Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 4 March 2025

Site visits made on 3 and 4 March 2025

by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/W/24/3355346
Land at Ryecroft Lane, Storrington, RH20 4PA

- 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 Earlswood Homes and Sussex Design & Development against the decision of Horsham District Council.
- The application Ref is DC/24/0069.
- The development proposed is erection of 20 new homes (houses & apartments) with parking, landscaping and associated works with access via North Street/Library Car Park.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Introduction

2. The appeal site is an area of undeveloped land in the centre of Storrington, which is identified as a large village in the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015 (Local Plan). Subject to compliance with other relevant policies, new housing development here would accord with the spatial strategy for the area set out in Local Plan Policies 2 and 3, and in Policy 1 of the Storrington, Sullington & Washington Neighbourhood Plan 2019 (NP).

3. The proposed development would involve the construction of 20 dwellings in total, comprising of 1 bungalow and 12 detached and semi-detached houses. The remaining 7 units would be provided in an apartment block. Vehicular access to the site would be through the existing North Street/Library car park, which also serves the village centre and veterinary practice. An additional pedestrian access to Ryecroft Lane would be provided as part of the scheme. The site has no formal public access, but its eastern boundary is contiguous with the Riverside Walk along the River Stor, which is identified as a Local Green Space in the NP.

Main Issues

4. The principle of development at the appeal site is not at issue, but the Council considers that the proposed layout would be cramped, and that the scheme would represent overdevelopment. The Council's reason for refusal on character and appearance grounds is intrinsically linked to its concerns about living conditions, the effect on trees and the level of car parking. Accordingly, I have dealt with the Council's second, third and fourth reasons for refusal before coming to an overall conclusion on matters of character and appearance.

5. The Council confirmed at the hearing that, subject to finalisation of the legal agreement, its objections relating to affordable housing provision and water neutrality could be withdrawn. A signed section 106 agreement has now been provided, so the Council's fifth reason for refusal has fallen away.

6. The main issues therefore are:

- the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring and future occupiers, having regard to outlook, light and the provision of amenity open space,
- the effect of the development on the long-term health of trees,
- whether the proposed parking and access arrangements would be suitable and safe, and
- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

Relationship with neighbouring properties - outlook and light

7. The appeal site is bounded on two sides by residential development on Ryecroft Lane and Spierbridge Road.

8. The proposed new dwellings on plots 8, 15 and 16 would all share a common boundary with 11 Ryecroft Lane (No. 11), which is sited on a triangular shaped plot and has a large rear garden. The proposal would result in the introduction of permanent built development close to the neighbouring property, on a site which is currently open. This would represent a significant change for the occupiers of No. 11, but the line of tall trees and shrubs along the common boundary provides screening and privacy to the house and garden at the neighbouring property.

9. The proposed house on Plot 8 would be sited adjacent to the front garden/driveway area of No. 11, which narrows to a point. Existing boundary vegetation provides screening, but if it were to be removed or reduced, the new house would be clearly visible from the front windows of No. 11, which likely serve habitable rooms. The proposal would change the outlook from those windows, but it would only be seen from an oblique angle. Space would be retained at the side of the new house on plot 8, so there would be a degree of separation between the two houses. Even if the boundary vegetation were to be reduced, the relationship between plot 8 and No. 11 would be acceptable.

10. Plot 15 would be occupied by a two storey house, and would be adjacent to the part of the rear garden closest to the house at No. 11. That part of the neighbouring garden is likely to be the most intensively used and therefore sensitive, but it is wide at this point, and the new house would be separated from the common boundary by a strip of garden and parking spaces.

11. The existing trees and shrubs, most of which are on the neighbour's side, would provide a good level of screening and would help retain privacy for both No. 11 and plot 15. But even if the vegetation were to be reduced, the distance between the two properties and their relative orientation would mean that the proposed house would not significantly enclose the neighbour's large rear garden, nor would it

cause unacceptable harm to their outlook. The lack of habitable room windows on the facing upper floors of either property means that overlooking would not be an issue either.

12. The proposed bungalow on Plot 16 would be adjacent to the bottom corner of the No. 11's large garden. Owing to the separation between them, the relationship between No. 11 and plot 16 would be acceptable.

13. Plot 16 would share most of its rear boundary with that of 14 Spierbridge Road (No. 14). The proposed bungalow would have a shallow back garden, part of which would be very close to the rear building line of the neighbouring property. Even so, the relative orientation of the buildings and the single storey form of the closest elements would avoid any unacceptable overbearing impact, loss of privacy or light to the occupiers of either No. 14 or plot 16.

14. Overall, the relationship between the proposed development and the surrounding houses would be acceptable.

Relationship between proposed dwellings

15. The long side elevation of the proposed house on plot 15 would be sited very close to the rear boundary of plots 13 and 14, which would be occupied by a pair of semi-detached houses. The gardens and upper rear windows of plots 13 and 14 would look directly towards the blank wall of plot 15, which would extend along most of the width of the neighbour's gardens, with an eaves height of around 5m.

16. At around 9m, the separation distances between the side wall of plot 15 and the rear facing habitable room windows of plots 13 and 14 would be less than the 10.5m that the Council usually apply in this situation. That figure comes from the Council's design guidance 'Planning permission for home extensions', so is not directly applicable to this proposal for new residential development. Nonetheless, it provides a useful starting point for considering what might be an acceptable distance between adjacent properties.

17. The gardens of plots 13 and 14 would not be particularly long, and the high brick wall of plot 15 very close to their rear boundaries would significantly enclose the outdoor spaces, to an extent which could feel oppressive. I acknowledge that the site is in a central village location, where a higher density of development might be expected than in more peripheral areas. However, this does not justify the proposed arrangement, which would result in a poor outlook from the rear windows and gardens of plots 13 and 14, causing unsatisfactory living conditions for future occupiers.

18. The proposed house on plot 15 would be positioned to the west of plots 13 and 14, so there would be some overshadowing to their garden areas in the late afternoons, particularly to plot 14. However, the gardens of plots 13 and 14 would both retain an open aspect to the south east, and would receive a reasonable amount of sunshine during the middle of the day.

19. The gardens for plots 13 and 14 would be fairly small, but there would be sufficient space between those houses and plot 15 to allow daylight and sunlight to reach their rear windows. The pair of semis on plots 13 and 14 would be reliant on their front and rear windows for natural light, but I am satisfied that overshadowing from plot 15 would not cause the back rooms to be excessively dark or gloomy.

20. Two parking spaces in a tandem arrangement would be provided between the side of plot 8 and the rear gardens of plots 9 and 10. The parking spaces would increase the separation between plot 8 and plots 9 and 10, and would help to avoid the overbearing impact that would be experienced at plots 13 and 14. Whilst the spacing would not be particularly generous, the distance between the properties on plots 8, 9 and 10 would be adequate.

Private amenity space

21. The garden lengths of plots 10-14 and 16 would be less than the 10.5m guideline that the Council generally work to, but that figure comes from the house extension guidance, and relates to separation distances between facing properties, rather than the overall provision of amenity space. The garden sizes would be modest, but all of the proposed houses and the bungalow would have a reasonable amount of private outdoor space for future occupiers. That said, for plots 13 and 14, the combination of short garden lengths and the proximity to the side elevation of plot 15 would result in an overbearing impact, as previously discussed.

22. Plots 8, 15 and 16 would all include strips of side garden adjacent to the boundary with No. 11. Because of the boundary trees, these areas of the gardens would be shady and not particularly useable. That said, only parts of the gardens would be affected, and the overall provision of private amenity space for those units would be acceptable.

23. The apartment block would have a limited amount of landscaping around the building. Flats 2 and 4 would have balconies, but most of the units would have no private amenity space. Whilst this would be a disadvantage for future occupiers, there is no policy requirement for private amenity space, and the Riverside Walk provides opportunities for informal recreation very close to the site. The lack of private amenity space for the apartment blocks would be acceptable in this instance.

Conclusion – living conditions

24. I have found that the relationship between the proposed development and existing properties would be acceptable. For future occupiers of the scheme, the provision of amenity space would be adequate, and there would be no significant harm from overshadowing causing loss of light. However, the occupiers of plots 13 and 14 would have a poor outlook from their rear windows and gardens, and the high side wall of the house at plot 15 would be overbearing.

25. The failure to provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupiers of plots 13 and 14 due to outlook means that the development would not be of a high quality, so would not meet the requirements of Local Plan Policy 32. As it would not provide a high standard of amenity for future occupiers of neighbouring properties, there would be conflict with Local Plan Policy 33, and with Framework paragraph 135f).

Effect on trees

26. The site has an attractive, green setting, with numerous native and non-native trees and shrubs. These are particularly concentrated around the edges of the site, notably along the common boundary with No.11, and on the eastern edge, the Riverside Walk. The trees within the site and on its boundaries are not protected,

but it is common ground that they make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. I agree.

27. A modest number of poorer quality trees, mostly within the central area of the site, would need to be removed to facilitate the development. At the hearing it was confirmed that it would also be necessary to remove part of the group of hazel trees identified as G4 in the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement (AIA). I saw when visiting the area that group G4 is an attractive feature of this part of the Riverside Walk.

28. Whilst the loss of some trees would detract from the green setting of the site and adjacent Local Green Space, the plans show that most of the trees would be retained, with measures for their protection set out in the AIA. However, construction of the proposed buildings, internal access roads and parking spaces would, in some instances, require pruning of trees and incursion into identified root protection areas (RPAs). This includes proposed root pruning of tree T8, a mature Tree of Heaven which is identified in the AIA as being a moderate quality, Category B tree, with an estimated lifespan of 20-40 years.

29. At the hearing, the Council's Arboricultural Officer queried the way in which some of the RPAs had been drawn, having regard to particular characteristics of the site including topography and water sources. Whilst noting the Council's points, I also appreciate that the extent of a tree's roots cannot be accurately determined from above ground, and that until on-site works begin, a full picture cannot be determined.

30. The submitted documents explain that incursion into RPAs would be kept to a minimum, with technical solutions such as a 'reduced dig' construction technique proposed to limit harm. Even so, this approach does not fully reflect British Standard BS 5837: 2012[1], which advises that structures should be located outside of the RPAs of trees to be retained. The appellant has acknowledged that root pruning could result in harm to affected trees.

31. Furthermore, BS 5837:2012 says that development should achieve a harmonious relationship between trees and structures, that can be sustained in the long term. Where the relationship between trees and development is not adequately considered, this can lead to pressure to remove or severely prune specimens to allow light and daylight into rooms and across amenity areas.

32. This is a particular concern in relation to the line of trees along the common boundary with No. 11. These include T8, T10 and T15, which are all identified in the AIA as being moderate quality category B trees, with heights of around 15m. The plans show that the canopies of these and other trees along the boundary would collectively overhang parts of the gardens and parking spaces of plots 15 and 16. Plot 8 would also be affected, but to a lesser extent.

33. The boundary trees are mostly outside of the appeal site, but there could well be pressure from future residents of the scheme to prune or fell them. Whilst some future residents may appreciate the shady setting, others may be less tolerant of reduced light levels and other tree related issues, including leaf fall and bird detritus. There may also be safety concerns about branches falling during stormy weather.

[1] Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations

34. The trees are not protected, but root pruning to some of the trees during construction, in combination with future pressure to remove branches, has the potential to cause harm to the long-term health of the trees. Over time, their reduction or loss would detract from the character and appearance of the site and wider area, including the wooded setting to No. 11. Whilst I note comments about the sustainable location of the site and efficient use of land, a different layout or reduced scale of development could have avoided the conflicts.

35. The proposed landscaping plan provides for some replacement planting within the site, and if the scheme was otherwise acceptable, additional detail could be secured through an appropriate condition. However, the new trees would take a considerable amount of time to provide the amenity value afforded by the existing specimens, and no additional planting is proposed along the common boundary with No. 11.

36. Taking all these factors into account, I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the long-term health of trees in and around the site. Harm to the trees means that the proposal would not maintain or enhance the existing network of green infrastructure, including the Riverside Walk Local Green Space. Consequently, the proposal would not comply with Local Plan Policy 31. Because of the pressure on trees, the proposal would not relate sympathetically to the local landscape or respect the character of the surrounding setting and green corridors, so there would be conflict with Local Plan Policy 33.

Parking and access arrangements

37. A total of 23 car parking spaces would be provided at the site, with at least one for each of the houses and bungalow, and three spaces for the apartment block. There would also be one space for visitor parking.

38. The proposed level of cycle parking would be sufficient and could be secured by condition. However, it is common ground that the level of car parking would be less than that required by the adopted parking standards for the area, contained in the 'Guidance on Parking and New Developments' (West Sussex County Council, 2020). The site falls within 'Parking Behaviour Zone 1', and the parties have advised that, using the parking calculator, there would be a shortfall of 14 spaces.

39. The site is within a central location, with a range of facilities within easy walking distance. However, Storrington is a village, and it is likely that future residents would need to venture further afield on a regular basis to reach a wider range of services or employment opportunities. Local bus services provide access to surrounding towns and villages including Horsham and Worthing, but many of the services are not very regular, particularly at the weekends. Storrington is not served by rail, with the nearest stations around 7km away. Whilst a car may not be essential for some residents of the proposed development, it is likely that many households would have one or more vehicles.

40. Notwithstanding that, in arriving at a requirement for a particular site, the parking calculator has taken account of the character of the area in terms of transport behaviour. For a development of 20 dwellings, a shortfall of 14 parking spaces is not inconsiderable. If insufficient on-site spaces are provided, the result could be increased demand for parking in the surrounding area.

41. The highways officer did not object to the lack of parking, but that appears to be on the basis that spaces are available at the adjacent North Street public car park. According to the appellant, the public car park has 170 spaces. Future residents would need to drive through it to access their homes, so it could provide a convenient place to park. The car park is free of charge on Sundays and Bank Holidays, with no charges between the hours of 6pm and 9am on other days. Outside of those times, parking costs £0.80 for up to one hour, or £1.70 for 1 - 4 hours. This is not a particularly high rate, but the costs would add up over time if parking on a regular basis.

42. Residents could apply for an Annual Parking Disc, which could well be more convenient and cost effective, although a single stay during the daytime would still be limited to 4 hours. I also note comments from the Council's Car Park Manager that, in response to concerns about parking capacity, the number of season tickets had been reduced to free up spaces for casual visitors. This raises questions about the availability of Annual Parking Discs for future residents.

43. Notwithstanding that, the car park could provide a useful facility for residents to park during the evening, overnight and on Sundays, when it is free to use. Outside of these times, the requirement to pay (albeit a fairly low charge), together with the limits on stay time, may reduce its attractiveness as a regular place for future residents to leave their vehicles.

44. Concerns have also been raised about the capacity of the car park to accommodate additional parking by future residents of the appeal site. To address this matter, a parking survey was undertaken between the hours of 7am and 10pm on a Friday and Saturday during July 2023. The busiest time during the survey was on Friday morning, when 87% occupancy was recorded. The survey suggests that the car park is, at times, well used, but there is likely to be plenty of capacity later in the afternoon and during the evening. These findings reflect my own observations on site.

45. That said, the survey and my site visits were only a snapshot in time, and may not be representative of conditions at other times of the week or year. According to the Parish Council, the car park can get very busy, and local residents have commented that it is full at times. I also note comments that, in 2023, the Car Park Manager had been asked to investigate whether parking capacity in the village could be increased.

46. I acknowledge that peak times for the car park may not necessarily coincide with demand for parking by future occupiers of the appeal scheme. If residents only wished to park during the evening or overnight, any additional demand for car parking associated with the appeal proposal could be easily accommodated. However, with differing living and working patterns, that is very difficult to predict, and residents' use of the car park at busier times could add to parking pressure in the village. If customers find it difficult to park, there could be knock on harm to local businesses.

47. Taking all of these factors into account, I am not convinced that the proximity of the public car park justifies such a significant shortfall in parking provision. The requirement to pay for parking during the day may well limit the attractiveness of the car park for use by future residents, and it appears that there are already concerns about capacity at certain times.

48. It is likely that some residents would prefer to park closer to their properties, without having to pay or remember parking times. If there were not enough marked out parking spaces, future residents may choose to park in front of their houses, and on the internal access roads. Overspill parking may also occur on nearby streets, the capacity of which to accommodate additional parking has not been addressed in the Transport Statement.

49. Concerns have been raised about the use of the car park to access the development, including for construction traffic. I appreciate that the access and egress from the car park can be congested at times and the proposal would add further traffic. However, the proposed development is not of a large scale, and there is no compelling evidence to suggest that it would result in significant problems within or around the car park.

50. The appellant has provided tracking information which shows that refuse trucks, which would be the largest vehicles likely to access the site once construction was complete, would be able to manoeuvre around the site. To avoid conflict with parked cars, three marked parking spaces would be removed. This would conflict with NP Policy 18, which resists schemes that would result in the net loss of public car parking facilities in Storrington village centre. However, the number of spaces involved would be small, and the policy conflict would be minor.

51. Any restrictions needed to accommodate construction vehicles would only be needed for a temporary period and could be managed via a Construction Management Plan, to minimise disruption to car park users.

52. Overall, I find that the proposed access would be acceptable and safe, but the arrangements for car parking would not be suitable for the reasons set out above. As it would not provide adequate parking within the development to meet the needs of anticipated users, the proposal would conflict with Local Plan Policy 41.

Character and appearance

53. The design and external appearance of the proposed dwellings would be acceptable, but I agree with the Council that there are deficiencies in the proposed site layout. Whilst the development would make efficient use of land, the poor relationship between plots 13/14 and 15 is indicative of a cramped form of development, with insufficient spacing between some of the buildings.

54. In addition, the proximity of parking spaces, access roads and buildings to existing trees proposed to be retained would necessitate root pruning, with associated risks to tree health. There could also be post development pressure from future occupiers, if trees were found to cause shading or other unwanted effects. Harm to the long term health of trees would detract from the green setting which the trees provide, both to the site and the immediately surrounding area, including the Riverside Walk.

55. The overall shortfall in on-site parking would likely result in ad-hoc parking within and around the development. As well as contributing to a cramped appearance to the development, parking of vehicles on verges and in front of houses could cause damage to soft landscaping. The result would be to detract from the attractiveness of the scheme.

56. Taken together, these factors are indicative of overdevelopment which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would fail to comply with Local Plan Policy 32, which requires a high quality design for all development, which contributes to a sense of place in the buildings and spaces and in the way they integrate with their surroundings. There would be further conflict with Policy 33 of the same plan, which requires that development conserves and enhances the natural and built environment, and is locally distinctive in character.

Other Matters

Arun Valley Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar Sites (designated sites).

57. The site is within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone. Natural England has issued advice to say that ongoing abstraction in this area is believed to be having a detrimental impact on the integrity of the Arun Valley designated sites. To avoid adding to this impact, the appellant has sought to demonstrate that the development would be water neutral.

58. In addition to on-site measures aimed at limiting demand, a water credit scheme is proposed at a nearby farm. Switching the water supply at the farm from mains to harvested rainwater would generate water credits, which would enable the appellant to offset water consumption at the appeal scheme. The signed planning obligation provides for the off-site water offsetting measures to be secured, and implementation of the on-site demand management measures could be ensured through a planning condition. With these mitigation measures in place, I am satisfied that the scheme is capable of being water neutral.

59. Had I been allowing the appeal, I would have needed to undertake an Appropriate Assessment (AA) as part of a Habitats Regulations Assessment for the scheme. It has not been necessary to do that, but the Council's AA for the scheme concludes that adverse effects on the integrity of the Arun Valley designated sites can be ruled out, on the basis of the measures identified in the appellant's Water Neutrality Statement. Natural England have responded to say that they agree with these conclusions, and have no objection to the scheme, subject to the delivery, management and maintenance of measures identified to achieve water neutrality. I have no reason to take a different view.

60. Based on the information and proposed mitigation measures provided, it appears likely that the proposal could be implemented without adversely affecting the integrity of the Arun Valley designated sites, or the Mens Valley Special Area of Conservation with regard to bats.

Other considerations

Planning policy

61. The signed legal agreement makes appropriate provision for affordable housing and water neutrality, so there is no conflict with Local Plan Policies 16 or 39, which are concerned with meeting local housing needs and protecting biodiversity. The most important Local Plan policies for determining the appeal, therefore, are Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity; Policy 32 - the quality of new development; Policy 33 - Development principles, and Policy 41 - Parking.

62. At the hearing it was agreed that the most important policies are consistent with the most up to date version of the Framework, and I agree. The policies reflect the Framework objectives of conserving and enhancing the natural environment, securing a high quality of development, and ensuring that parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes. I therefore give significant weight to the conflict with these policies.

Housing supply

63. There is no dispute that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The Council's Annual Monitoring Report dated January 2004 identified a supply of just 2.9 years. Housing Delivery Test (HDT) results for 2023 shows that housing delivery over the previous three years was 62% of the authority's housing requirement, meaning that an Action Plan and 20% buffer are required.

64. Whilst I appreciate the challenges associated with delivering new housing that meets requirements for water neutrality, the extent of the shortfall is significant. With a replacement local plan still some way off, the Council has advised that the housing land supply situation is unlikely to improve in the near future.

65. The application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance, including habitats sites, does not provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed. Because of the housing supply situation, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies, as set out in Framework paragraph 11.d)ii. and footnote 8. This means that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Planning balance

66. The proposal would provide 20 new homes, which would make a positive contribution towards meeting local housing needs in an area with an acknowledged shortfall of housing land. The proposed development would provide a range of types and sizes of dwellings to meet a variety of needs, including 7 affordable homes, with an appropriate tenure split. These are benefits of the scheme to which I attach significant weight. There would also be modest economic benefits during the construction of the scheme, and through spending by future residents in local shops and services.

67. The site is an appropriate location for housing in a larger village, which complies with the Council's development strategy. The development would make efficient use of land, in a centrally located site, and occupiers of the new homes would have easy access to the services and facilities in Storrington.

68. The proposal would be consistent with the Framework objectives of boosting the supply of housing, but the principle of new housing development is not at issue here, rather it is the quality of the development proposed. Increasing the supply of homes is very important, but the Framework also makes clear that the creation of high quality places is fundamental to what the planning process should achieve.

69. In this case, there would be significant deficiencies in the proposed layout. The spacing of the buildings, both in relation to each other and surrounding landscaping, as well as the under provision of parking, would result in

unsatisfactory living conditions for some occupiers, and a cramped form of development, in which pressure for parking would be likely to detract from the appearance of the streetscene. The potential for harm to landscaping and trees, both during construction and post development, would detract from the ability of the proposal to achieve overall ecological enhancements. These factors combined means that the proposed scheme would not provide a high quality of development that would function well over its lifetime, as sought by the Framework.

70. There is no evidence, including on viability grounds, that precludes a different layout or development configuration on this site. Whilst it may be necessary to reduce the number of units slightly, a similar contribution to local housing needs could be made through an alternative scheme, with a layout which was more sensitive to its wider green setting, provided a more appropriate level of on-site parking, and achieved satisfactory living standards for all future occupiers.

71. Taking all these considerations into account, I conclude that, even taking into account the housing supply situation, the benefits of the scheme would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm. Overall, the adverse impacts of the scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

72. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, and there are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh those findings. Consequently, the appeal is dismissed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR

Hearing Appearances

For the Appellant:
Craig Lee - Appellant
Mark Campbell (planning consultant)
Luke Mitchell (architect)
Patrick Ambridge (arboricultural consultant)
Paul Jacob (architect)
Mr Whittingham (transport consultant)

For the Council:
Amanda Wilkes (planning officer)
Giles Holbrook (planning officer)
Andrew Bush (arboricultural officer)