

Appeal Statement of Case

Land To The South And East of Senuna Park, Station Road, Ashwell

Residential development of 36 no. dwellings
including creation of vehicular access off Station
Road, associated parking, drainage, amenity
space and landscaping

Project No: 26/L/026

Appellant: Mr Ben Wilkinson

Version: APP.I.0

Contents

1. | Introduction
2. | Appeal Context
3. | Planning Policy Considerations
4. | Summary of Grounds of Appeal

Appendices

- A – Barnes Walker Landscape Appeal Statement of Case
- B – Committee Report (with Update Note) and Minutes
- C – Appeal Decision – Senuna Park Development - 3279843
- D – North Hertfordshire Five Year Supply Statement – Nov 25
- E – Local Bus Timetable

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Appeal Statement has been prepared by JWPC Chartered Town Planners in support of a Written Representations appeal by Ben Wilkinson of Beck Homes following the decision of North Hertfordshire District Council (NHDC) to refuse planning consent on Land to the South and East of Senuna Park, Station Road, Ashwell (NHDC Application Reference: 25/02547/FP).
- 1.2 The appellant applied for Full Planning Permission on the 17th October 2025. The description of development was: *'Residential development of 36 no. dwellings including creation of vehicular access off Station Road, associated parking, drainage, amenity space and landscaping.* Following consideration, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) issued its Decision Notice refusing consent for four reasons on the 16th April 2026.
- 1.3 The application was refused for the following reasons:

1-

The proposed 36 new homes would be located on land outside the settlement boundary of Ashwell and therefore within the countryside designated by the North Hertfordshire Local Plan as Rural Area beyond the Green Belt. The proposal does not meet any of the exceptions of Local Plan Policy CGB1 and therefore conflicts with the provisions of Policies SP2, SP5 and CGB1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011 to 2031 and Policy ASH 1 of the Ashwell Neighbourhood Plan.

2-

The proposal would have an urbanising effect on this open field beyond the village edge, and line of trees, contrary and harmful to the rural character and appearance of area thereby failing to comply with the design aims of Local Plan Policy D1 and the design aspirations of paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3-

The site lies outside of the village boundary of Ashwell and is not within easy walking distance of services and facilities within the village, with most facilities beyond the preferred maximum walking distance as identified in the submitted Transport Statement and with a limited bus service. Therefore, it is in an unsustainable location where future occupiers would be reliant on the private car for most journeys, contrary to the aims of Policy SP1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031, and paragraph 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4-

In the absence of a completed S106 Legal Agreement or Unilateral Undertaking the proposal fails to mitigate its direct impacts and does not satisfy the requirements of Policy SP7 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011 to 2031. Therefore, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not lead to an unacceptable burden on existing local infrastructure, contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Local Plan.

- 1.4 This Appeal Statement sets out the appellant's grounds of appeal as to why the appeal should be allowed and consent granted. It will provide rebuttal to the specific reasons for refusal, which were contrary to the recommendation to Planning Committee for approval. In addition to addressing this, it will explain the fundamental consideration of the decision making process; in this case being the presumption in favour of sustainable development as expressed in paragraph 11d of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Statement of Case will set out why consent should be granted on this basis in the tilted balance as a sustainable development.
- 1.5 A specific Landscape Appeal Statement of Case has been prepared by Barnes Walker in rebuttal to the second reason for refusal, which is provided at Appendix A of this Statement.
- 1.6 The appeal site is immediately adjacent to the recently completed Senuna Park development, which was allowed on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate in 2022. The current appeal

therefore concerns land in a location that has already been established in principle as a suitable location for residential growth when assessed against national policy considerations, a position that is reinforced by the Council's significantly deteriorated housing land supply position.

2. Appeal Context

The Site

- 2.1 The site forming the subject of this appeal is located immediately adjacent to the eastern developed limits of the village of Ashwell on Station Road, which is the main road connecting the village of Ashwell with Ashwell and Morden train station. Full details of the site's location and context are set out in the Planning Support Statement and supporting documents that form the planning application.
- 2.2 The site measures approximately 3 hectares and lies outside the village settlement boundary, but immediately adjacent to an existing housing development (known as Senuna Park and recently completed). This also lies outside of the defined settlement boundary, and was allowed planning consent to be built on appeal in 2022. As well as the existing houses to the appeal site's western boundary, the site is also bordered by existing trees and hedgerow and Station Road to the other boundaries of the site.

Planning Process

- 2.3 The appellant was also the appellant for the allowed appeal consent recently built at Senuna Park. After pre-application discussions with the Highway Authority in June 2025 regarding an access to the appeal site, the appellant subsequently submitted a planning application in October 2025 for 36 houses to NHDC, which is now subject to this appeal.
- 2.4 Discussions with the planning officer during the course of the application resulted in beneficial amendments being made to the layout and design to address concerns raised by officers and statutory consultees, who were subsequently satisfied that the changes largely addressed those concerns. The Council's Head of Planning presented the application to the Planning Control Committee in a fully and professionally reasoned manner on the 16th April 2026 with a recommendation to grant permission, subject to finalisation of the S106 Agreement. Committee overturned that recommendation for approval and the application was therefore

refused (The Committee Report (with Update Note) and Minutes of the Meeting are provided at Appendix B).

- 2.5 It is particularly notable that professional planning officers, having considered all consultation responses and technical evidence, concluded that planning permission should be granted. The reasons for refusal therefore arise not from unresolved technical objections but from a departure by Members from professional planning judgement contained within the Committee Report.
- 2.6 The application was made in full to allow consideration of the details of the development, with the intention that upon approval the development could be swiftly commenced and fully completed within the next five years. The adjacent residential development at Senuna Park was also submitted by the appellant in full and subsequently allowed on appeal in April 2022 (Appeal Ref: 3279843 at Appendix C). Four years later, that scheme has now been completed. This demonstrates that a consent issued for development now on this adjacent site by the same applicant could realistically be completed within the next five years and thereby meaningfully contribute to the present five year supply of housing land within the district.

3. Planning Policy Considerations

- 3.1 A summary of relevant planning policies for this proposal is set out in Chapter 4 of the Planning Support Statement (PSS) submitted with the planning application, with the policies cited in the reasons for refusal detailed below. The Development Plan is formed by the North Hertfordshire Local Plan (NHLP), adopted in 2022. The Ashwell Neighbourhood Plan (ANP) was also made in April 2022. National Policy within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is also a material consideration in determinations.

Housing Land Supply and Paragraph 11 of the NPPF

- 3.2 The Head of Planning confirmed within the Committee Report that paragraph 11d of the NPPF is engaged since policies most important for determining the application are out-of-date due to the Council's inability to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land. Paragraphs 4.45-4.54 in the PSS detail the evidence at submission of the LPA's five year supply, which was a 3.9 year supply in 2024. Further evidence presented at Planning Committee informed the Members that this had fallen to just 2.6 year supply – a position which was recognised by the body of the meeting. The Council provided updated evidence in a Five-Year Housing Land Supply Update in November 2025 (Appendix D), post submission of the application, showing this as a projection for the five years from 1st April 2025-2030.
- 3.3 This presents an existing housing shortfall during the plan period to 2025 of 1,253 houses. It also presents a housing requirement to the year 2030 of 6,976 new dwellings. The projected supply of housing from the year 2025 is just 3,347 dwellings, which represents the 2.6 year supply presented to Committee in making their decision. The LPA acknowledged the weight to be given to this in the Committee Report, but it is not mentioned in the Reasons for Refusal. Importantly, the Committee Meeting Minutes do make it very clear that the planners informed Councillors of two important considerations in making their determination:

“as the Council did not have a 5-year housing land supply, as outlined in the NPPF, significant weight had to be given to the delivery of new homes”.

“it was outlined in the NPPF that where a 5 year housing land supply did not exist, limited weight should be applied to these policies, as they were in effect considered out of date”

- 3.4 Should the LPA wish to challenge the importance of paragraph 11 being engaged during the course of the appeal, or reassess the five year supply figure being just 2.6 years, the appellant wishes to reserve the right to provide further evidence and challenge the five year supply and its importance to the appeal in more detail. The appellant accepts the Council’s current evidence that the projected housing land supply was 2.6 years as at 31st March 2025, and this represents a significant fall in the housing projections from when the planning application was submitted, highlighting further the need to apply significant weight to paragraph 11 being engaged.
- 3.5 The Housing Land Supply Update does not reference Affordable Housing, but the 2025 Local Authority Monitoring Report does provide details that since the start of the plan period in 2011, up to the year 2025, 1,167 affordable houses have been completed. In that same period, 5,017 new dwellings have been completed in total, which calculates as an affordable housing rate of 23%. As the overall Plan target was for 33% of new homes to be affordable, with 40% delivered on greenfield sites, this demonstrates that there has also been a significant shortfall in the delivery of affordable homes in the plan period. In the context of the shortfall of affordable homes against the plan targets, the delivery of 14 new affordable homes on site should also carry significant weight in the planning balance.

Policies in First Reason for Refusal

- 3.6 The first reason for refusal is given as being a conflict with the development and Policies CGB1, SP2, SP5 of the NHLP and ASH1 of the ANP. The conflict with these policies specified in the reason for refusal was taken directly from the text of paragraph 4.3.4 of the Committee Report, which was a point clearly made at the Committee Meeting. However, the next sentence of that Committee Report then explains that these policies are out of date because the latest housing land supply position shows a 2.6 year supply of deliverable housing sites,

noting “in general but specifically with regard to new housing development (policies) were considered ‘out of date’”.

3.7 The policies cited in this reason for refusal are Policy CGB1 and Policy ASH1. CGB1 is a permissive locational policy that provides criteria under which planning permission will be granted in areas defined as ‘rural areas beyond the green belt’ on the proposals map. Policy ASH1 in the ANP also relates to the location of development and seeks to focus new development within the settlement boundary, with development outside the boundary limited to certain criteria. In essence, these policies are similar as they seek to control development outside of the settlement boundary. Policy CGB1 in the Local Plan is considered to be out of date because of the lack of a five year housing supply.

3.8 With regard to policy ASH1 of the ANP, the NPPF clearly sets out, at paragraph 14, that only where a Neighbourhood Plan contains allocations to meet an identified housing requirement would conflict with that Neighbourhood Plan be likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits in the tilted balance. This argument was outlined in the PSS at paragraph 4.27 and the appellant repeats the case here that conflict with this policy is not sufficient to outweigh the benefits in the tilted balance.

3.9 Policy SP2 is a policy that defines the settlement hierarchy and spatial distribution of development during the plan period. This policy is certainly out of date, and given the consistent undersupply of housing in the district up to 2025, and the projected undersupply over the next five years, then any conflict with this policy carries very limited weight in the tilted balance. Policy SP5 defines the rural areas beyond the green belt outside of settlement boundaries and therefore lies over policy CGB1. This policy, as it relates to housing is also out of date and conflict carries limited weight in the tilted balance.

Policies in Second Reason for Refusal

3.10 The second reason for refusal references paragraph 135 of the NPPF and Policy D1 of the NHLP. These are general design based considerations, which have been considered by the appellant in preparing the planning application. Explanations and professional judgement of the design

approach and details are provided in the submitted Design and Access Statement and Landscape Visual Appraisal, prepared by Barnes Walker.

- 3.11 Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments: will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting; establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit; optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and create resilience.
- 3.12 Policy D1 is a general design policy that includes specific elements regarding nature and scale of development. This policy and paragraph 135 were considered fully in the design of the development and supporting documents prepared by Barnes Walker. The appellant also notes that paragraph 4.3.10 of the Committee Report states that the proposal complies with Policy D1.
- 3.13 Paragraphs 4.3.11 – 4.3.15 of the Committee Report, sub-titled ‘Layout and Design’ outlines the above considerations, framed within the requirement of Policy D1 to ‘respond positively to a site’s local context’. This also explains changes made during the course of the application, which sought to address a number of concerns regarding the layout and design by the case officer and statutory consultees. The letter provided to the LPA on behalf of the appellant detailing these changes and reasoning, is included within the Appeal documentation. The Committee Report concluded that “the proposed development does have a broadly acceptable layout and design” and specifically that the sections of the proposal to the front of Station Road “was not out of

context or scale for the locality". It also considered the following elements of design and layout were satisfactory:

"the proposed houses are reflective in style, scale and external materials to the neighbouring Senuna Park development, so in time these two developments will appear as one co-ordinated development"

"the detached houses are well spaced without being wasteful of land, and the use of hedgerows to form private gardens is complementary to this rural location"

- 3.14 Barnes Walker have provided a detailed Landscape Appeal Statement of Case that is submitted as part of this appeal (Appendix A). This provides rebuttal to the argument in this second reason for refusal that the proposed scheme, if implemented, would have a significant "urbanising effect on this open field beyond the village edge, and line of trees, contrary and harmful to the rural character and appearance of [the] area". It provides their professional assessment of the scheme as submitted, and amended prior to determination, and summary of the comments of the external Landscape Consultant (Place Services) with whom the LPA engaged to provide professional feedback on the proposals. These comments from Place Services formed part of the assessment in the Committee Report on which a decision was made.

Policies in Third Reason for Refusal

- 3.15 The third reason for refusal argues that the site is in an unsustainable location where future occupiers would be reliant on the private motor car for most journeys. The reason for refusal considers the proposal contrary to the aims of policy SP1 and paragraph 110 of the NPPF.
- 3.16 Policy SP1: Sustainable development in North Hertfordshire states that the plan supports the principles of sustainable development within North Hertfordshire, and that the Council will ensure the long-term viability of the District's villages by supporting growth which provides opportunities for existing and new residents and sustains key facilities. It also states that the Council will grant planning permission for proposals that; deliver an appropriate mix of homes that contribute towards the targets of the plan; create high-quality developments that respect and improve their surroundings; provide the necessary infrastructure required to support an

increasing population; and secure any necessary mitigation measures that reduce the impact of development, including on climate change.

- 3.17 Paragraph 110 of the NPPF states that significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. It also notes that *“however, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in decision-making.”*
- 3.18 The Council makes specific arguments in the third reason for refusal that the site; lies outside of the village boundary of Ashwell; is not within easy walking distance of services and facilities within the village, with most facilities beyond the preferred maximum walking distance in the Transport Statement; and that there is a limited bus service.
- 3.19 The site does lie outside of the defined Local Plan settlement boundary, as is also the case with the recently completed Senuna Park development that it lies adjacent to. The appellant has set out above how the Local Plan policies that define the village boundaries should be considered ‘out of date’, and this is detailed in the Committee Report.
- 3.20 Land between the appeal site and the village boundary was approved on appeal and subsequently built out for 28 new dwellings as Senuna Park. The Delegated Report states at paragraph 4.3.9 that whilst outside the settlement boundary, *“it is positioned close to its outside edge as the Senuna Park development adjoins the settlement boundary and this application is to the east and south of Senuna Park.”* The appeal Inspector for Senuna Park allowed the appeal despite the site being outside of the defined village boundary on the basis of the tilted balance as housing land supply was less than five years supply. As set out above, the housing supply has since reduced significantly.
- 3.21 The reason for refusal references within it maximum walking distances set out in the Transport Statement (TS), noting that most facilities are beyond the preferred maximum walking

distances. This likely refers to table 2 of the TS, which lists 12 amenities and their distances from the site access. These maximum walking distances to locations are actually noted as a 'preferred maximum' walking distance but are by no means meant as an arbiter of a specific distance beyond which services and amenities automatically become inaccessible or unsustainable.

- 3.22 Notably, The TS on which the reason for refusal relies, also provides a summary of Site Accessibility at paragraph 3.20 which states:

"The site benefits from good accessibility via a range of transport modes to support a sustainable development. It is well connected to Ashwell village centre by continuous footways and PRow routes including Byway 16. Cycling is supported by low traffic volumes and a 20mph zone in the village centre. Local amenities are within a reasonable walking and cycling distance, and public transport is available from nearby bus stops such as the 'War Memorial' and a newly constructed stop associated with adjacent residential development (Senuna Park). Ashwell & Morden railway station also provides regular services to Cambridge and London, enhancing regional connectivity."

- 3.23 The presence of several footpaths through the site, connecting to Senuna Park and to Small Gains further increases the potential for safe and comfortable walking routes to local amenities in the village. Paragraph 4.3.9 of the Committee Report notes that *"it can be concluded that the site is in a relatively sustainable location as walking and cycling into the village is a realistic prospect from the site"*.

- 3.24 Paragraph 4.3.47 also notes that *"there is an existing footpath on Station Road, and two links to Small Gains to the north, one in this development and one in the adjoining Senuna Park development. As a result, the proposal is considered to be well connected"*.

- 3.25 The Committee Report notes that there is a footpath on Station Road connecting the site into the village, and a new bus stop is being provided on Station Road as part of the Senuna Park development.

- 3.26 This was detailed in the Transport Statement submitted with the application, which noted in paragraphs 3.10-13 that the nearest bus stop was 600 metres, at 'War Memorial', but that this would be improved by a new northbound and southbound bus stop being delivered 250 metres from the site access on Station Road.
- 3.27 This new stop is named Station Road, Opp Small Gains and is served by the 91, 91a buses, providing services to Letchworth and Royston, via Newnham, Radwell, Clothall Common and Baldock. The services run approximately every hour from 7.30 to 18.30. (timetable provided at Appendix E). The bus stop provides regular services during the working daytime and peaks to the nearby village, towns and also direct to Ashwell and Morden Train Station, which connects to London and Cambridge via train.
- 3.28 This is clearly not a limited bus service and would directly serve the appeal site, representing a significantly improved bus service from the one considered acceptable for the Senuna Park appeal, which also delivered the new bus stop outside the site on Station Road.
- 3.29 In addition to the existing non-car means of transport available to the site, the development also secures a £354,996 contribution towards sustainable transport, which is supported by Policy SP1.
- 3.30 The Statutory Comments of the Highways Authority to the application state that:
"the site benefits from good accessibility to a wide range of sustainable transport options, offering viable alternatives to private car use. This significantly reduces reliance on private vehicles and demonstrates strong alignment with both local and national transport policies."
- 3.31 This professional guidance should have been fully acknowledged by the Planning Committee in any balanced consideration of the application intentions and should be afforded considerable weight in the determination of this appeal.

- 3.32 Future occupiers would clearly not be reliant on the private car for many journeys, due to the alternative options available, and this is the opinion of the Highway Authority and the appellant. The appeal site, in fact, has an excellent range of alternative transport choices particularly given it is in a sustainable village location, as Ashwell itself has an excellent range of services and amenities associated with a village of its size, to which the appeal site can benefit from and also importantly, contribute to maintaining.
- 3.33 The above evidence demonstrates that the location and proposal offer a genuine choice of transport modes and limits the need to travel by private car, consistent with paragraph 110 of the NPPF and Policy SP1.
- 3.34 Paragraph 110 of the NPPF notes that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, but development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable. In this context, the accessibility to sustainable transport is excellent for a village of the size of Ashwell, and as the proposal would provide for growth to one of the district's villages, this also provides opportunities for existing and new residents and would help to sustain key facilities, ensuring the long-term vitality of the village, which is also consistent with Policy SP1.
- 3.35 The appellant has provided evidence that the proposal is consistent with Policy SP1 and paragraph 110, and is in no way contrary to the aims of these policies.

Policies in Fourth Reason for Refusal

- 3.36 The fourth reason for refusal concerns policy SP7 and the requirement for mitigation through financial contributions. The appellant agreed to the principle of all sought financial contributions in the Heads of Terms presented in the Officer report to the Planning Committee. An additional, late request was made just prior to Committee with regard to Therfield Heath, which was also accepted in principle prior to Committee, with the financial amount verbally agreed at Committee by the appellant's representative. The principle of the sports contribution was also accepted by the appellant at Committee, with only the specific justified financial amount left to be resolved via the Officers.

3.37 Subsequent to the application being refused, the appellant has agreed the amounts and triggers of all financial contributions sought with the Local Planning Authority, to address the relevant mitigation, with both parties agreeing that they are consistent with policy SP7 and the CIL Regulations. The following agreed contributions have therefore been included within a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) submitted with the appeal, presenting the following contributions to the County Council and Local Authority as appropriate:

Childcare	0-2 year olds	£7,681
	5-11 year olds	£504
Library Service		£10,127
Secondary Education		£342,425
Youth Services		£6,111
SEND		£59,919
Habitat (Therfield Heath SSSI		£24,480
Recycling Centre		£7,249
Transfer Station		£10,138
Pavilion		£139,500
Sustainable Transport		£354,996
Fire and Rescue		£3,229

3.38 We understand the LPA will not contest this reason for refusal upon receipt of an appeal with this UU signed at submission.

4. Summary of Grounds of Appeal

- 4.1 The grounds of appeal in this case are that the appeal site presents a sustainable location for new housing development, being immediately adjacent to existing housing development in the village on a main road through the village of Ashwell. A new bus stop close to the site on Station Road provides connectivity to an excellent rural bus service that connects the village to the rest of the district and the Ashwell and Morden train station, along with existing walking and cycling routes that connect directly to the rest of the village, which is well served by a local school, shops and facilities.
- 4.2 The proposal presented at appeal is a full application for 36 new dwellings that has been designed with local context and policy at its heart, reflecting on the recent appeal allowed on the site adjacent to the appeal site, which the Inspector allowed and which is now built and demonstrates the scale, quality and benefits of a similar housing development on the appeal site. The previous Inspector's conclusions regarding the principle of residential development in this location remain highly relevant and carry substantial weight, particularly given the Councils significantly worsened housing land supply position.
- 4.3 The scheme's benefits include providing 36 new homes, of which 14 will be affordable homes, particularly addressing the general housing and some of the specific affordable housing need in the district that continues to be undersupplied against the Local Plan targets. Due to this undersupply and lack of future five year supply, local policies are out of date, and the appellant's main ground of appeal is that the tilted balance of sustainable development at paragraph 11 of the NPPF is engaged.
- 4.4 The appeal proposes a new housing scheme (including all matters) as a full planning application, allowing all potential impacts and benefits to be considered in the planning balance. The proposal includes the new housing, along with drainage infrastructure, open space and landscaping, and a new access from Station Road that are considered acceptable in technical terms. The proposal utilises and enhances the existing physical features of the appeal site to increase connectivity and the design quality of the scheme, reflecting on the adjacent allowed appeal site, and with limited

local impacts as detailed in the Landscape Appeal Statement. The scheme also provides more than a 50% increase in Biodiversity Net Gain, representing multiple times the improvements required.

- 4.5 It is notable that the proposal did not attract any outstanding technical objections from the Council's statutory consultees. Matters relating to highways, drainage, ecology, biodiversity net gain, accessibility and infrastructure delivery were all capable of being satisfactorily addressed through the submitted application, associated planning obligations and conditions. Furthermore, professional planning Officers recommended the application for approval following detailed assessment of the proposal and consultation responses. The refusal of planning permission therefore does not arise from any identified technical constraint to development of the site, but rather from Members reaching a different planning judgement on matters already fully considered within the Committee Report.
- 4.6 Any conflict with adopted planning policy wording is fully or partially mitigated by those policies referenced in the Reasons for Refusal being out of date, and the initially perceived potential impacts of development have been reduced through amendments made during the course of the application, such that the consultation responses on the matters on which the reasons for refusal relate, notably landscape, design and sustainable travel, are generally complementary and provide no clear demonstrable or significant harm.
- 4.7 The presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged by paragraph 11 and the benefits of development are not demonstrably and significantly outweighed by the potential impacts.
- 4.8 We respectfully request that the appeal is allowed.

Appendix A: Barnes Walker – Landscape Appeal Statement of Case

Appendix B: Planning Committee Report (with Update Note) and Minutes

Appendix C: Appeal Decision – Senuna Park Development – 3279843

Appendix D – North Hertfordshire Five Year Supply Statement – Nov ‘25

Appendix E – Local Bus Timetable



JWPC Ltd
1B Waterview, White Cross
Lancaster, Lancashire, LA1 4XS

Tel: 01524 599980

enquiries@jwpc.co.uk www.jwpc.co.uk

