

RESPONSE TO LPA STATEMENT & THIRD- PARTY REPRESENTATIONS APPEAL - 6010036



**AN APPEAL BY:
MR N HANNAN
PRINCIPAL DESIGNER, CH ARCHITECH
ON BEHALF OF EMMAUS SCHOOL**

RELATING TO:

**EMMAUS SCHOOL, SCHOOL LANE,
STAVERTON, TROWBRIDGE, BA14 6NZ**

**AGAINST A REFUSAL OF PLANNING
PERMISSION FOR:**

**RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR
APPROVAL OF SECURITY FENCING
WHICH REQUIRED TO SUPPORT THE
SAFEGUARDING, SAFETY AND
EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF THE
SCHOOL, WHILE MAINTAINING AN
OPEN AND WELCOMING
ENVIRONMENT APPROPRIATE TO ITS
EDUCATIONAL SETTING.**



01689 836334



enquiries@replanning.co.uk



www.replanning.co.uk

Robinson Escott Planning LLP,

Downe House, 303 High Street, Orpington, Kent BR6 0NN

1. INTRODUCTION:

- 1.1. We confirm the receipt of the Council's appeal statement and Third-Party representations which were received via email on 2 July 2026.
- 1.2. With regard to the Council's case, the Appellant would like to comment on the points raised. For clarity, the relevant points raised in the Council's Statement will be addressed in turn. We have then prepared a response to the sole Third-Party representations.

2. RESPONSE TO COUNCIL STATEMENT:

- 2.1. Section 1 provides a summary of the appeal. The Appellant has no comments on this section.
- 2.2. The Appellant's case establishes significant areas of common ground between parties as well as identifying the purpose and need for the fencing. A balanced judgement, in line with paragraph 216 of the NPPF has also been advanced. This includes giving great weight to the need to alter schools as outlined in paragraph 100(a) of the NPPF. Based on the low significance and low impact on the NDHA as a result of the fencing, the importance attributed to alter schools in the NPPF and the positive community benefits of the proposal outweigh any harm in this instance. On this basis the fencing is acceptable and in accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF and Core Policies 57 and 58 of the Core Strategy.

3. THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATION:

(i) Interested Party 1

- 3.1. It has been established as common ground between parties that the demolition of the former wall on site was permitted development.

3.2. The Appellant has confirmed that they will be preparing a suitable soft landscaping scheme which can be secured via planning condition. The reason why this has not been done yet is due to budget pressures.

3.3. In terms of lighting, these are on timers so they shouldn't be on at night. The Appellant is investigating this.

(ii) Interested Party 2

3.4. The Appellant acknowledges this letter of support which highlights the justification for the fence and its height.

4. CONDITIONS:

4.1. The Council have not prepared a schedule of planning conditions, if the Inspector was minded to allow the appeal. Given that the appeal proposal is retrospective, a time limit and approved plans are not considered necessary in this instance. As outlined in the appeal statement, the Appellant would accept a soft landscaping condition as part of an approval.

5. CONCLUSIONS:

5.1. The Appellant reiterates the conclusions of the Grounds of Appeal Statement.

5.2. Taking all material factors into account, it is respectfully requested for this appeal to be allowed.