



---

## Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 21 April 2026

Site visit made on 21 April 2026

**by Timothy C King BA (Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 23 June 2026**

---

### **Appeal A: APP/R0355/C/25/3377131**

#### **Land at Mare Lane Farm, Howe Lane, Binfield, Bracknell RG42 5QP**

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
  - The appeal is made by Mr David Bertie against an enforcement notice issued by Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
  - The enforcement notice was issued on 3 December 2025.
  - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is 'Without planning permission, the erection of a barn and associated hardstanding.
  - The requirements of the notice are:
    1. Deconstruct and remove from the land the barn building shown shaded blue on the attached plan.
    2. Remove the hardstanding and lighting from the land as shown shaded purple on the attached plan.
    3. Remove from the land all materials associated with steps 1 and 2.
  - The period for compliance with the requirements is 12 months from the date this notice comes into effect.
  - The appeals are proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (b), (c), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
- 

### **Appeal B: 6002453**

#### **Mare Lane Farm, Howe Lane, Binfield, Bracknell, Berkshire RG42 5QP**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr David Bertie against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 24/00353/FUL, dated 25 May 2024, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2025.
  - The development proposed is described as '*Erection of a commercial barn building, for a mix of agriculture storage & operations (sui generis), and office and retail space (use Class E), with associated parking, following demolition of previous barn building (retrospective)*'.
- 

## **Formal Decisions**

### **Appeal A**

1. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

### **Appeal B**

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a commercial barn building, for a mix of agriculture storage and operations (sui generis), and office and retail space (use Class E), with associated parking, following demolition of previous barn building (retrospective) at Mare Lane farm,

Howe Lane, Binfield, Bracknell, Berkshire RG42 5QP, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 24/00353/FUL, dated 25 May 2024, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule. A related s106 legal agreement has also been concluded and signed by the relevant parties.

## **Background**

3. In August 2019 planning permission (ref 19/00267/FUL) was, by way of the Council's decision notice, granted for the change of use of an agricultural building to Classes A1 and B1 (mixed use) external alterations and formation of parking spaces.
4. The appellant claims that the Implementation of the approved works began in January 2020, although the Council disputes whether implementation actually took place. Nonetheless, the following month there was considerable storm damage to the building as then existed which, apparently, brought about its partial collapse, and its subsequent rebuild.
5. Despite the extensive works which were required an application was then made to the Council for just a non-material amendment (NMA) and, by definition, limited changes to the barn building's appearance. This was approved in August 2021 under 21/00719/NMA, and further works were undertaken. Concerns, though, continued as to the state of the structure – particularly the steel frame – and it was decided that the frame would need to be replaced.
6. In the event the development proceeded which involved changes to the building's design, including an increase in eaves height, roof design and fenestration.
7. As a response the application, the subject of Appeal B, was submitted in May 2024, although it was not determined until June 2025. As works had continued regardless the Council then issued an enforcement notice in December 2025 requiring for the building's removal.
8. The enforcement notice and the refusal of planning permission were subsequently appealed. There is no deemed planning application by way of the s174 appeal (Appeal A) but the merits and impacts of the development fall to be assessed under the s78 appeal (Appeal B).

## **Preliminary Matter**

9. At the Hearing the Council confirmed that Refusal Reason 4, concerned with drainage, would be resolved by way of an agreed condition in the event that the appeal was allowed and planning permission granted. Further, on 11 May 2026, following the Hearing, the appellant and the Council signed a s106 legal agreement which amongst other matters addressed the issue of Biodiversity Net Gain. As a result, the Council has confirmed in writing that the agreement resolves its concerns on this issue and Refusal Reason no 2 has been withdrawn.

## **Appeal A**

### **The appeal on ground (b)**

10. An appeal by way of ground (b) is the claim that the alleged breach of control has not occurred as a matter of fact.

11. The onus is on the appellant to prove his case on the balance of probabilities in this regard.
12. The enforcement notice targets both the erection of the building and the associated hardstanding, requiring for the removal of both.
13. The NMA application essentially hangs off the 2019 planning permission. The application form describes the works as limited to *'proposed revision to openings.'* On the above basis I must agree with the Council's case report which, in referring to the extent of the amendments, mentions only alterations to some of the approved doors and windows, along with changes to the location of the approved fenestration. The submitted drawings confirm this, and the report goes on to say that the proposal would not involve any changes to the overall massing and design, and there would be no material impact on the appearance of the building.
14. In the circumstances, as I made clear at the Hearing, I cannot understand why the Council accepted that a NMA was appropriate in the circumstances. The development, as it had proceeded, went considerably beyond the extent of the proposed NMA works, and this would have been clear at the time given the extent of the works already undertaken. Accordingly, the Council should have, instead, insisted on a full planning application in order that the development might be regularised.
15. The NMA, as applied for, was clearly insufficient in this regard. To illustrate this I must refer to comments made in certain of the appellant's submissions.
16. At the time of the application 19/00267/FUL the development described on the application form stated:  
  
*'Refurbishment of existing building including external works, landscaping and planting. Change of use of part of building to A1, B1 Use Classes Order 2018'*
17. Yet, paragraph 3.12 of the appellant's initial grounds of appeal on Appeal A says:  
  
*'The new building is identical in depth, height and appearance as that which was approved, but there is 2m addition to the length'.*
18. Paragraph 4.5 of the Design and Access Statement submitted alongside application 24/00353/FUL states:  
  
*'The overall built form and design of the barn remains the same as the previous permission and its non-material amendment in relation to openings (approved in application 21/00719/NMA).'*
19. In view of the above the development carried out is inconsistent with, and goes beyond, the scope of the works permitted. Clearly, a larger footprint, with the additional 2m in length constitutes significant materiality and, given the planning history I have outlined, I am satisfied that the breach of control, as alleged – namely the erection of a barn building - took place as a matter of fact.
20. The appellant says that the hardstanding in situ is identical to that approved under application 19/00267/FUL and this is therefore permitted. However, the hardstanding is inextricably linked to the unauthorised building erected.
21. The information provided in the appellant's various representations are clearly contradictory and do not give a true picture as to the actuality of the planning

position. Given my findings, I have concluded that the planning permission 19/00267/FUL was not implemented and I therefore doubt the applicability of the NMA, especially when bearing in mind the limitations of the proposed changes.

22. For these reasons the appeal under ground (b) does not succeed.

### **The appeal on ground (c)**

23. An appeal under ground (c), although accepting that the matters referred to in the alleged breach have occurred, claims that no planning permission is required for the development identified.

24. It would appear that the original barn was removed from the land, and, effectively, a new building was erected in its place. Planning permission 19/00267/FUL was only concerned with the original building's material change of use and also external alterations thereto, yet the rebuild involved the erection of a replacement building which was effectively larger than the previous structure. The Council has estimated that the developable area has increased by nearly 40%.

25. Clearly, for the above reasons, the building as erected requires the benefit of planning permission. If that were not the case then there would have been no reason to submit the 2024 application. Moreover, the description of the development on the application form for this development states '*Erection of commercial barn building...following demolition of previous barn building.*'

26. I find that this all points to conclusive evidence that planning permission was necessary for the development, as built at the time the enforcement notice was issued.

27. The appeal on ground (c) therefore similarly fails.

### **The appeal on ground (f)**

28. An appeal under ground (f) is the claim that the enforcement notice's stipulated steps for compliance go beyond that which would reasonably remedy any harm caused by the breach.

29. A ground (f) appeal does not allow for unauthorised operational development to be retained which requires the benefit of planning permission. In other words, if the development, in its entirety, does not enjoy planning permission then a ground (f) submission cannot on its own regularise the breach. Notwithstanding this, as I have found that the hardstanding is so closely linked with the unauthorised building and facilitates its use, ground (f) cannot reasonably succeed.

### **The appeal on ground (g)**

30. A ground (g) appeal is that the said time period for compliance is unreasonably short.

31. The enforcement notice stipulates that a period not exceeding twelve months is sufficient to allow for full compliance with its requirements. The appellant says that this is insufficient due to existing tenancy agreements, and the claim that it could take up to twelve months to secure the demolition of the building. I have not, though, received any compelling information in this regard.

32. If complying with the notice's requirements it would potentially be open to the Council to extend the said period should problems be encountered. However, as I am allowing the s78 appeal and granting planning permission for the existing development it is not necessary that I explore this matter further.
33. Accordingly, on the evidence available, I see no reason to extend the compliance period. The appeal under ground (g) therefore fails.

### **Appeal B**

34. The main issues in this appeal area as follows:

- 1) Whether the proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt, affecting its openness or whether the land can be considered as grey belt for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework;
- 2) Whether any adverse traffic impacts resulting from the development can be mitigated by way of the imposition of planning conditions and s106 obligations; and
- 3) if it is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

#### *Effect on the Green Belt*

35. The appeal site is reached via a long accessway off Howe Lane. It is surrounded by fields, although there is some small-scale sporadic development along Howe Lane. The land falls within the Metropolitan Green Belt where policy LP34 of the Bracknell Forest Local Plan 2020-2037 (LP) says that proposals within will be determined in accordance with relevant national Green Belt policy.
36. Paragraph 153 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
37. Paragraph 154 of the Framework sets out exceptions to proposals being considered as inappropriate development in the Green Belt where they are considered to preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. In this respect, openness is identified in the Framework as one of the Green Belt's essential characteristics. It has a spatial aspect as well as a visual aspect.
38. The development, though, would not meet the relevant exceptions to inappropriate development set out in paragraph 154. Accordingly, by definition, the development is harmful to the Green Belt.
39. Paragraph 155 of the Framework discusses the concept of grey belt land where development in the Green Belt may not be considered inappropriate. For the purposes of decision making 'grey belt' is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land (PDL) and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to the various purposes of the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 143 of the Framework. The appeal site does not realistically contribute to these purposes, but it is PDL.

40. On the face of it, therefore, the development could be seen as utilising grey belt land. However, from the evidence before me, although I acknowledge the appellant's representations as to the claim that there is a need for the type of employment provided here, it is not so compelling as to show that there is a demonstrative unmet need for such land. Neither is the appeal site in a particularly sustainable location. It could not be described as remote but, as it stands, there is likely heavy reliance on the private motor vehicle.
41. As such, the proposal fails criteria b) and c) of paragraph 155, and the development must be regarded as inappropriate development within the Green Belt, and thereby harmful thereto. In accordance with the Framework's advice I afford this considerable weight.
42. In terms of the development's impact on the Green Belt's openness the word is open-textured and a number of factors are capable of relevance when it comes to applying it to the particular facts of a specific case. Prominent among these will be factors relevant to how built up the Green Belt is now and how built up it would be if development occurs and also factors relevant to the visual impact on the aspect of openness which the Green Belt presents. Matters relevant to openness in any particular case are a matter of planning assessment, so whilst visual impact can be relevant to openness it is not necessarily relevant in all cases.
43. The Council has provided photographs taken from afar comparing the current view across a field towards the building and that which was the case with the previous building. The new building is considerably higher and more prominent on the landscape and, given that agricultural fields surround the site, it is clear that the development has had an impact on the Green Belt's openness.

#### *Traffic impacts*

44. Paragraph 116 of the Framework says that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impact on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe.
45. The Council says that the proposed site use is not agricultural in the main and includes business class E, B8 and sui generis vehicle maintenance and servicing uses. The scope of uses is correct but units 5 and 7, which together have a gross internal of some 1,350 sqm, are specifically being set aside for agricultural storage purposes. This is a significant proportion of the total floorspace. The appellant's Transport Statement largely addresses the LP's transport policies' requirements and would provide car, cycle and disabled spaces. In this regard, a Travel plan would be submitted for the Council's approval.
46. A s278 under the Highways Act would be entered into for works necessary at the junction of the access driveway with Howe Lane in order to provide appropriate visibility splays and properly facilitate ingress and egress. This would accord with paragraph 115 of the Framework.
47. It would appear from the discussion at the Hearing that the Council's concerns relate less to the traffic movements generated and more to do with the adequate servicing of certain of the units and, in response the appellant has produced Swept Path Analysis in an attempt to show that there is adequate manoeuvrability space to allow for the units to be satisfactorily serviced. In response, a condition relating

to car parking, turning, deliveries and servicing has been agreed which requires that details of such are submitted to the authority for approval. The highway officer, when questioned at the Hearing, appeared satisfied that its intended requirements could thereby be potentially achieved.

48. Accordingly, I conclude that the Council's Refusal Reason no 3 has been effectively addressed, and negotiations can continue, as necessary, in order to resolve any difficulties that might be seen to continue. A likely successful outcome would accord with the aims and requirements of LP policies 25, 26, 60 and 62.

#### Other Considerations

##### *Economic growth*

49. The Framework's paragraphs 85, 88 and 89 concentrate on building a strong, competitive economy and also promoting a prosperous rural economy, advocating that policies and planning decisions should be formulated and used to achieve these goals. In this connection paragraphs 124 and 125 advise that developments make effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, and multiple benefits should be encouraged from both urban and rural land.
50. Leaving aside the presumption against inappropriate development for the moment I consider that, with suitable measures of mitigation employed, the development would accord with government objectives.

##### *Section 106 Agreement*

51. The s106 Agreement secures several measures to mitigate the impact of the development. First, although the development is retrospective and the normal 10% quota of Biodiversity Net Gain does not strictly apply the appellant has offered to contribute in this regard with the submission of a Biodiversity Gain Plan and a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan for the Council's approval prior to implementation.
52. The landowner shall manage and maintain the Biodiversity Net Gain Land in accordance with the Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan for the duration of the Biodiversity Management Period.
53. The owner also undertakes to draw up a Travel Plan, in order to identify car sharing and car club opportunities using a site wide database and a car sharing promotion campaign. Cycle spaces will be provided for staff, customers and visitors and other measures will be provided with the objectives of reducing car travel to and from the development. A Travel Plan Monitoring Fee will be paid to the Council.
54. The owner covenants, within three months of the date of this decision, to submit details of the necessary highway works to the Council and enter into a s278 agreement with the relevant authority.
55. The owner also covenants not to allow the occupation of Units 5 and 7 until certain obligations have been met.

##### *Very Special Circumstances*

56. Given my findings on this first main issue I must assess whether the appellants have demonstrated the very special circumstances necessary in order to outweigh

the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt which, by definition, is harmful thereto.

57. Paragraph 153 of the Framework says that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. As mentioned, to override this harm, very special circumstances will need to be demonstrated. These will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
58. Although the new building is larger and taller than the previous building it has replaced I am mindful that the 2019 planning permission granted planning permission for the mixed retail and business use of the previous agricultural building. In this regard it is also a consideration that the appeal site was at that time seen as a suitable location for the change of use despite the fact that it is not particularly sustainable in terms of the transport modal split.
59. Whilst, as mentioned, the appellant has not shown a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development being provided a letter has been submitted from property specialists which says that there has been a significant increase in demand over the past five years for industrial units in rural based premises. Moreover, and specifically, the letter says that the firm has received a high level of interest for the modern units available at the appeal site.
60. The development is consistent with the government's growth agenda, as highlighted earlier, and I consider that the owner's obligations under the s106 agreement along with the very comprehensive conditions imposed would provide adequate mitigation so as to ensure a satisfactory and workable form of development. Given this it would be unreasonable to demolish the building, thereby removing the businesses which occupy the site, with the likely loss of jobs.
61. Taking all these factors together I have concluded that the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and other harm identified is outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

## **Conditions**

62. Some of the conditions agreed at the Hearing have been incorporated into the obligations set out in the s106 agreement. I have considered the applicability of the remaining conditions and consider that they are both reasonable and necessary, and also enforceable.
63. To ensure a satisfactory standard of development a condition is imposed relating to the achievement of suitable access arrangements and the surfacing of the access driveway. In terms of traffic movements, servicing and parking a condition is imposed requiring the submission of satisfactory details for the Council's written approval. Also, in accordance with the intention not to occupy units 5 and 7 until the relevant mitigation measures have been carried out, the requirement for such is incorporated into condition no 4.
64. A suitable landscaping and tree planting strategy shall be submitted for the Council's approval along with an Ecological Management Plan, an external lighting

design strategy and a surface water drainage scheme, all with appropriate time periods specified. The open storage of goods, materials, plant and machinery at the site is also prohibited.

65. Although the development is largely complete a condition is imposed requiring a verification report in terms of construction details and specifications, with a further condition requiring that the approved drawings and details of development shall be fully adhered to.

### **Overall Conclusions**

66. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I have concluded that Appeal A should not succeed. I shall therefore uphold the enforcement notice. In contrast, Appeal B is allowed and planning permission is granted subject to the conditions imposed and also with the observance of the obligations set out in the s106 agreement, signed by the parties involved.
67. Section 180 of the 1990 Act, as amended, says that if, after the service of an enforcement notice, planning permission is granted for any development carried out before the grant of that permission, the notice shall cease to have effect so far as is inconsistent with that permission.
68. Accordingly, the requirements of the upheld enforcement notice are hereby overtaken by the development approved with the successful s78 appeal.

*Timothy C King*

INSPECTOR

## Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: Drawings Nos 20-J3464-151 P2, 20-J3464-154 A and 20-J3464-153 D.
- 2) Within 3 months of the grant of planning permission the design and details of any widening of the access road in order to provide for passing of large vehicles and for pedestrians along with lighting, signage and visibility splays shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Within three months of its approval, the access widening shall be completed in accordance with the approved design and details.
- 3) Within 3 months of the completion of the works to the junction with Howe Lane, the access road shall be surfaced with a bound or bonded material across the entire width of the access for a distance of at least 20 metres measured from the edge of the adopted highway of Howe Lane.
- 4) Within 3 months of the grant of planning permission a scheme for the internal design of the car parking and loading/deliveries for commercial units shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing and shall include details of:
  - (a) Car parking – with the number of spaces and their dimensions required by the Council's Parking Standards SPD 2016 (Tables 8 and 5 respectively);
  - (b) Directional signs and their locations;
  - (c) Surface markings and their locations;
  - (d) Lighting of car parking and turning areas including access road;
  - (e) Pedestrian routes within the carpark and along the access to Howe Lane;
  - (f) Location and design of cycle parking – compliant with the Council's Parking Standards SPD 2016 (Tables 8 and Annex C);
  - (g) Car parking for people with disabilities including signage;
  - (h) Gradients of the pedestrian and access routes;
  - (i) Sufficient areas for turning into and out of all spaces compliant with Manual for Streets;
  - (j) Electric vehicle charging infrastructure;
  - (k) Sufficient areas such that a 16.5m long articulated vehicle can arrive in a forward gear, deliver to the roller shutter/loading doors of each individual commercial unit and turn within the site to leave in a forward gear without overrunning parking spaces, landscaping or being required to use the gated area serving the vehicle repair and servicing unit;
  - (l) Details of the locations where vehicles associated with the vehicle repair and servicing unit are parked/stored such that they do not take up the spaces for staff and customers;

- (m) A waste storage and collection management plan, including swept paths for refuse vehicles that service the site.

The approved scheme shall be implemented within 3 months of approval of the scheme, prior to the occupation of units 5 and 7, and shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

- 5) Any gates provided shall open away from the highway and be set back a distance of at least 25 metres from the edge of the carriageway of Howe Lane. Gates should remain open at all times when any of the commercial units are in operation on the site such that the first member of staff arriving on the site in a day opens the gates and the last member of staff leaving the site in a day closes the gates.
- 6) Within 3 months of the grant of planning permission a scheme detailing the lighting design strategy for the whole of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of how and where external lighting is installed though the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans and technical specifications with operational timings. The approved scheme shall be implemented within 3 months of approval of the scheme and shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved lighting strategy.
- 7) Within 3 months of the grant of planning permission a scheme of landscaping and a programme for the provision of the landscaping shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The details shall include:
  - a) Comprehensive planting plans showing details of ground preparation and all other operations associated with plant and grass establishment, full schedules of plants, noting species, and detailed plant sizes/root stock specifications, planting layout, proposed numbers/densities locations;
  - b) Details of semi-mature tree planting;
  - c) Means of enclosures (walls and fences etc);
  - d) Paving including pedestrian open spaces, paths, patios, proposed materials and construction methods, cycle routes, parking courts, play areas, etc;
  - e) Any trees or plants which die, are removed, uprooted, are significantly damaged, become diseased or deformed within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development are to be replaced during the nearest planting season (1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> March inclusive) with others of the same size, species and quality as approved.
  - f) In the event of the Local Planning Authority giving notice of refusal of the submitted scheme and/or programme, the scheme and/or programme shall be expeditiously amended and re-submitted so often as may be necessary to secure the approval of the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme of landscaping shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved programme in the next planting season (1<sup>st</sup> October to 31<sup>st</sup> March inclusive).
- 8) Within 3 months of the grant of planning permission a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The content of the LEMP shall include the following:

- (a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed;
- (b) Ecological trends and constraints on the site that might influence management;
- (c) Aims and objectives of management;
- (d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objective;
- (e) Prescriptions for management actions;
- (f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period);
- (g) Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan;
- (h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The approved Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be implemented within 3 months of its approval.

- 9) Within 3 months of the date of this permission, the approved surface water drainage scheme, as shown on Drainage Layout Ref BIN-SOLID-XX-XX-DR-C-1001-C11 shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details. Prior to the commencement of these works, details of the attenuation feature and flow control system shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall thereafter be retained and maintained in accordance with the approved management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.
- 10) Following completion of the works, a verification report shall be submitted to the Local Planning authority for approval in writing. The report shall include substantiating evidence demonstrating that the approved construction details and specifications have been implemented. The verification report shall include, as a minimum, photographic evidence of excavations and soil profiles/horizons, installation of any attenuation tanks or geocellular storage (crates), connecting pipework, hydrobrakes or other flow control mechanisms, and cover systems.
- 11) No goods, materials, plant or machinery shall be stored or operated outside the building hereby approved.

## **APPEARANCES**

### **FOR THE APPELLANT:**

Paul Wakefield – Partner, Shakespeare Martineau  
Sarah Dutfield – Director, Turley  
Gareth Wilkins – Senior Planner, Turley

### **FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:**

Richard Cain (Enforcement officer)  
Andy Wells (Highways officer)  
Paul Corbett (Planning case officer)  
Charlie Fulcher (Principal Planning officer – Policy)  
Rosie Lear (Biodiversity officer)