presenting a wider frontage to the canal. The buildings would be of contemporary design, with extensive south and east-facing balconies, and flat roofs accommodating gardens and solar panels. There would be significant swathes of landscaping running from Simpson Road between the blocks through to the canal. Parking would be mainly along the Simpson Road frontage as well as at ground level beneath some of the blocks. Most blocks would be of four storeys but the end sections of the two blocks nearest to the listed lock buildings have been reduced to three storeys to reduce their visual impact.
20. The overall design of the scheme appears well considered and attractive, and the alignment of the blocks would give a pleasing permeability through much of the site allowing views from Simpson Road through to the extensive green area beyond the canal. However, despite the reduction in height of the blocks nearest to the listed lock buildings, and the overall height of the blocks not

being significantly higher than the existing warehouse, the overall form and massing of the blocks spread out across much of the site would be considerable. Overall, the development would starkly contrast with the immediately surrounding built context of the listed buildings and the current levels of openness around them.

21. Along the canal, significant views of the proposed development would be gained from the railway bridge over the canal to the lock area where it would be seen rising up behind the listed lock buildings, wrapping around the Red Lion and extending close to the canal frontage. It would appear as a dominant and relatively solid mass with its bold, flat-roofed form dominating this immediate setting. Similarly, in the view from Fenny Lodge south along the towpath, the proposed development would be equally dominant; the arrangement of the linear blocks with the planting between them would do little to mitigate this visual effect from these angles. Block D, in particular, with its wide canal side frontage would add significantly to this massing and visual impact.
22. The spread of such large buildings of contrasting, urban form down to the canal frontage would harmfully intrude into that open space that reinforces the listed lock building's rural character and visual isolation. The listed buildings would be overpowered and consumed by this distinctly urban form of angular blocks with their single site-wide façade and assertive design. The rooftop gardens and extensive terraces with their levels of activity would further emphasise this urban feel, detracting from the existing relatively peaceful, tranquil atmosphere along the canal side and diminishing the listed buildings' setting and prominence. This impact would be considerably greater than the existing warehouse because of the height of the flat roof forms compared to the pitched roof of the warehouse and the spread of development along the canal side.
23. Furthermore, despite the appearance and condition of the existing canal-side fencing, its replacement with a similarly high fence but of very uniform appearance, whilst emphasising the linear continuity of the canal corridor, would add to the dominating, hard, urban feel of the development. Whilst I recognise the need for privacy for the occupiers of the canal boats, the fence would not create any visual interest or have any landscaping to soften its appearance. Therefore, the new buildings, together with the extensive fencing would make one less able to appreciate the cluster of listed lock buildings because of the erosion of the space around them and their rural context and their height and form in such proximity would not assimilate with them.
24. In relation to the buildings associated with Fenny Lodge, the proposed development would also have an urbanising and dominating effect on its rural setting in views from the canal side. However, it would not be to the same extent as the listed lock buildings given that Fenny Lodge fronts Simpson Road rather than the canal. Nevertheless, the new development would prominently be seen in the existing open gap between it and the listed lock buildings, protruding into shared views of them, which would to some extent detract from their significance. When viewed from Simpson Road, I consider that the proposed development would not detrimentally impact on the setting of Fenny Lodge as it is viewed in a modern streetscape along with the existing warehouse, and the increase in built form and its appearance would not noticeably detract from that setting.

25. It may be that the appeal site has previously accommodated larger buildings associated with its historic uses, and greater activity around them. However, it has not been adequately demonstrated that buildings of the proposed size and form historically occupied the site close to the canal. In any event, in my experience, they would most likely have been industrial buildings of traditional proportions with pitched roofs which would have related to the industrial activity around the canal. However, that is not the way that the listed buildings are currently experienced and appreciated and I have explained that the more open, tranquil, rural context allows them to have a greater prominence in the area assisting in their understanding and interpretation.
26. The Council's urban design officer has not objected to the proposal and the Canal and River Trust has also commented that the proposal would not adversely affect the listed structures associated with the Canal. However, I must exercise my own judgement in relation to fulfilling my statutory duty and having carefully examined all the evidence, and viewed the site, these comments do not persuade me to conclude any differently.
27. Considering all of the above, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the setting and significance of designated heritage assets. Therefore, the expectations of the Act are not met. Paragraph 205 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 206 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the asset or from development within its setting and any harm should have a clear and convincing justification.
28. I find the harm in the context of the significance of the designated heritage assets as a whole, in the language of the Framework, to be less than substantial in this instance. At the hearing both parties discussed their view on the level of less than substantial harm. The appellant suggested that it would be at the lower end of less than substantial harm due to the slight urbanising effects of the development and the visual distraction of the change from light industrial to residential use. The Council considered that it would be at the medium to high end of less than substantial harm. Having considered all the evidence and viewed the listed buildings and their settings, I consider that in relation to the listed lock buildings the proposal would be at the upper end of less than substantial harm. This would be due to the encroachment of the proposed development on their relatively isolated and rural setting, together with the form and scale of that development being overpowering and overtly urban in appearance. In relation to Fenny Lodge, I consider that the harm would be at the lower end of less than substantial harm due to the severing of interconnected views with the listed lock buildings and the proximity of the proposed development which would be of a markedly greater form and scale. Nevertheless, whatever the level of less than substantial harm this still commands considerable importance and weight and is not to be treated as a less than substantial objection to the proposal. Paragraph 208 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.
29. The Council can demonstrate a five-year housing land supply with the Council's published figure at just over 6 years supply. At the hearing, the Council acknowledged that the provision of 98 dwellings was not an insignificant

amount in the context of its yearly supply figure. It would also be beneficial in helping assist with the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of housing and I recognise that the assessed local housing need is the minimum figure not a cap on it. The site would also be provided in a location with good access to services, facilities and public transport. Furthermore, the scheme would deliver on a windfall site which the appellant explains is available and deliverable, making effective use of previously developed land and would add to the mix and offer of housing in the area. It would also lessen the pressure on releasing greenfield land for housing. Therefore, even though the Council has a healthy five-year housing land supply, and the site is not allocated for residential development, these benefits afford substantial weight in favour of the scheme.

30. The provision of 20 units of affordable housing would also help meet the needs of those who are unable to secure housing in the open market. I also note the appellants reference to an historic under-delivery of affordable housing. However, even if the case for under-delivery has not been clearly made, the number of units proposed is afforded substantial weight in its own right.
31. There would also be economic benefits to the area arising from construction activity in the short term, and the spending power of future occupants in the longer term. It is also suggested that economic benefits to the Red Lion by improving the environment around it and bringing potential new customers would assist in securing its viability. Social benefits would also arise from the occupants' activities in the local area. I give these benefits significant weight.
32. The appellant suggests that the scheme would redevelop an untidy, derelict site and achieve a high-quality development with landscaping benefits thereby enhancing the canal side environment and Simpson Road. On this point I recognise that section 11 of the Framework, amongst other things, states that substantial weight should be given to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes. However, this benefit is moderated by the harm I have found to nearby designated heritage assets and, furthermore, high-quality development is an expectation of the development plan and national policy. I therefore attach this moderate weight as a benefit.
33. It is also suggested that there are wider sustainability benefits including electricity generation and energy efficiency measures, the roof would be landscaped for the benefit of occupiers to grow food and to use as a social space. It is also stated that the development would exceed the Building Regulations' requirement for accessible and adaptable homes and would achieve significant bio-diversity net gains. These factors attract moderate weight.
34. The obligations set out in the planning agreement, discussed below, with the exception of the affordable housing contribution and additional provision of accessible and adaptable homes, essentially mitigate the effects of the proposed development and are therefore neutral as public benefits.
35. Overall, the cumulative public benefits of the proposed development, which include the matters I have highlighted above, are clearly worthwhile and should afford substantial weight in favour of the scheme. However, the harm identified to the designated heritage assets is real and significant and I must be mindful of my statutory duty and the requirement in the Framework to give great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets.

36. Given the above, I conclude that the public benefits while collectively of substantial weight would not be of sufficient weight to outweigh the great weight to be given to the harm to the designated heritage assets. As such, the proposal would not comply with the Framework and I am not satisfied that there is clear and convincing justification for the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets. It follows that the proposal would also conflict with Policy HE1 of the Milton Keynes Plan (2019) (MKP) which seeks to underpin the statutory and policy objectives, including ensuring that development sustains and, where possible, enhances the significance of heritage assets including their setting.

Living conditions

37. With regard to future occupants, the Council's concerns relate to the flats on the first and second floors in Block D facing existing residential properties. As a result of potential overlooking issues in a previous scheme, several windows have been angled towards the building which the Council considers would give its occupants a poor outlook and inadequate natural light. The appellant identifies 10 bedrooms with staggered/angled windows, comprising 8 flats.
38. Although the appellant comments that the staggered windows are suggested in the Milton Keynes New Residential Design Guide (2012) (RDG) as a solution to maintain privacy, it does not necessarily follow that their use would be acceptable in every case and circumstances will vary. No objections from the Council's Urban Design Officer also does not necessarily encapsulate all issues that the planning officer has to consider. Also, whilst bedroom windows may be less reliant on outlook and generally have a greater need for privacy than a living room, bedrooms could be used at times for other uses, for instance, working from home, and a reasonable outlook would create a more pleasant daytime environment.
39. It appears to me that some of the flats with the angled windows have a second bedroom with a window with an acceptable outlook. Only 4 flats (D12, D21, D13 and D22) would have all bedrooms with a restricted outlook. However, even in these cases, drawing No.PAL18 details the angled window and illustrates that they would be of reasonable size. At the hearing, the appellant indicated that they would be floor to ceiling height. Most of these windows would also have relatively long site lines and although no clear indication of these views has been provided, and occupants would need to stand in a particular location, it is likely that most occupants would be able to have views which would not be restricted to walling. Furthermore, all of these flats appear to have extensively glazed living areas with full-width balconies, and are double aspect. Therefore, taken in the round, I consider that despite the limited outlook from the bedrooms identified, the flats would have a good standard of living accommodation for all future occupants of those properties.
40. The Council is also concerned that those same bedrooms would not benefit from adequate daylight. The SDAA concludes that poorer levels of light would be received by the occupants of these rooms owing to the angled windows blocking some of the daylight entering them. However, the report comment that bedrooms have the least requirement of all habitable rooms and the light levels experienced would not have a significant impact on those future occupiers. The report also explains that the rest of the proposed development

overall would meet the requirements and would therefore comply with the relevant local plan policies and the BRE.

41. At the hearing, both parties discussed the methodology and current guidelines and whether the results of the report aligned with BRE guidance. Based on the evidence before me, including the Council's Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Report by Syntegra Consulting (April 2024) (DSOR) there is very little detailed analysis of the predicted light levels in those rooms, as advocated in the BRE209 guidelines. Therefore, I have limited details to understand just how poor the light levels would be in those bedrooms. Nevertheless, as with my conclusions on outlook, only 4 of the proposed flats would have all bedrooms with identified poorer light levels.
42. The drawing No.PAL18 illustrates that the side walls of the angled windows would incorporate a tall, solid wall ventilation panel with a restricted opening. At the hearing, the possibility of setting opaque glazing within these panels was discussed. Both parties considered this a possibility to allow more natural light into these rooms. It seems reasonable that this could be secured by condition were I to allow this appeal. Whilst this may to some extent compromise the thermal efficiency of these rooms, there is nothing before me to suggest that this detail would significantly affect the performance of the flat. Overall, therefore, this would appear to be an acceptable compromise to ensure both privacy and to increase natural light levels in these rooms.
43. The DSOR mentions that the appellant's lighting consultants have not conducted overshadowing assessments for green spaces between the blocks and neighbouring gardens of the houses to the north of the site, and therefore the scheme could potentially impact on light levels for surrounding areas. The matter of blockage of light and overshadowing has also been raised by nearby residents. A resident at No.68 comments that the development would tower over them causing them to live in a dark shadow on both levels.
44. No.68 is a two storey dwelling of traditional proportions with a relatively long, rear garden running alongside and parallel to the appeal site. On the appeal site I saw that No.68 had a first floor window facing south but it was not possible to see the location of ground floor windows. Currently, apart from the boundary fence, the property enjoys a relatively open aspect to its south and east and the evidence before me suggests that this has been the case for some time. Block D would be a four storey building with a roof garden of significant massing which would extend close to the side of No.68 and its garden and wrap around its bottom end. Drawing No.PAL8 clearly illustrates the relationship between these buildings including the comparative scale and proximity.
45. Based on the evidence before me and my visit, it appears that the occupants of No.68, who currently enjoy a relatively open aspect to their garden, would be significantly impacted by the proposed development. They would be very aware of the looming presence of Block D running along the side and bottom end of their premises to the east and south and would be likely to experience significantly restricted sunlight and shadowing. The windows facing the development, especially any on the upper floor, would also be likely to receive less daylight. Therefore, on the basis of the evidence before me, I am not convinced, in all likelihood, that the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupants of this property.

46. Therefore, in relation to outlook and daylight, although I have concluded that the development would provide suitable living conditions for future occupants, it would not provide acceptable living conditions for existing occupants. It would be unduly harmful in this respect and the scheme would therefore conflict with MKP Policies HN4 and D5 and the RDG which require that development should not result in an adverse impact on the amenity of occupiers. It would also conflict with the Framework which seeks a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupants.

Other Matters

47. At the hearing, the occupant of Fenny Lodge raised a concern regarding vehicle lights shining into a window of his property at the site access. In response, appellant suggested installing a screen in front of this window. Whilst this potentially could address this concern, at this stage I do not have details of what this screen would look like or how it might affect the listed building's significance. However, given my overall conclusion, I have not needed to consider this matter further.

Planning Agreement

48. The agreement sets out obligations including in respect of affordable housing, travel planning, and accessible dwellings, as well as City Council contributions for health, cultural wellbeing, waste, recreation, education and highways.
49. In terms of these obligations, the appeal has been accompanied by statements from the City Council which set out in detail the requirements for each and the links to relevant policies. The justification for each obligation, as well as the level of contribution, is well made.
50. Consequently, I am satisfied that each planning obligation either alone or in combination is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, is directly related to the development and is fairly and reasonably related to the scale and kind of the development. The planning obligations would meet with the requirements of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy 2010, and I attach them full weight.

Conclusion

51. I have given careful consideration to all the representations made during the application stage and at the appeal and have taken them into account in reaching my decision.
52. In terms of the heritage balance, I have concluded that the harm to the designated heritage assets would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and paragraph 205 of the Framework in relation to the harm caused to the listed buildings.
53. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
54. I have set out the main benefits of the scheme above and I acknowledge that the development would provide a wide range of planning benefits. These include the delivery of open market and affordable housing on a brownfield site

within the built up area. However, the harm to the setting and significance of the listed buildings is to such an extent that this harm would outweigh these benefits and in addition there is undue harm to the living conditions of the occupants of an existing property. The harm and related policy conflicts in these respects is such that the scheme would not be in accordance with the development plan when considered as a whole.

55. For the reasons given above, there are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Bayliss

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Jennifer Smith	Smith Jenkins Planning and Heritage
Garry Hutchinson	Smith Jenkins Planning and Heritage
Jennifer Cooke	Smith Jenkins Planning and Heritage
Mike Kane	KNK Architects
Louise Smith	Aval Consulting Group
Jayaprakash V	Aval Consulting Group
Ramesh Pratheek	Aval Consulting Group
Mr Kamal	Representing the appellant

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Nathan Makwana	Senior Planning Officer
Paul King	Planning Team Leader
Simon Peart	Conservation and Archaeology Manager
Hannah Khalifa	Syntegra Group

INTERESTED PARTIES

John Adair	Fenny Lodge, Simpson Road
------------	---------------------------

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

- Extract from BRE document: Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight, a guide to good practice.
- Completed and signed Section 106 Agreement relating to infrastructure and public services.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE HEARING

- Draft list of conditions agreed between both parties. Received 19 June 2024.