
Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 6 August 2025

Site visits made on 5 and 6 August 2025

by Peter White BA(Hons) MA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 September 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/J1535/W/24/3350572

London Hoist Ltd, 43 London Road, Stanford Rivers, Ongar, CM5 9PH

- 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 London Hoist Ltd against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application reference is EPF/0355/24.
 - The development proposed is proposed siting and operation of a tower crane.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/J1535/C/24/3350190

London Hoist Ltd, 43 London Road, Stanford Rivers, Ongar, Essex, CM5 9PH

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The appeal is made by London Hoist Ltd against an enforcement notice issued by Epping Forest District Council.
- The notice was issued on 16 July 2024.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: without planning permission, the erection of a tower crane.
- The requirements of the notice are:
 - i. Dismantle the crane.
 - ii. Break up the concrete plinth.
 - iii. Remove from the Land all debris resulting from the works carried out at step (ii).
- The period for compliance with the requirements is: 2 months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Summary of decisions:

Appeal A is dismissed. Appeal B succeeds in part and the enforcement notice is upheld with a variation in the terms set out below in the Formal Decision.

Applications for costs

1. An application for costs was made by London Hoist Ltd against Epping Forest District Council. That application is subject to a separate decision.

Appeal A

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form is, "Proposed siting and operation of a tower crane", but the tower crane has been erected. The parties agree that the term, "Erection and operation of a tower crane" would more accurately reflect the development which has occurred, and for which planning permission is sought, in the terms of Section 55 of the Act. I shall therefore consider the appeal on this basis and use the revised description of development in my formal decision.

3. The appellant has requested that consideration be given to two alternative proposals in the event that I am minded to dismiss the appeal. Firstly, that the height of the tower crane be reduced by around 5 metres. And secondly, that planning permission be granted for a temporary period of 5 years.

The main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - Whether the development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant development plan policies;
 - The effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt;
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - The effect of the development on the setting of listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets;
 - The effect on employment and the construction industry; and
 - Whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Whether inappropriate development

5. The Land lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt.
6. Policy DM4 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011-2033 Part One (2023) ("LP") generally follows national policy, as found in the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework"). But it is silent on the matter of 'Grey Belt' land.
7. The main parties agree that the erection of the crane is the construction of a building for the purposes of the Act, but that none of the exceptions in paragraph 154 of the Framework apply to the development.
8. Paragraph 155 of the Framework states that commercial and other development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate in certain circumstances. Criteria (a) and (b) are relevant to Appeal A but are a matter of dispute between the parties. The parties agree criterion (c) is relevant but met.
9. In relation to Paragraph 155(a), grey belt, the site is previously developed land. I agree with the main parties that the land does not strongly contribute to any of the Green Belt purposes (a), (b) or (d), and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. But the Council consider the application of policies in the Framework to designated heritage assets provides a strong reason for refusing or restricting the development, thereby excluding it from the definition of grey belt land set out in Annex 2 to the Framework. I consider the effect of the development on designated heritage assets in detail below but, for the reasons given in that section of my decision, it does not provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting the development. The land is therefore grey belt land, and criterion (a) is met.

10. In relation to 155(b), the appellant makes the case that there is a specific business need for a tower crane for operating the site in its current form. I acknowledge the tower crane offers the appellant a safe and efficient way to carry out its operations on this Land. But I have not seen compelling evidence that it is the only site which can be used for this purpose, or that this is the only means by which the business operations can be provided. Neither have I seen evidence of a need for a tower crane or cranes generally in the area. I therefore consider a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed has not been demonstrated, and criterion (b) is not met. The development is therefore inappropriate development in the green belt.
11. Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances ("VSCs"). VSCs will not exist unless harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the development, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Whether or not that is the case is considered below.

Openness

12. The Framework describes the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy as being to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. The Council describes openness as the absence of development, and I agree that encompasses much of its essence.
13. Spatially, the tower crane has a height of almost 30m, a jib length of 70m and a 2.4m wide square structure at its base. The jib and counter jib together bring its overall horizontal length to around 90m. Although much of the structure is of lattice design, it nevertheless has a notable volume which reflects its size and reduces openness.
14. Visually, I note the permeability of the lattice structure, and that the presence of the former workhouse buildings reduces its visibility from some locations. I also note it has different effects at different times, given its rotation. However, the height and size of the crane makes it highly visible from some perspectives, and it is substantially higher than buildings in the vicinity and landscape features in the immediate area. The development therefore reduces visual openness.
15. I note the crane could be removed in future in a manner which would remove the harm to openness, but that is not the proposal before me in the first instance. Even in the alternative, were I to refuse to grant permanent planning permission, harm to openness would arise for a temporary period of 5 years, which would weigh against the development, albeit less significantly. Similarly, reducing the height of the crane by around 5m would not reduce the scale of the jib and counter jib and would only marginally reduce the overall effect on openness.
16. The operation of the tower crane is relatively quiet, despite the occasional clang as the lifting gear engages, and has replaced the noise associated with diesel operated 'telehandlers' with reversing alarms. Nevertheless, the benefits in terms of tranquillity do not outweigh the spatial and visual harm to openness.
17. In conclusion, the development is harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and conflicts with LP Policy SP5, which seeks to protect the openness of the Green Belt from inappropriate development.

Character and appearance

18. The appellant's landscape and visual appraisal (LVA) evaluates the landscape and effects of the development.
19. In terms of landscape character, the part of the site on which the crane is sited is part of the wide valley floor of the middle section of the Roding Valley. It sits among a patchwork of arable fields delineated by mature hedgerows and where woodland patches contribute to the sense it is a wooded landscape. The front part of the Land, and the settlement at Stanford Rivers Little End, is part of an area characterised by frequent patches of woodland, which provide an intermittent sense of enclosure within views across the landscape.
20. The Epping Forest Landscape Character Assessment¹ found the landscape character areas of which the site is part had a moderate to high sensitivity to change. With the evidence before me, mature vegetation means the industrial use of the Land is not readily apparent in the wider landscape from public vantage points, and only one or two elements are clearly visible above it. A sewage works less than 0.5km from the Land on the valley floor is also visible in part, although much of its apparatus is low-lying behind boundary vegetation. Without the tower crane, man-made features in the landscape are therefore present, even if their visibility is limited. The appellant's assessment that the landscape in the vicinity of the Land is of moderate sensitivity is therefore not unreasonable.
21. The noise and movement associated with the A113 London Road may disturb the overall sense of tranquillity to some degree but was not a notable feature at my visits. At this time of year very little of the industrial character of the Land was visible in most landscape views, but from the nearest public footpath one or two industrial elements could be seen above the hedgerow and trees. Nevertheless, the overall sense was one of a wooded landscape in a shallow valley setting.
22. The crane is a substantial industrial feature in the landscape and appears taller than most landscape features. The appellant considers it to be prominent but not substantially uncharacteristic within the existing landscape, considering other man-made elements in the form of pylons. However, the pylons to the south-west are some distance from the Land and are distant features only visible in large scale views. There are also two radio masts on the horizon to the east, but none of these features has the prominence of the tower crane, which is the only feature in the landscape with an extensive horizontal man-made element standing above the treeline.
23. A permanent tower crane is neither a common rural feature, nor a typical feature of industrial sites. In my view the development stands out and dominates some views and can be described as 'prominent and totally uncharacteristic' when set within the attributes of the receiving landscape. Were I to apply that to the appellant's methodology, the magnitude of change would be 'large' not 'medium', and the significance of landscape effects would be major/moderate. I therefore consider the level of landscape effect to be a material change.
24. Considering visual effects, the appellant concluded their significance from the A113 would be 'potentially moderate'. However, other than one viewpoint from which the

¹ As reported in the appellant's LVA in relation to LCA B3 and LCA G6.

crane is largely obscured by trees and the former workhouse building, all the viewpoints assessed were from a distance of 1km or more from the Land.

25. The LVA considered no other viewpoints, and I do not accept that all others offer limited views of the site, or that those chosen represent views seen by the most sensitive receptors around the site.
26. A public footpath runs parallel to the Land, at close proximity, with wide open views across an arable field. At my site visit the tower crane was a very prominent feature on the skyline above the trees and hedges when walking this path in either direction. Users of public rights of way are considered to have 'high' receptor sensitivity, and even if I were to accept the appellant's verbal assessment that the tower crane constitutes a 'medium' magnitude of change, rather than the Council's view that it is 'large', the significance of visual effects along this route would be major/moderate.
27. The appellant's methodology also made provision for assessment for occupiers of residential properties, but no such assessments have been made. There are a number of residential properties near the Land, and the tower crane is plainly visible, and a significant feature, from the street over houses and gardens in Garden Fields and at the entrances to dwellings on 65 and 67 London Road. It is also likely to be visible and prominent from a number of gardens and the rear of several dwellings on the south-eastern side of London Road.
28. Views from the gardens of these properties, and some houses, are likely to be similar or greater in effect than those from the public footpath. In my view photographs taken from the garden of No 43 London Road and parts of the garden at 10 Garden Fields show at least a 'large' magnitude of visual impact.
29. Landscape and visual assessment is a complex matter. But the findings above reflect my own judgement of the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, having visited the Land and surrounding area and considered all the evidence. The tower crane is an uncharacteristic feature in its location of substantial height and length and is seen above other features in the landscape.
30. In conclusion, the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and conflicts with the relevant parts of LP Policies SP6, DM3 and DM9. These policies require developments to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the countryside, relate positively to their context, make a positive contribution to a place and be sensitive to their setting in the landscape.
31. Were I to grant a temporary planning permission for a period of 5 years, the development would have the same effects, albeit over a limited period of time.
32. Reduction in the height of the crane by around 5m would have a relatively limited effect in reducing the landscape and visual harm, as the extensive jib and counter jib and tower head would remain visible and prominent in most views and perspectives. The slight reduction in scale or prominence in views very close to the Land would only marginally reduce the effect from some locations.

Heritage assets

33. I have a statutory duty under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (“the LBCA Act”) to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest they possess.
34. The Council considers the tower crane is harmful development within the setting of three listed buildings (Stanford Rivers House, The Rectory and Little Colemans), and the locally listed building the Ongar Union Workhouse. The Parish Council also consider it results in harm within the setting of the locally listed site of the former Congregational Church.
35. In addition, there are two further Grade II listed buildings (Bridge Cottage and Hare Cottage) in the vicinity of the Land, but the tower crane is not visible in the surroundings within which these assets are experienced. The parties agree there are no visual impacts on the settings of either building, and that their significance and features of special architectural or historic interest are preserved. I agree and have not considered these buildings further.

Stanford Rivers House

36. Stanford Rivers House is a grade II listed building. It is a 17th Century former farmhouse with architectural interest, and historic interest on account of being the home of the artist, author and inventor Isaac Taylor. The appellant considers its significance is limited to its architectural features and interior.
37. The parties disagree on the extent to which setting contributes to the building’s significance. As a former farmhouse, its setting would have been an agricultural one, and that appears to be the case beyond its generous curtilage. The curtilage is a domestic one, with trees obscuring an industrial building on one side and a modern dwelling on the other.
38. The building is generally orientated with views to the north and south, and I have not seen any evidence of views of the crane from the building or its grounds. If it is visible, then these views will be relatively oblique, and I have not seen any evidence that the crane affects its setting in a manner which harms the significance of the building. With the evidence before me, the development is not harmful to the listed building or its significance and preserves its setting and features of special architectural and historic interest.

The Rectory

39. The Rectory is a Grade II listed 18th-19th century house of architectural interest.
40. The substantial belt of trees between the house and the appeal site, and the presence of the former workhouse building, mean the crane is barely perceptible in views around the house. The frontage of the house faces 90 degrees away from the tower crane, and the building is set back on its plot. I have seen no evidence of any views of the crane from or within the curtilage of the house. And in the surroundings within which the asset is experienced I saw no views in which the crane was a prominent feature.
41. The development is not harmful to the listed building or its significance and preserves its setting and features of special architectural and historic interest.

Little Colemans

42. Little Colemans, or One Little Colemans, is a 17th century grade II listed building with later alterations. It is of architectural interest and one of the oldest buildings in the parish.
43. Its setting changed significantly in the 1970's when a very large dwelling was erected adjacent to it. Together with very substantial coniferous hedges along its frontage, and woodland at its side and rear, it is almost entirely obscured from views towards the Land. Furthermore, Little Colemans is not seen in association with the tower crane from the public footpath between Little Colemans and the Parish Church, which runs east-west, with the crane to the south. The surroundings within which the asset is experienced are therefore very small.
44. Although the tower crane can be seen on the skyline in views from the road in the vicinity of the house, it has no effect on its setting. The development is therefore not harmful to the listed building or its significance and preserves its setting and features of special architectural and historic interest.

Ongar Union Workhouse

45. The former workhouse is a Locally Listed Building of evidential, architectural and historic value and, in the terms of the Framework, is a non-designated heritage asset.
46. Built in 1830 it was one of the last workhouses built before the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 and was designed to serve 9 parishes. Its most distinctive feature was its central hub at the rear of the original building, which overlooked the yards. It was enlarged in 1837, and a workhouse infirmary and workhouse school buildings were built in 1871.
47. The workhouse buildings are located on the Land near its road frontage and the built-up part of the settlement. The original building is an imposing 3-and-a-half storey brick building, beyond which is the two-storey former infirmary building, and then the main storage yard. The tower crane is located relatively centrally in the rear yard, around 100m from the infirmary building and 130m from the original workhouse building.
48. Within the Land, the current setting of the workhouse is an industrial one, with open storage, industrial buildings and associated car parking. The distance of the crane from the buildings and the difference in character between the primary storage area and the parking and storage between the historic buildings means the primary storage area reads as a different site to some extent.
49. The layout of the buildings provides a degree of enclosure to the yard between the workhouse buildings. Along with the separation distance between the buildings and tower crane, that sense of enclosure, along with that afforded by other intervening buildings, reduces views of the upper parts of the tower crane from ground level to a large extent. But there will be clear views from the rear of the infirmary building and from the upper storeys of the main workhouse building. There are also views of the tower, jib, counter jib and tower head beyond the historic buildings on the access road, and in gaps between the buildings, which mean the crane is prominent within the area within which the buildings are experienced.

50. Historically the environs of the workhouse would have been largely agricultural, and the crane is a very large industrial feature. The setting of the workhouse buildings have already been harmed by the extensive external storage, but the tower crane contributes further to that harm, resulting in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset in the terms of the Framework. Reducing the height of the tower crane by around 5m may marginally reduce the effects from the road, but would have little or no effect in relation to the infirmary building.

Site of the former Congregational Church

51. Listed as 'Tombstone and Railings' in the local list of heritage assets for Stanford Rivers Parish, it is located adjacent to The Rectory, and opposite the Ongar Union Workhouse building. The railings are acknowledged to be modern and of no historic significance, but the site is of historic interest, being the site of an old church where David Livingstone once preached. An interpretive plaque has been erected on a low modern wall in recent times.
52. The tombstone is the only historic above-ground feature associated with the former church, and I saw no views of the tower crane from the site. With the evidence before me I have found no harm occurring to the significance of the asset.

Conclusion on heritage assets

53. In conclusion, in relation to designated heritage assets, the development preserves their settings and features of special architectural or historic interest and does not harm their significance. The requirements of the LBCA Act are therefore satisfied and, in this respect, the development accords with LP Policy DM7, which is described below.
54. With regard to non-designated heritage assets, the development does not harm the locally listed site of the former Congregational Church, but results in less than substantial harm to the significance of the locally listed Ongar Union Workhouse. The development therefore conflicts with LP Policy DM7, which requires the significance of all heritage assets, including the contributions made by their settings, to be preserved or enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance.
55. This harm is weighed in a balanced judgement below in accordance with LP Policy DM7 and paragraph 216 of the Framework.

Employment and construction

56. London Hoist advise they operate the UKs largest supplier of mast climbers and hoists to the construction industry. The Land is their main yard, but they also have a northern division site, which is supplied by this site, and they advise they employ more than 90 people throughout the UK.
57. The lifting equipment is stored as a range of components variously designed to lift between 200kg – 3 tonnes when assembled into larger units. Individual components can weigh up to 4 tonnes, close to the capacity of the mobile cranes formerly used.
58. Prior to the installation of the tower crane, these components were loaded onto lorries using telehandler cranes and forklift trucks. A telehandler overturned in 2019 in an incident reported to the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and a safety review recommended replacing them with a crane with a greater safe working load

capacity. Lifting capacity diminishes with reach and lifting loads of up to 4 tonnes substantially increased the risks. The tower crane provides significantly greater load capacities, of between 12 and 2.1 tonnes and, with a jib length of around 70m, most of the yard is accessible to it. It also significantly improves site safety, and removes the noise associated with diesel mobile cranes and their reversing alarms.

59. The appellant advises the yard has been laid out in a way that makes components accessible to the tower crane, but not necessarily by mobile cranes. They advise the use of mobile cranes would also require an assessment of the ground each time it was used and would dramatically reduce load efficiency. At the Hearing the appellant advised the loss of the tower crane would make the site untenable for the business and could result in the loss of 90 jobs and a further 20 in the northern division.
60. The appellant states that lifting equipment is a fundamental element in the supply chain of providing new homes. It has a functioning site which, with the tower crane, meets its business needs. It therefore gains support from LP Policy E1, which seeks to retain and enhance existing employment sites, and paragraphs 85 and 87 of the Framework, which recognise the need to support economic growth and productivity taking into account local business needs. At the same time, I have not seen any evidence demonstrating that this is the only site that could do so, or whether any other more suitable sites have been considered. This matter should be weighed in the planning balance in favour of the development.

Other Matters

61. Interested parties have raised concerns about the effect of the development on living conditions of local residents, including noise and outlook from houses and gardens in the vicinity of the Land. As consideration of these matters (in addition to the visual effects considered above) would not change my decision, I have not considered them further.
62. The parties agree that the development would not have a significant impact on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (EFSAC). The EFSAC is around 6km from the Land and is identified primarily for its beech trees, wet and dry heaths, and stag beetles. The Council, as competent authority, has identified two main pathways of impact: (1) recreational pressure; and (2) atmospheric pollution (primarily from vehicle emissions). The development does not affect the EFSAC in relation to either and will not have a likely significant effect on the qualifying features of the EFSAC, either alone or in combination with other development.

Other considerations / the planning balance

63. Against the development, I am required to give substantial weight to any harm to the Green Belt, including to its openness. In addition, I attribute significant weight to the harm to the character and appearance of the area and moderate weight to the harm to the setting of the non-designated heritage asset Ongar Union Workhouse.
64. I attach significant weight in favour of the development to the employment and construction industry benefits of the crane. Nevertheless, these benefits do not clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harms and very special circumstances therefore do not exist. Consequently, I attribute further weight against the development on account of conflict with LP Policies SP5 and DM4,

which seek to protect the openness of the Green Belt, only granting planning permission for inappropriate development in very special circumstances.

65. For the reasons given above, a reduction in the height of the tower crane would have only a marginal effect in reducing the harm to the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the Ongar Union Workhouse buildings. Other considerations would not clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harms and very special circumstances would not exist.
66. In relation to retention of the tower crane for a temporary period of 5 years, the appellant advises such a period would align with the hire period of the tower crane, avoiding early termination charges, and would provide time to explore other solutions, including an alternative site if necessary. However, even if I attribute less weight to the harm to openness, the character and appearance of the area and the heritage asset, the benefits of the development do not clearly outweigh the substantial weight due to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Very special circumstances therefore do not exist.

Conclusion on Appeal A

67. In conclusion, the development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, is harmful to its openness, harms the character and appearance of the area and results in less than substantial harm to a non-designated heritage asset. The tower crane plays a specific role in the operation of the business supplying lifting equipment to the construction business and employing over 90 people. However, the harm to the Green Belt, together with the other harms identified above, are not clearly outweighed by other considerations and very special circumstances do not exist. The development therefore conflicts with development plan policies, and there are no other material considerations that require a decision to be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
68. For the reasons given above the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Appeal B

69. Appeals on ground (g) are made on the basis that the period specified in the notice for compliance with its requirements falls short of what should reasonably be allowed.
70. The Notice specifies a period of two months to dismantle the crane, break up the concrete plinth and remove from the Land all debris resulting from the works carried out.
71. In terms of physically removing the crane, the appellant advises it would be necessary to negotiate early termination of the lease and identify a team of contractors to remove it, considering their availability. Adverse weather conditions, such as high winds, could affect those timescales, even at short notice. The appellant advises the minimum period of time for doing so would be 3 months if all work at the site ceased, and at a cost of around £50,000. They also advise a 3 month cessation of business operations would be untenable for the company.
72. If work were carried out at the weekends, to allow the operation of the site on weekdays, the appellant states that process would take 12 months, depending on weather conditions, but I have not seen compelling evidence for that timescale.

73. Nevertheless, at the Hearing the appellant advised that removal of the tower crane would have a significant effect on operation of the yard. Challenging operating conditions post-COVID also mean the business currently has no funds for alternative lifting machinery which would meet the HSE recommendations. Too short a period would make it impossible to uphold existing contracts without delays and associated penalties. That would put the business at risk, with the potential loss of around 110 jobs and resulting in construction delays for the building industry.
74. As the site has been arranged for access by the tower crane, the access paths required for moving items by mobile cranes have also been lost. Removal of the tower crane will require re-organisation of the yard and the laying of concrete for mobile cranes.
75. The appellant also advises that, if the tower crane cannot operate on the Land then suitable alternative sites will need to be considered, and planning permission will need to be sought for the crane's relocation.
76. Considering all the evidence, a period of 2 months to comply with the requirements of the Notice would be unreasonably short. Even if the tower crane and its foundation could be removed in that time, it would come at a significant cost to the business and its employees.
77. Notwithstanding the harm I identify in relation to Appeal A, there is no immediate need for its removal either on grounds of irreparable damage to assets of acknowledged importance or of risk to human life. A period of 12 months would afford the appellant an opportunity to reconfigure the existing site, either temporarily or permanently, to explore more suitable sites, and seek planning permission elsewhere if necessary. Doing so would limit the risk of job losses and reduce any disruption in the supply chain for the construction industry.

Conclusion on Appeal B

78. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the period for compliance with the notice falls short of what is reasonable, and the appeal on ground (g) succeeds.

Formal decisions

Appeal A

79. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

80. It is directed that the enforcement notice is varied by:

- in Section 6, the deletion of "two months" and its substitution with "12 months" as the period for compliance.

81. Subject to the variation, the enforcement notice is upheld.

Peter White

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Joe Bennett – Principal Planning Consultant (RCA Regeneration)

Helen Morris – Director (RCA Regeneration)

John-Paul Friend – Director (LVIA Ltd)

Edmund Simons – Associate Professor of Heritage Management (Cultural Heritage Institute, Royal Agricultural University).

Aaron Jones – Yard Manager (London Hoist Ltd)

Brett Lee – Independent Health & Safety Advisor (Richardson Hill Ltd)

Doug Genge – Chartered Engineer

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Alex Sadowski – Senior Planning Officer

Stella Sudekum – Conservation Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Cllr John Glover – Chairman of Stanford Rivers Parish Council

Cllr John Adams - Stanford Rivers Parish Council

Mr J Molloy – 10 Garden Fields

Mr S Molloy – 11 Garden Fields