



Compulsory Purchase Order Decision

Inquiry Held 20 – 22 February 2024

Site visit made on 22 February 2024

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd April 2024

Case Ref: APP/PCU/CPOP/G5750/3327480

The London Borough of Newham (James Riley Point) Compulsory Purchase Order 2023

- The Compulsory Purchase Order was made under Section 226(1)(a) of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 by the London Borough of Newham (the Acquiring Authority).
 - The purpose of the Order is:

Facilitating the carrying out of the comprehensive scheme of development, redevelopment and improvement of James Riley Point, Carpenters Road, London E15 2HZ to deliver high quality refurbished homes, community centre and improved public realm which will contribute to achieving the promotion or improvement of the economic, social, and environmental wellbeing of the area.
 - The main grounds of objection were:
 - Inadequate attempts to acquire by negotiations
 - Viability
 - Equalities Impacts, and
 - Excessive use of powers
 - When the inquiry opened, there were 5 remaining qualifying objections.
 - At the close of the inquiry, there were 5 remaining qualifying objections.
-

DECISION

1. The London Borough of Newham (James Riley Point) Compulsory Purchase Order 2023 is confirmed.

PROCEDURAL MATTERS AND STATUTORY FORMALITIES

2. On 22 August 2023 the Secretary of State confirmed that the decision had been delegated to an appointed Inspector.

The Order Land and Surroundings

3. The Order Land comprises a 23 storey tower block consisting of 21 storeys of residential accommodation containing 132 apartments, built over a ground floor under-croft and half sunken podium car park. The building is known as James Riley Point (JRP).
4. JRP sits on the edge of the Carpenters Estate which is a development of largely residential properties. The area surrounding JRP is a mixture of residential, commercial, and retail with access to services, amenities, and transport links. The Council owns JRP and acts as landlord for the vast majority of the apartments. However, four apartments were purchased from the Council, with the owner/occupiers receiving lengthy leases. The Council has negotiated with three of the leaseholders who have provided the Council with vacant possession of their apartments to enable the works to JRP to go ahead.

The Scheme

5. The Scheme which the Order will deliver is a mixed-use development comprising the carrying out of the comprehensive scheme of development, redevelopment, and improvement of JRP to deliver refurbished homes, a community centre and improved public realm which the acquiring authority consider will contribute to achieving the promotion or improvement of the economic, social, and environmental wellbeing of the area.

Considerations

6. The Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities Guidance on Compulsory purchase process and the Crichel Down Rules (2019) (the CPO Guidance) refers to factors which may be considered in deciding whether to confirm a CPO, and I have used these as the structure for the remainder of this decision. I have also considered other matters raised by objectors, but the CPO process is not an opportunity to revisit the merits of the planning permission which has been granted for the Scheme, nor whether sufficient monetary valuations or compensation have been presented by the Acquiring Authority (AA).

National Planning Policy Framework

7. The purpose of the planning system is to achieve sustainable development, meeting the 3 overarching objectives, economic, social, and environmental. Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously developed or 'brownfield' land. Planning policies and decisions should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability and communities and residential environments.
8. Local planning authorities should take a proactive role in identifying and helping to bring forward land that may be suitable for meeting development needs, using the full range of powers available to them. This should include

identifying opportunities to facilitate land assembly, supported where necessary by compulsory purchase powers.

9. The Framework also seeks to significantly boost the supply of homes to support strong, vibrant, and healthy communities by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations. It also sets out that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity. This is to help build a strong, responsive, and competitive economy.

Planning Policy and Planning Permission

10. The Scheme is supported by the Development Plan for the Borough which comprises of the London Plan 2021 (LP), and the London Legacy Development Corporation Local Plan 2020 (LLDCLP). The LP is the overall strategic plan for London and is a component part of the Development Plan for the Borough. Policy H1 of the LP sets out the Mayor's approach to increasing housing supply and states that boroughs should allocate an appropriate range and number of sites that are suitable for residential and mixed use development, optimising all suitable locations and available brownfield sites through their development plans and decisions. Policy H4 of the LP also sets out the strategic target of 50% of all new homes delivered across London to be genuinely affordable. To follow the Fast Track Route, Policy H5 of the LP does not require scrutiny of development viability on public sector land where 50% of affordable housing is being provided within the scheme.
11. In accordance with Policy H1 of the LP, the London Legacy Development Corporation, which acts as the planning authority, allocates JRP at Site Allocation Reference SA3.4 within the LLDCLP. This sets out the vision for the Greater Carpenters District which will deliver housing across the estate through various means such as comprehensive redevelopment and refurbishment and a combination of these options for the site allocation area.
12. Policy H1 of the LLDCLP seeks to ensure that a diverse range of housing is provided through securing an appropriate mix of housing and accommodation types to meet identified requirements. Policy SP.2 of the Local Plan reflects the housing targets established within the LP and seeks to maximise housing infrastructure provision within new neighbourhoods through optimising housing delivery on suitable and available sites. It also requires the LLDC to work with its partners to maximise opportunities for delivering high-quality, sustainable affordable homes, with a variety of types and tenures and provision of supporting infrastructure. Policy H.2 sets out further detail on how affordable housing will be sought, stating the breakdown of tenures within the affordable housing provision of 60% low cost rented and 40% intermediate.
13. Planning Permission Ref: 21/00543/FUL was granted subject to conditions and a S106 agreement for the development underlying the Scheme on 13 April 2023. The evidence¹ demonstrates that planning permission consistent with the development plan has been obtained in respect of the Scheme that will bring forward 136 properties, 96% of which will be affordable. As such, there are no planning-related impediments to the delivery of the Scheme.

¹ PoE Lizzie Le Mare Ref: AA/LLM/1

Conclusion

14. The Scheme is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework, the Council's development plan policies contained within the LLDCLP, and the LP. The evidence demonstrates that all necessary consents, including planning permission have been obtained in respect of the Scheme.

Benefits of the Scheme

15. The AA has set out why the Scheme is needed to support the delivery of social, economic, and environmental benefits in Newham.

Social wellbeing

16. The AA have set out that the CPO Scheme would provide a range of social wellbeing benefits that include:
- Complete refurbishment of the tower block to meet nationally described space standards. This requires stripping back of the building essentially to its frame with new windows and external cladding. All pipework and electricity cabling will be replaced, along with new lifts. Each apartment will be fitted with new kitchens and bathrooms and external amenity space in the form of balconies.
 - 136 new (4 net additional) homes to help meet current and future housing needs that includes 96% affordable homes and, in a mix of tenures to meet London Affordable Rented and Intermediate, providing a range of 1, 2 & 3 bed units².
 - The existing under-croft space, which currently has little function, will be converted to become a useable space in the form of a 2,486 sq. m sports and community facility to replace the existing Carpenters and Docklands Centre which is in a dilapidated state. The sports and community facility will provide a 5-a-side futsal pitch, a sports hall, 2 flexible studio spaces, office space and treatment rooms, before and after school club, a food bank, and a café area with outdoor space.
 - In addition to the built proposals, the development will also provide landscaped areas to the base of JRP, offering a range of spaces and activities. Although the Scheme will provide on-site open spaces, the shortfall will be provided within Carpenters Estate, a short walk from JRP.
 - The new market and affordable dwellings, which will provide a range of unit sizes and tenures, will help to establish a balanced community, and facilitate the regeneration of the area. The additional resident population in Newham as a consequence will support a range of facilities and services, as well as contribute to the enhancement of the environment through evening activity, increased footfall, and greater natural surveillance.

² See LLDC Housing Requirements Study 2018 and the Greater London Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2017 which identify a great need for low cost rented properties.

- The Scheme's balanced mix of uses, alongside the range of facilities and services available within the existing centre of Newham, will secure greater public benefits for regeneration and sustainable development as a whole than if the benefits were secured individually or on a piecemeal basis.

Economic wellbeing

17. The AA sets out that the Scheme fits with the development plan and would contribute to the economic objectives set out at paragraph 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework as follows:

- The Scheme will bring forward a predominantly vacant residential tower block into active use. It will also provide sports and community facilities, along with childcare facilities and a café. This would create jobs for the local economy.
- The refurbishment of JRP will also support growth of the local economy through the provision of apprenticeships and construction jobs. This will also create additional spending in the local area. The planning obligation secured through the planning permission also requires a Labour and Employment clause requiring the developer to, amongst other things, to recruit from the local area, ensuring a balance of ethnic backgrounds and disabled people.
- The Scheme will also contribute a Community Infrastructure payment to LLDC and the Mayor of £76, 068.44, along with securing other benefits through the planning obligation such as 96% affordable housing, community facilities, public realm and play space and a car free development.

Environmental wellbeing

18. The AA have set out that the CPO Scheme would provide a range of environmental wellbeing benefits that include:

- Significantly improving the quality of the built environment, which currently largely appears tired and not fitting of Newham's aspirations, through high quality building architecture and landscape design. The Scheme will also maximise energy efficiency through the installation of PV panels, air source heat pumps together with high performance insulation and glazing which will promote a low carbon economy and allow for heat recovery and load sharing between residents to reduce the operational cost of energy.
- Improving the thermal and acoustic performance of the building, which in turn will improve the living conditions of future occupiers.
- Encouraging the use of public transport through a reduction in vehicle parking and the provision of high quality cycle parking.

Conclusion

19. The Order Land is located within the Carpenters Estate, close to services, amenities, and facilities as well as public transport options. The Scheme has the potential for delivering a higher density of development to contribute towards meeting the compelling need for affordable accommodation in London generally and as identified for Newham specifically.

20. The nature of the Scheme would create a comprehensive, transformative change to this site in the Carpenters Estate and would contribute to Newham's ambition of providing a mixed-use Scheme that would deliver much needed housing including 96% affordable homes, as well as sports and community facilities. The Scheme offer would promote vibrancy and activity for the community boosting the evening economy and positively regenerating the site. The Scheme would improve the built and environmental quality with increased permeability and the creation of new public spaces.
21. The regeneration of Carpenters Estate would be a substantial public benefit that would contribute to the improvement of the economic, social, and environmental wellbeing of the area. Given the need to regenerate JRP, and the substantial benefits in the public interest, there is a strong compelling case for the acquisition of the Order Land.

Funding, viability, and deliverability

22. The Council's evidence³ sets out in detail how the Scheme will be funded and that there is a reasonable prospect that it will be delivered. The Council considered funding of the Scheme on 9 March 2023 and its Cabinet accepted the recommendations to increase funding for the refurbishment of JRP. It also ratified that the CPO Scheme is to be funded through the Council's Housing Revenue Account and borrowing from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB).
23. The Council's report of 9 March 2023 also considered the recouperation of the funds required for the Scheme through the delivery of the masterplan for the Carpenters Estate. However, it is reiterated that the Scheme to refurbish JRP is nonetheless a standalone project that is not reliant on the viability or future delivery of the masterplan for the estate.
24. I have carefully considered the evidence of the Objectors, specifically in relation to the funding of the CPO Scheme. As a Scheme that will provide 96% affordable homes, it was queried whether the development would be viable. However, the Council has provided evidence that it is capable of funding the refurbishment programme itself through its public report of 9 March 2023 that it is capable of funding the refurbishment programme itself, which was prepared by its Finance Team and ultimately sanctioned by its elected Members.
25. Although the Objectors have argued that the funding agreed by the Council has not been independently scrutinised and verified, there is nothing before me to suggest that funding would not be forthcoming. Indeed, the evidence from the AA points out that there is no requirement for the funding to be verified, rather that there is a realistic possibility that it will come forward. Given that the totality of the Scheme is to be funded by the London Borough of Newham and it has access to funds from its Housing Revenues Account and for a non-discretionary loan from the PWLB, I am satisfied that there is a realistic probability of the Scheme being fully funded and is therefore viable and likely to be delivered within a realistic timeframe⁴.
26. Therefore, based on the evidence before me I can conclude that it has been demonstrated that the Scheme is funded and viable, meaning that there is a realistic prospect that it will be delivered within a reasonable timescale.

³ PoE Darren Mackin Ref: AA/DM/1

⁴ POE Nick Clough, Carpenters Project Director, Populo Living Ref: AA/NDC/1

THE OUTSTANDING OBJECTIONS

27. At the time the CPO was made, there were 5 qualifying objections, and the remaining objections are summarised below.

Lack of Reasonable Efforts to Negotiate with the Objectors

28. The CPO Guidance sets out that acquiring authorities are expected to provide evidence that meaningful attempts at negotiation have been pursued or at least genuinely attempted⁵. Paragraph 19⁶ details what acquiring authorities should consider when negotiating. The AA must demonstrate that it has taken reasonable steps to acquire all the land and rights in the Order by agreement. Compulsory purchase is intended as a last resort. Furthermore, the CPO guidance is clear that it is necessary for the acquiring authority to demonstrate that they have taken reasonable steps to acquire all the land and rights included in the Order by agreement.
29. However, it is also clear that 'if an acquiring authority waits for negotiations to break down before starting the compulsory purchase process, valuable time will be lost. Therefore, depending on when the land is required, it may often be sensible, given the amount of time required to complete the compulsory purchase process, for the acquiring authority to; plan a compulsory purchase timetable as a contingency measure; and initiate formal procedures'.
30. The Objectors argue that the intention to redevelop or refurbish JRP has been a protracted event, spanning over some 20 years. During this period, it is argued that the Council has allowed JRP to deteriorate to the point that it has made living there a challenge, especially as the Objectors live on the 21st floor and the only working lift was closed down in 2021 as a result of the Council failing to source replacement parts. The Council did enter into discussions with the Objectors and three other families that held the freehold to their properties in September 2022 and again in early 2023. At this time, the Council agreed that an uplift of £1 million would be paid, should the Scheme fail. However, the Objectors did not enter into the agreement within the timeframe insisted by the Council as they sought legal advice over its terms and conditions. Furthermore, as the agreement was tied to a grant from the Greater London Authority, the offer of a £1 million uplift in the event of the Scheme's failure was withdrawn. The Objectors argue that no meaningful efforts to negotiate have been made by the Council since the withdrawal of the agreement.
31. As the Objectors' state, the redevelopment or refurbishment of JRP has been mooted for over 20 years. Indeed, from 2020 extensive advertising, workshops, and consultation on the proposed masterplan to regenerate Carpenters Estate was undertaken, culminating in the Council balloting occupiers through the Landlord Offer⁷ from 19 November – 14 December 2021. This essentially asked the community whether it agreed to the regeneration of Carpenters Estate, which included JRP. Moreover, the Landlord Offer made it explicit that resident homeowners in JRP would have several options open to them and should a voluntary agreement not be reached, the Council may, as a last resort, apply for a compulsory purchase

⁵ Tier 1, Stage 3, Paragraph 17

⁶ Tier 1, Stage 3

⁷ Core Document 5, The Landlord Offer, Carpenters Estate

order to compulsorily acquire their property⁸. The Objectors voted in favour of the Landlord Offer.

32. The Objectors have had to vacate their home and move into temporary accommodation and have not been able to readily access the flat and their personal effects within JRP. However, the Objectors have been rehoused as a family unit, close to JRP, and the Council have adapted the property to ensure that it meets their needs. The Objectors still reside at the property, rent free and can continue to do so until the works at JRP are complete. The Objectors then have the options available to them, as set out within the Landlord Offer.
33. The evidence from the Council⁹ is comprehensive and fully demonstrates how it has attempted to negotiate with the Objectors in compliance with the CPO guidance. Therefore, based on the evidence before me I consider that the Council acting as the AA has adequately demonstrated that they entered into meaningful negotiation with the Objectors subject to the Order. In addition, although the Objectors stated that offer letters from Savills were never received and the offers were not followed up, it is clear from the AA's evidence that discussions regarding the purchase of Flat 128 JRP had been taking place between the Objectors and the Council.
34. Although I acknowledge Dr Saravanamuthu statement that the other three freeholders "just gave up", none of the other freeholders/owners of those properties provided any evidence to support this assertion either written, or orally during the inquiry. Moreover, the AA has stated that once the works to JRP has been completed, the Objectors are free to move back into their newly refurbished property, and in the event that the Scheme is not completed, an enhanced payment to the value of the flat as if it were refurbished, would be made.
35. Thus, I am satisfied that the AA has attempted to negotiate the vacant possession of Flat 128 at JRP. In reaching this conclusion I accept that collectively the Objectors' connection with the Order Land would have made any negotiation very difficult. In this respect I can fully understand their unwillingness to sell their interest in the land or being unable to reach an agreement. However, a failure to ultimately reach an agreement does not mean that the negotiation process was flawed. Therefore, I conclude that the AA have taken reasonable steps to acquire all the land and rights included in the Order by agreement.

Excessive Use of Powers

36. One of the factors in considering whether to confirm a CPO is if the purpose for which the AA is proposing to acquire the land could be achieved by any other means. This may include considering the appropriateness of any alternative proposals/locations put forward by others.
37. The Objectors argue that the AA's requirement to acquire all of their legal interest in the property is disproportionate as the flat is already vacant. Moreover, the Objectors are willing to stay in their emergency accommodation for a further three years, until the works are completed. A licence or

⁸ Page 17 of the Landlord Offer

⁹ Darren Mackin POE

arrangement to allow temporary access into the flat is also agreeable to allow the refurbishment works to be undertaken.

38. I note the current state of the building, which is uninhabitable, the protracted history of decanting, the alleged mismanagement of the building's maintenance and the tenancy agreement, the antisocial behaviour, and disturbances caused by filming at JRP. However, these matters are not material to the issue at hand. In order to achieve the policy objectives, set out above, the development has to take place on the Order Land and its surroundings. Despite the purported offers from the Objectors, no alternative Scheme or agreement has been put forward which would meet the policy objectives and the comprehensive regeneration of the Order Land which is clearly essential to enable the provision of affordable housing that is needed in the area. It is therefore clear that the purpose for which the Council is proposing to acquire the land cannot be achieved by any other means and the use of the CPO as a last resort is proportionate to achieve the aims set out above.

Human Rights and Equalities

39. Article 1 of the First Protocol to the European Convention on Human Rights, as incorporated by the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) and, in the case of the dwelling, Article 8 of the Convention apply in the consideration of this CPO. The CPO Guidance¹⁰ sets out when confirming an order, authorising authorities should be sure that the purposes for which the compulsory purchase order is made justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected. As addressed above, there is a compelling case in the public interest for acquisition of the properties subject to the CPO. The comprehensive benefits of the CPO Scheme could not be achieved without acquisition of the land and interfering with the individuals' rights.
40. Therefore, given the significant public benefits that would be provided, this represents a compelling case to justify interfering with Article 1 of the First Protocol to the Convention, as incorporated by the HRA and, Article 8 of the Convention.
41. Turning to Article 6 of the HRA, the Objectors have been given the opportunity to attend the inquiry and put forward their evidence, both in writing and orally. The Objectors also had legal representation. Thus, I am satisfied that they have been given the right to a fair trial.

Public Sector Equality Duty

42. I am bound by the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) set out in s149 of the Equality Act 2010, and as a public authority I must comply with the PSED. It is my duty personally to have due regard to the need to:
1. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
 2. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 3. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

¹⁰ Tier 1, Stage 1, Paragraph 2

43. To comply with PSED it is the duty of public authorities to have 'due regard' to consider the three aims when making decisions. This means two things; 1. It is a duty to ensure that any decision giving rise to any negative impacts in relation to the three aims is informed and made with regard to any less harmful alternative outcome. 2. It is a duty to seek to achieve a positive outcome in respect of the three aims where possible.
44. The AA carried out an Equality Impact Assessment in January 2023¹¹ (the EqIA) which found that the redevelopment of JRP has the potential to impact on the young, and older people, disabled people, people from ethnic minority groups, people from minority faith groups, single people, and women. However, it also identifies that there will be several significant benefits for future residents/occupiers through the provision of a significantly improved housing stock built to modern energy and space standards. It sets out that the Council has sought to mitigate adverse impacts through a range of reasonable and proportionate measures focused on engagement, rehousing and relocation assistance and compensation options to improve the outcomes of the redevelopment for the current and future residents of JRP.
45. I note the Objectors' comments about being decanted away from the Tamil community, and the Tamil speaking surgery within walking distance of the JRP. I also note the wheelchair use of the disabled father. I acknowledge that the family were moved into temporary accommodation when the lifts failed in JRP until they settled in Wilmer Lea Close and the upset that this would have caused, along with the indignity of being made homeless. However, the home that the Objectors currently reside in at Wilmer Lea Close is a short distance from JRP. The family are now settled and the works to JRP, which is described in detail¹², clearly sets out the improvements that will result once the refurbishment is complete which would greatly enhance the living experience at JRP for disabled users and place the family unit back in JRP, should they wish to return.
46. Therefore, based on all the evidence before me I have no reason or justification to disagree with the findings of the EqIA and the Action Plan set out at Tables 5.1 and 5.2. This includes ensuring that JRP is secure and made appropriate for the needs of its residents, including that the lifts are safe and functioning.
47. Thus, based on all the evidence before me I have no reason or justification to disagree with the findings of the EqIA. Consequently, in reaching my decision I have had 'due regard' to the likelihood that there will be impacts on older, disabled and those from minority ethnic groups and minority faith groups people because of the CPO. However, I conclude that the actions put in place by the Council are proportionate and there are no further reasonable measures that can be taken to remove them entirely.

Other Potential Impediments

48. The evidence provided by Populo Living¹³ demonstrates that it has the expertise required to deliver the Scheme and has been involved in other large

¹¹ Core Document 5 ~ Carpenters Estate Redevelopment – James Riley Point

¹² Lizzie Le Mare POE para 10.5.2

¹³ Nick Clough POE

regeneration projects. Moreover, the concerns over the stability of the tower as a result of flooding was not supported by any evidence from a suitably qualified structural engineer. Conversely, the AA undertook a thorough assessment of JRP which states that the structural testing of the building indicated no significant defects in the primary concrete elements of JRP which has a lifespan of at least a further 60 years¹⁴.

49. In their closing submission, the Objectors have referred to a CPO decision at Dagenham¹⁵. However, I have not been provided with a full copy of the decision and how it relates to the Order before me. In such circumstances, I can only afford it limited weight.

COMPENSATION

50. The issue of compensation is not a matter for the inquiry. The amount of compensation that should be payable, if not agreed, is a matter for the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber).

CONCLUSION

51. The Scheme underpinning the CPO is wholly in accordance with the development plan and has the benefit of planning permission.
52. I am satisfied that the Scheme would substantially contribute to the achievement of the promotion or improvement of the economic, social, and environmental wellbeing of the area, and that these purposes could not be achieved by other means. Financial resources are also in place for the Scheme. The Order would interfere with the human rights of the Objectors, but I consider that the interference is proportionate and that there is a strong public interest in ensuring that the regeneration of the James Riley Point site takes place. Overall, and having taken all matters into account, I conclude that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the acquisition of the Order Land.
53. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised I therefore conclude that the London Borough of Newham (James Riley Point) Compulsory Purchase Order 2023 be confirmed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR

¹⁴ Core Document 37: James Riley Point Feasibility Report June 2020

¹⁵ The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council (Vicarage Field and surrounding land) Compulsory Purchase Order 2021

APPEARANCES

For the acquiring authority:	
Douglas Edwards KC	Instructed by the Council of the Royal Borough Greenwich
He called	
Darren Mackin BA (Hons) MA	Director of Community Wealth Building, London Borough Of Newham
Lizzie Le Mare BA (Hons) MsC MRTPI	Director, Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design
Tom Hanman BA (Hons) MRICS	Principal Planning Officer, Royal Borough of Greenwich
Nicholas Clough BA (Hons) MRTPI	Carpenters Project Director, Populo Living
For the Objectors	
Gregory Jones KC	Instructed by Irwin Mitchell Solicitors
He called	
Dr Piraveena Saravanamuthu	Objector
Manoranjitham Saravanamuthu	Objector
Adam Rhead MRICS	Director, Gerald Eve LLP

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS *(submitted during the inquiry)*

Date	Document
20 February 2024	The Council's Opening Submissions
21 February 2024	Report for Cabinet Call-In 30 March 2023
21 February 2024	Report for Carpenters Early Phase Delivery Strategy 5 September 2023
22 February 2024	Corrected Proof of Evidence for Manoranjitham Saravanamuthu
29 February 2024	Objectors' Closing Submissions
4 March 2024	The AA's Final Submissions