

Leanne Buckley-Thomson

Call: 2009

"Leanne has a thorough and meticulous grasp of the case detail. She is also a clear thinker, applying law and logic to cases."

Legal 500 2025



Leanne is a sought after planning and housing law specialist.

Leanne's main practice is in planning whereby she regularly advises and represents developers, local planning authorities and Rule 6 Parties at all stages of the process and in all procedures through to judicial and statutory reviews. Leanne has a busy inquiry and advisory practice with a focus on residential schemes (sole and mixed use), including particularly contentious or complex matters. She also has expertise across the full spectrum of planning enforcement from early advice to inquiry and court (including injunctive action and prosecutions). At inquiry, Leanne is particularly known for her extensive preparation and impressive work ethic, alongside skilled advocacy. At the advisory stage, Leanne gives detailed and robust advice on law and strategy with business realism. She particularly enjoys the interpretation of policy and policy making.

Leanne's housing practice is focused on Landlord and Tenant disputes together with all matters related to HMOs. She is a strategic and tactical advocate, well versed in arguing technical points of law. Her civil litigation background as an in-house county court advocate prebar means he has a strong working knowledge of civil procedure and experience in court nationally.

Leanne is a qualified trainer regularly delivering seminars and webinars nationwide as well as appearing on podcasts and panels. She provides bespoke training for all manner of organisations on request. Leanne is passionate about access to the profession regularly speaking at schools, universities and to junior planning professionals, as well as mentoring formally and informally. As part of her commitment to state education, she sits as a co-opted school governor and visits schools to speak about accessing the profession.

Expertise

Planning

Leanne is a sought-after planning junior both by clients in her own right and by silks in and outside of Chambers. Her meticulous preparation, information recall and both written and oral advocacy make her an asset to any team. She regularly advises and represents developers, Local Planning Authorities and Rule 6 Parties at all stages of the process and in all procedures through to judicial and statutory reviews.

Birmingham

103 Colmore Row Birmingham B3 3AG

DX: 16075 Fountain Court Birmingham Telephone: +44 (0) 121 606 0500 London

Fifth Floor 7 Savoy Court London WC2R 0EX

DX: 449 London Chancery Lane Telephone: +44 (0) 207 420 7500 Bristol

30 Queen Square Bristol BS1 4ND



Leanne has a busy inquiry, court and advisory practice with a particular focus on residential schemes (sole and mixed use), including contentious or complex matters. She is a team player, which is notable when considering the extensive positive feedback and thanks she receives from clients, professionals and even those opposing schemes due to her skilled yet friendly approach.

At inquiry and in court, Leanne is particularly known for her extensive preparation and impressive work ethic, alongside skilled advocacy. At the advisory stage, Leanne gives detailed and robust advice on law and strategy with a realistic business focus. She particularly enjoys the interpretation of policy and policy making, most recently contributing towards the Planning and Environmental Bar Association's consultation response regarding the NPPF 2024. Please see the below sections, in particular 'Planning Appeals', for more detail as to inquiry advocacy.

She also has expertise across the full spectrum of planning enforcement from early advice to inquiry and court (including injunctive action and prosecutions).

Early strategic advice and assessment of merits can be invaluable and Leanne is regularly instructed to advise at all stages of the progression of a proposal from the initial pre-application consideration of a potential scheme all the way through to appeal and beyond. Advice can also be invaluable as an accompaniment to an appeal submission, particularly where the matter is to be dealt with via the written representations procedure or at a hearing where counsel is not to be instructed. Leanne's advice was recently described by an inspector as "compelling" in the context of a s.78 appeal relating to an application for permission in principle for the residential development of land for four self and custom build dwellings whereby a dispute had arisen as to the extent to which such housing may be delivered via the PIP route [APP/J3720/W/23/3336035].

As a qualified trainer, Leanne regularly delivers remote and in-person seminars and training to a variety of organisations on a broad spectrum of planning-related matters. This includes delivering mock inquiries for planning professionals, training new and returning members of planning committees at local planning authorities, and delivering training to the Planning Inspectorate's incoming Inspectors. She also acts as a mentor for prospective members of the planning bar.

For more detail in relation to Leanne's experience in relation to specific categories of planning work, please see the dedicated sections below.

'Leanne has a thorough and meticulous grasp of the case detail. She is also a clear thinker, applying law and logic to cases' – Legal 500, 2025

Notable Cases	
Planning Inquiries:	
and at Chapel Cottage,	Playley Green, Gloucester [APP/P1615/X/24/3348297]

Birmingham

103 Colmore Row Birmingham B3 3AG

DX: 16075 Fountain Court Birmingham Telephone: +44 (0) 121 606 0500 London

Fifth Floor 7 Savoy Court London WC2R 0EX

DX: 449 London Chancery Lane Telephone: +44 (0) 207 420 7500 Bristol

30 Queen Square Bristol BS1 4ND



s.78 appeal in respect of the refusal of outline planning permission for the extension to the existing business park for up to 3.9ha of employment land and up to 150 residential dwellings with associated open space and infrastructure (means of access to be determined only). This was a redetermination appeal of a previous Inspector's decision quashed by consent on one of the several grounds brought by the Claimant. The inquiry ran for 4 days. 5YHLS was no longer in issue therefore contested matters related to the location of the development and spatial strategy, the weight to be given to material considerations including the provision of a secondary access road to Area B of the Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension and its implications for the appeal, and the alleged potential under delivery of housing over the residual plan period. Represented the Council. Decision is pending.

Land North-West of Goring Station, Goring-by-Sea [APP/M3835/W/21/3281813] - redetermination appeal

s.78 appeal in respect of the refusal of an outline application for a mixed-use development including up to 475 residential dwellings, station parking and a local centre. 2-week inquiry with issues including landscape, highways, heritage, prematurity and housing need. Represented the Appellant, led by Paul Cairnes K.C. Decision is pending.

334-340 High Street and 8-22 Harborne Park Road, Harborne, Birmingham [APP/P4605/W/23/3336011]

s.78 appeal in respect of the refusal of planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of 83 residential apartments across two new development blocks, central amenity space including soft landscaping and planting, cycle storage, bin stores, plant store and enabling works. 2 week inquiry with issues including the effect of the proposed design on the character and appearance of the street scene, whether or not satisfactory living conditions would be achieved for occupants of the appeal scheme and neighbouring properties, and the effect on the safety of highway users with particular regard to the parking demands of the appeal proposal. Successfully represented the Appellant.

Land at Coombebury Cottage, Dunsfold [APP/R3650/W/23/3332590]

s.78 appeal in respect of the refusal of an outline planning application for demolition of existing buildings and the erection of up to 53 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and related infrastructure (all matters reserved except for access). I week inquiry with issues including landscape harm, trees and sustainability. Successfully represented the Appellant, led by Christopher Young K.C. It is noted that this decision was challenged by the High Court but successfully defended.

Former Greencore Factory, Prestleigh Road, Evercreech [APP/Q3305/W/23/3314693]

s.78 appeal in respect of the refusal of outline planning permission (with all matters reserved except access, appearance, layout and scale) for the demolition of all existing buildings and equipment other than Kemps Mill which will be retained as flexible Class E/F2 floorspace and erection of 120 no. residential dwellings and a shop (falling in use class E), together with open space, vehicular and pedestrian accesses, landscaping and related infrastructure and engineering works. 2week inquiry with issues including compliance with employment policies, design (including character and appearance, trees and open space) and heritage. Successfully represented the Council.

Land at Truman's Farm, Gotherington [APP/G1630/W/23/3314936]

Residential development comprising 45 dwellings, creation of new access, public open space and other associated ancillary works 1-week inquiry including issues related to 5YHLS, spatial strategy, social cohesion, and character and appearance. Successfully represented the Appellant, led by Peter Goatley K.C.

Land at Hartnoll Farm, Tiverton [APP/Y1138/W/22/3313401

Outline planning permission for the extension to the existing business park for up to 3.9ha of employment land and up to 150 residential dwellings with associated open space and infrastructure (means of access to be determined only). 2-week inquiry with issues relating to 5YHLS, the location of the development and spatial strategy, and the sufficiency of infrastructure to support the scheme. Successfully represented the Council.

Bristol

30 Queen Square Bristol BS14ND

Tel: +44 (0) 117 917 8501

Birmingham

103 Colmore Row Birmingham **B33AG**

DX: 16075 Fountain Court Birmingham Telephone: +44 (0) 121 606 0500

London

Fifth Floor 7 Savoy Court London WC2R 0EX 3



Land at Rectory Farm, Yatton [APP/D0121/W/21/3286677] Outline planning permission for residential development of up to 100 no. dwellings and associated infrastructure following demolition of existing buildings on site, with access for approval and all other matters for subsequent approval. 1-week inquiry including issues relating to 5YHLS, spatial strategy, ecology and biodiversity, character and appearance, and highway safety. Successfully represented the Appellant, led by Charles Banner K.C Land North-West of Goring Station, Goring-by-Sea [APP/M3835/W/21/3281813] Outline application for a mixed-use development including up to 475 residential dwellings, station parking and a local centre. 2-week inquiry with issues including landscape, highways, heritage, prematurity and housing need. Successfully represented the Appellant, led by Paul Cairnes K.C. Land at Little Sparrows, Sonning Common, Oxfordshire [APP/Q3115/W/20/3265861] Hybrid application for full planning permission in respect of 73 assisted living units within a village core building with ancillary facilities together with outline permission for up to 60 assisted living units with ancillary community space. 2-week inquiry with issues including need and policy on extra care, AONB (exceptional circumstances), landscape, design and 5YHLS. Successfully represented the Appellant, led by Christopher Young K.C. (then Q.C.). Footzie Social Club, Station Approach, Lower Sydenham [APP/G5180/W/20/3257010 Demolition and redevelopment for four to eleven storey development comprising 254 residential units. 2-week called-in inquiry with issues including Metropolitan Open Land (VSC), character and appearance, living conditions and affordable housing. Successfully represented the Appellant, led by Christopher Young K.C. (then Q.C.). Land North of Viaduct, Ledbury [APP/W1850/W/20/3244410] Outline application for a mixed-use development including up to 625 residential dwellings, up to 2.9ha of B1 employment land, and a canal corridor. 2-week called-in inquiry with issues including highways, infrastructure, AONB, heritage and flooding. Successfully represented the Appellant, led by Christopher Young K.C. (then Q.C.). Site of the former Hazeldens Nursery, London Road, Albourne, West Sussex [APP/D3830/W/19/3241644] Outline application for an extra care development of up to 84 units including associated communal facilities. 2-week called-in inquiry with issues including the need for extra care, landscape, BMV land, Heritage and accessibility. Successfully represented the Appellant, led by Christopher Young K.C. (then Q.C.). Land to the rear of the former Dylon International Premises, Station Approach, Lower Sydenham, London [APP/G5180/W/18/3206569] Demolition and redevelopment for four to eight storey development comprising 151 residential units and an estate road. 2-week called-in inquiry with issues including Metropolitan Open Land (VSC), character and appearance, living conditions and 5YHLS. Successfully represented the Appellant, led by Christopher Young K.C. (then Q.C.). Planning Hearings:

Birmingham

103 Colmore Row Birmingham B3 3AG

DX: 16075 Fountain Court Birmingham Telephone: +44 (0) 121 606 0500 London

Fifth Floor 7 Savoy Court London WC2R 0EX

DX: 449 London Chancery Lane Telephone: +44 (0) 207 420 7500 Bristol

30 Queen Square Bristol BS1 4ND



Lucky Rails Alpaca Farm, Dexter Lane, Hurley [APP/R3705/W/24/3341147]
s.78 appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the siting of a timber cabin to replace mobile home to provide rural workers accommodation, subject to conditions. Issues included consideration of the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt and very special circumstances, including whether there was an essential need for a permanent dwelling to accommodate a rural worker at the site. Successfully represented the Appellant.
High Court:
R (on the application of Captain Lee Jones) v Shropshire Borough Council AC-2024-LON-001634 (unreported - decision pending)
Represented the Claimant in Judicial Review proceedings where the challenge surrounded an allegation that the Defendant Council was out of time to issue a Cll Stop Notice by virtue of s.9 of the Limitation Act 1980 which imposes a statutory time limit of 6 years for actions for sums recoverable by statute. The claim had been commenced by Captain Jones as a litigant in person with the assistance of a McKenzie Friend. Following the refusal of permission on all grounds on the papers, and refusal of permission on all grounds at an oral renewal hearing, Captain Lee appealed to the Court of Appeal and Leanne was instructed on a Direct Access basis to draft a skeleton argument in support. This successfully resulted in the grant of permission to apply for judicial review on one ground. Leanne was then instructed via solicitors to represent Captain Lee Jones at the substantive hearing, a decision in respect of which is pending
Waverley Borough Council v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government [2024] EWHC 3302 (Admin)
Successfully represented the developer, Sigma Homes, in defending a statutory review brought by the Council pursuant to s.288 of the 1990 Act against the decision of the Secretary of State's Inspector to grant outline planning permission for up to 53 homes. The challenge was brought on the basis of the alleged unlawfulness of the Inspector's conclusion that there was no adverse impact on the Surrey Hills National Landscape it being suggested that he had failed to take account of a material consideration when relying on the context for the existing village as a reason why there would be no harmful effect, namely that he had found that the Development would change the existing context of the village in a harmful way in views from the footpath to the east. The Council also asserted that insufficient reasons had been provided. Led by Christopher Young K.C., Leanne assisted in liaising with clients, drafting the summary grounds of resistance and skeleton argument, and made oral submissions in Court in respect of the reasons element of the Council's grounds.
R. (on the application of Andrew Hill) v Wychavon District Council AC/2024/BHM/000027 (unreported - July 2024
Successfully represented the Council in defending judicial review proceedings at a renewal hearing for permission. The application was argued at hearing on four of the five grounds: a failure to take into account the correct distance between the Site and Three Gables; irrationality in concluding that the garden area was a paddock; failure to take into account and/or give adequate reasons and/or rationally apply paragraph 8.3.15 of the SPD; and irrationality/inadequate reasoning more broadly.
Captain Lee Jones v Shropshire Borough Council CO/3623/2021 (unreported)
Successfully appealed by way of case stated from an order of DJ Boswell making a liability order against the Appellant. Challenge surrounded the Judge's conclusion that the Council had properly served the summons in accordance with rule 99(1)(b) of the Magistrates' Court Rules 1981 and the correct interpretation of the wording of that provision.
R. (on the application of Hollings) v Bath and North East Somerset Council [2018] 5 WLUK 375

Birmingham

103 Colmore Row Birmingham B3 3AG

DX: 16075 Fountain Court Birmingham Telephone: +44 (0) 121 606 0500 London

Fifth Floor 7 Savoy Court London WC2R 0EX

DX: 449 London Chancery Lane Telephone: +44 (0) 207 420 7500

Successfully represented the Claimant in judicial review proceedings challenging a controversial grant of planning permission and listed building consent for

Bristol

30 Queen Square Bristol BS1 4ND



Court of Appeal:	
Kestrel Hydro v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Spelthorne Borough Counc EWCA Civ 784	I [2016]
Successful defence on appeal of the Local Planning Authority's pursuit of enforcement action; the juridical basis for Murfitt and Somak Travel; the ex Bowring and also compliance of ground (F) appeals with Article 1 Protocol 1. Led by Scott Stemp	ent of

Planning Appeals

6



<u>Contrins</u>
Test Part and Progression 2018 in Egy Indicate Artificing the Artificing Artificing Conference and a supply and production of the progression in Artificing Conference and Art
Strikenists or 78 appeals. Leaves in experienced in dualing with contract instance graphic graphic and CE, in particular terinory experience and contraction and subject of the interpretation and the NVG.
Leavan's (1.71 and 1.15's experience) connect to the Experience Connec
comparison. Compa
namer assum in inperiors arrang in inperior manus in unrealization of the production
wody flain riginan Name, Desart Lann, Heslig (NW 700706/W725725WHXT)
C 70 appeal qualited the-relocated glaimining precisioning precisioning precisioning of the relocated glaimining precisioning of a feature contain to response to the relocated process of the disease and the proposation of the appeal and the appeal
100 1 Chapter Chapter 7 (Project
land at Hamadi Princ, Transac (AMP 1755 AMP 20.0151-00) - reducembasion-appeal
This appeal on responsible the refuse of the refuse of the refuse of continue places of the refuse of continue places of the refuse of the ref
Teams Cannot and its injuscious to the august and the language and production and the design of the section of
77 Supposition resignated the melluluid all an authors supposition for a mission supposition for a mission during supposition for a mission supposition for a mission for
33-4-90-hip from and \$22 Holomo Park Republic Re
C70 appeal or required the relocated planning periodicular the demonstrate periodicular planning periodicular processes and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect on the subject of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of the popular demonstrate and appeal and the effect of
Paparasi California (1997) (19
The control of the co
Forest Control State Control S
This paper in required the review of control of the relation of the relati
land of Consulty Timburg, Consulty (DAPP) (2017) (PAPP) (P
Description of a special position part of the property of the
Will be a served from the company of the control of
Outline-joilaning permission for the entire plant in the entire pl
land of Distriction (March 1997 (March 199
Construction (1) the series, or an inflation between the configuration of the configuration o
The control of the first plant and the control of t
Outline-planning perinkision for revision for the revisio
Mare Resear Transport Services, Non-English, Marine Services, Non-English, Marine Services, Non-English, Marine Services, Non-English,
Colletion begin Statistical to an instanction of the respect of the Colleting Statistics of the Colleting Statisti
Land at Littin Spanners, Swinger Common, Christopher (Littin Spanner
Highed application for fail properties for the grant application for the properties for the properties for the properties for the properties of the properti
Feeds held CA, Rinks Lapses Leave Spring Section 1997 (1997
Commission of the Commission o
The of the Innovational Austral, Advance, London Stock, Advance, West Assembly 17,10000 (AVII) 200000 (Control of the Austral
Continue agricultural area and a core development of up the first this challenge agricultural continue agricul
Design and independent for four to indicate on the four training for the four training f
Ablas Wak
Larry strategic abins and assessment of melts can be invasible and larrow ent of melts can be invasible and larrow ent of melts can be invasible and in properties and a proposable in the way for expension of a proposable in the way for expens
cell and custom build develope; whereby a dispose be all unions are to the relatest to which business gap be defined with the WP scale (MP) (272/20/02/2),
Leava's constitution; institution to the foliation of the constitution of the constitu
**Printing as deviced as deviced in relation to the country of the
*Animon is conference and the refusal of distance are control to a state of the control of the c
* William advise for a developer investigation to the expertation or the expertation of policy seguring afficient to be incorporate investigation of the policy of the transit in the expertation of the interview of the interview of the expertation of the interview of the expertation of the interview of the expertation of the interview of the interview of the expertation of the interview of the expertation of the expertation of the interview of the expertation of the
* William advice and advice in conference for a developer in recognit of the lawly proposed of a forecast in a support of a forecast in a
** Administration of the second of the secon
** Till this and an an annumen at a till to income from the proposal intelligent to be proposed in an annumen at a streetment, under the proposal intelligent to be proposed in an annumen at a streetment, under the proposal intelligent to be proposed in an annumen at a streetment, under the proposal intelligent to be proposed in an annumen at a streetment, under the proposal intelligent to be a consistent of a streetment of a s
* Advisiona local alternativa authority in respect of a drift of fill conference of the conference of
* Administry is local planning authority in conference in respect of an application for residential development including entre care proposals and my view as to filely prospects of success.

Residential

Leanne is a very experienced inquiry advocate in respect of planning appeals with a residential element, the main focus of her work being residential development projects, of all sizes. Her experience includes contests on matters relating to green belt, metropolitan open land, green gaps/wedges, landscape, highways and transport, housing land supply, affordable housing including first homes, self and custom house building, extra care, design, viability and heritage. Leanne also has experience since the publication of the NPPF 2024 dealing with Grey Belt.

Leanne has a friendly yet firm approach. She is a team-player, placing all members of her inquiry team at ease whilst working extremely hard to deliver exceptionally high quality work. She is particularly known for her detailed written submissions both in her own right and when led by silks. Her cross examination is thorough and effective, and she is fast and strategic thinker.

Leanne is currently instructed in a number of large inquires yet to be heard. Recent completed inquiries (following 4–6-month maternity leaves in 2019-20 and 2022-23) have included:

- * Acting for the local planning authority at both the first inquiry and redetermination in defending their refusal of outline planning permission for the extension of an existing business park and up to 150 residential dwellings.
- * Acting for the Appellant led by Paul Cairnes K.C. at both the first inquiry and redetermination promoting a mixed-use development including up to 475 residential dwellings.
- * Acting for the Appellant promoting 83 residential apartments across two blocks.
- * Acting for the Appellant led by Christopher Young K.C. promoting up to 53 dwellings
- * Acting for the local planning authority in defending their refusal of outline planning permission for flexible Class E/F2 floorspace, 120 residential dwellings and a shop.
- * Acting for the Appellant led by Peter Goatley K.C. promoting 45 dwellings.
- * Acting for the local planning authority in relation to their refusal of planning permission for 133 dwellings.
- * Acting for the Appellant led by Lord Charles Banner K.C.
- * Acting for the Appellant led by Christopher Young K.C. promoting up to 73 assisted living units (full permission) and up to 60 assisted living units (outline permission) and community space.

7



- * Acting for the Appellant led by Christopher Young K.C. promoting 254 residential units of 4-11 storey development.
- * Acting for the Appellant led by Christopher Young K.C. promoting a mixed use development including up to 625 residential dwellings, employment land and a canal corridor.
- * Acting for the Appellant led by Christopher Young K.C. promoting an extra care development of up to 84 units and communal facilities.
- * Acting for the Appellant led by Christopher Young K.C. promoting 151 residential units of 4-8 storey development.

Please see the 'Planning Appeals' section for further detail of advocacy and advisory work, as well as the 'Judicial and Statutory Review' sections for court work relating to residential schemes.

Planning Enforcement

Leanne regularly acts for local planning authorities, landowners and occupiers in all manner of planning enforcement-related matters. She is frequently instructed to provide early tactical advice to assist parties who either anticipate possible enforcement action or wish to take it, providing strategic advice as to options both short and long term. This includes matters related to enforcement notices, breach of condition notices, stop notices and other forms of action together with pursuing certificates of lawfulness in relation to proposed and retrospective operational development and use.

Leanne is an experienced inquiry advocate regularly representing parties at enforcement appeals pursuant to s.174 of the 1990 Act across all available grounds and often in complex situations involving multiple properties, complicated planning histories, and concerning both operational development and material changes of use.

Leanne also has a wealthof experience advising and representing parties in respect of obtaining lawful development certificates in respect of either proposed or existing operational development or changes of use pursuant to sections 191 and 192 of the 1990 Act. Her work includes assisting in the drafting of submissions and advice at application stage and at the point of a s.195 appeal.

Outside of her advisory and inquiry practice, Leanne also acts for both local planning authorities and landowners/occupier in the context of criminal proceedings in the Magistrates Court throughout the process from initial hearings to trial, and beyond to sentencing.

Please see the 'Planning Appeals' section above and the 'Injunctions and Committal Proceedings' sections below for more detail as to work related to this area.

Recent experience has included:

- * Advising in conference as to the implementation and applicability of two competing planning permissions, substantial completion, potential breach of condition and the likely prospects of success of an application for a certificate of lawfulness relating to both retrospective operational development and use.
- * Representing the Appellant at a s.195 inquiry in relation to the Council's refusal to issue a certificate of lawfulness in respect of the mixed use of land as a) a dwelling with ancillary amenity land and b) commercial use for the repair, maintenance and tuning of motorcycles and other small engine vehicles and equipment. This included strategic advice in conference as well as advocacy at inquiry.
- * Advising in writing as to substantial completion involving a detailed assessment of relevant case law and consideration of the opposing opinion of the Council's in-house legal team.
- * Representing the Appellant at a s.195 inquiry in relation to the Council's refusal to issue a certificate of lawfulness in respect of operational development relating to hardcore and the parking of motorised vehicles including arguments surrounding the extent of the planning unit, intensification and what amounts to a material change.

8



- * Representing a Defendant in relation to criminal proceedings in the Magistrates Court in respect of the breach of enforcement notices resulting in a successful submission of no case to answer at half-time relating to one alleged offence on the basis of legal submissions, an acquittal in relation to another alleged offence, and in due course a good outcome at sentencing in respect of the remaining two offences.
- * Advising in conference and in writing as to the likely prospects of success of an application for a certificate of lawfulness in relation to a houseboat, including detailed consideration of case law and appeal decisions in respect of what constitutes a building and a chattel, and a thorough analysis of opposing counsel's advice with submissions in response.
- * Advising in writing as to an alleged breach of condition and the correct interpretation of said condition together with the likely prospects of obtaining a certificate of lawfulness. My opinion asserted that the correct interpretation of the condition was such that part of the alleged breach was not in fact a breach of condition and the remainder, due to the passage of time, could be made subject to an application for a certificate.
- * Representing a local authority at inquiry in respect of a combined s.174 and s.78 appeal in respect of a Gypsy and Traveller site involving detailed cross examination of an expert witness and analysis of policy.
- * Numerous advices in conference and writing in respect of the prospects of appeal from refusals of s.195 applications and/or enforcement notices as well as the prospects of high court challenge

Injunctions and Committal Proceedings

Leanne is experienced in litigation related to injunctive action. Her background working as an advocate for a large law firm prior to the bar, and ongoing housing-law practice, mean that she has a solid training in civil litigation, the procedure rules and court-based advocacy.

Leanne acts for local planning authorities and occupiers/landowners both in the context of the process of securing/defending interim and final injunctions as well as committal proceedings in the context of alleged breach. Her experience extends beyond injunctions related to planning and into other related areas, as well as acting in committal proceedings in respect of breaches of such injunctions and related to other contempt of court.

Recent work includes:

- * Successfully obtaining an emergency without notice interim injunction pursuant to section 187B of the 1990 Act and section 222 of the Local Government Act 1972, providing urgent drafting and oral advocacy at a remote High Court hearing to secure an emergency planning injunction against numerous Defendants relating to unauthorised encampment.
- * Representing a local planning authority at interlocutory hearings in respect of an ongoing injunctive matters providing strategic and tactical advice for the successful progression of the case as well as negotiating a favourable outcome with the other side;
- * Assisting a local planning authority in drafting and issuing two sets of committal proceedings in respect of breaches of an interim planning injunction at two distinct times during the progression of injunctive proceedings;
- * Providing advice and guidance in conference in respect of intended injunction proceedings including assisting in amendments to the draft claim form, details of claim, application form, draft injunction orders (interim and final) and witness evidence resulting in the local planning authority being able to issue the application in short order;
- * Acting for a Defendant in multi-handed committal proceedings in respect of alleged contempt of court related to dishonesty in court documents. Provided strategic advice and advanced submissions and mitigation on their behalf in the High Court resulting in a) the Court sentencing on the basis of the particular facts the Defendant admitted rather than the more serious contested facts asserted by the Claimant, and b) a much-reduced penalty compared to that anticipated

9



Judicial and Statutory Reviews

With her wealth of inquiry experience, Leanne is frequently instructed to advise professionals and lay clients in respect of merits and strategy relating to both judicial and statutory reviews, as well as providing expert representation at contested hearing. Her dual expertise as both a planning and housing barrister, and her previous broad general civil litigation background, gives her a strong understanding of the litigation process which is particularly helpful when considering court-based action. She understands that some clients benefit from hearing advice in conference rather than (or as well as) in writing which Leanne is happy to accommodate remotely, in chambers or at the offices of those instructing her.

Of course, not all matters make their way to a court room and early advice is invaluable be that in respect of the likely prospects of success of a challenge or the extent to which an already issued claim should be contested. Leanne's advice is sensible, accessible and thorough. She has a keen focus not only on the law but the business practicalities of pursuing or defending a claim and where her advice is not to proceed with a challenge, Leanne is happy to be instructed to advise on strategy and alternative courses of action and which may be available to a client in the longer term.

Recent matters to contested hearing have included:

R (on the application of Captain Lee Jones) v Shropshire Borough Council AC-2024-LON-001634 (unreported – decision pending)

Represented the Claimant in Judicial Review proceedings where the challenge surrounded an allegation that the Defendant Council was out of time to issue a CIL Stop Notice by virtue of s.9 of the Limitation Act 1980 which imposes a statutory time limit of 6 years for actions for sums recoverable by statute. The claim had been commenced by Captain Jones as a litigant in person with the assistance of a McKenzie Friend. Following the refusal of permission on all grounds on the papers, and refusal of permission on all grounds at an oral renewal hearing, Captain Lee appealed to the Court of Appeal and Leanne was instructed on a Direct Access basis to draft a skeleton argument in support. This successfully resulted in the grant of permission to apply for judicial review on one ground. Leanne was then instructed via solicitors to represent Captain Lee Jones at the substantive hearing, a decision in respect of which is pending.

Waverley Borough Council v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government [2024] EWHC 3302 (Admin)

Successfully represented the developer, Sigma Homes, in defending a statutory review brought by the Council pursuant to s.288 of the 1990 Act against the decision of the Secretary of State's Inspector to grant outline planning permission for up to 53 homes. The challenge was brought on the basis of the alleged unlawfulness of the Inspector's conclusion that there was no adverse impact on the Surrey Hills National Landscape it being suggested that he had failed to take account of a material consideration when relying on the context for the existing village as a reason why there would be no harmful effect, namely that he had found that the Development would change the existing context of the village in a harmful way in views from the footpath to the east. The Council also asserted that insufficient reasons had been provided.

Led by Christopher Young K.C., Leanne assisted in liaising with clients, drafting the summary grounds of resistance and skeleton argument, and made oral submissions in Court in respect of the reasons element of the Council's grounds

R. (on the application of Andrew Hill) v Wychavon District Council AC/2024/BHM/000027 (unreported – July 2024)

Successfully represented the Council in defending judicial review proceedings at a renewal hearing for permission. The application was argued at hearing on four of the five grounds: a failure to take into account the correct distance between the Site and Three Gables; irrationality in concluding that the garden area was a paddock; failure to take into account and/or give adequate reasons and/or rationally apply paragraph 8.3.15 of the SPD; and irrationality/inadequate reasoning more broadly.

Captain Lee Jones v Shropshire Borough Council CO/3623/2021 (unreported)

Successfully appealed by way of case stated from an order of DJ Boswell making a liability order against the Appellant. Challenge

10

Birmingham

103 Colmore Row Birmingham B3 3AG

DX: 16075 Fountain Court Birmingham Telephone: +44 (0) 121 606 0500 London

Fifth Floor 7 Savoy Court London WC2R 0EX

DX: 449 London Chancery Lane Telephone: +44 (0) 207 420 7500 Bristol

30 Queen Square Bristol BS1 4ND



surrounded the Judge's conclusion that the Council had properly served the summons in accordance with rule 99(1)(b) of the Magistrates' Court Rules 1981 and the correct interpretation of the wording of that provision.

R. (on the application of Hollings) v Bath and North East Somerset Council [2018] 5 WLUK 375

Successfully represented the Claimant in judicial review proceedings challenging a controversial grant of planning permission and listed building consent for development within the Bath World Heritage Site on heritage and other grounds.

Court of Appeal:

Kestrel Hydro v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Spelthorne Borough Council [2016] EWCA Civ 784

Successful defence on appeal of the Local Planning Authority's pursuit of enforcement action; the juridical basis for Murfitt and Somak Travel; the extent of Bowring and also compliance of ground (F) appeals with Article 1 Protocol 1. Led by Scott Stemp.

In addition to the above, Leanne initially acted in Worthing Borough Council v Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities CO/1221/2022, led by Paul Cairnes K.C., assisting in drafting the summary grounds of resistance to the Council's claim before her maternity leave in summer 2022.

Leanne is also involved in pending actions not presently listed

Plan-making	

Leanne has a wealth of experience at inquiry and in court arguing matters of policy interpretation and application, as well as a strong working knowledge of the NPPF. Indeed, she was involved in the drafting of the Planning and Environmental Bar Association's response to the recent Government consultation in relation to the NPPF 2024 and regularly delivers seminars and talks on local and national policy content and interpretation. She is therefore well-placed to advise as to the drafting of local and neighbourhood plans and other development management documents, as well as in relation to allocations. Leanne is able to make robust submissions in challenging or defending plans and allocations within plans, including scrutiny of the evidence base.

Leanne's most recent instructions have included:

- * Advising a local planning authority post inquiry decision as the impact of the decision on policy interpretation, and the implications for their emerging local plan. Advice in particular relating to required evidence base and the development of appropriate policy.
- * Assisting (led) in advising in relation to multiple sites of different scales and complexities under one common ownership with a view to seeking allocation in the emerging local plans of two local planning authorities respectively.
- * Reviewing and advising on written submissions in the context of emerging local and neighbourhood plans.

Leanne has acted, both led and in her own right, at inquiries relating to motorway service area development and public rights of way. She has also been instructed to secure stopping-up orders in the Magistrates Court (s.116 and s.117 of the 1990 Act) as well as to act for the Highways Authority at public inquiry in the context of s.78 appeals.

Recent work has included:

Gloucestershire

11

Birmingham

103 Colmore Row Birmingham B3 3AG

DX: 16075 Fountain Court Birmingham Telephone: +44 (0) 121 606 0500 London

Fifth Floor 7 Savoy Court London WC2R 0EX

DX: 449 London Chancery Lane Telephone: +44 (0) 207 420 7500 Bristol

30 Queen Square Bristol BS1 4ND



County Council Public Footpath CHL 6, Parish of Leckhampton [ROW/3249302]

2-day inquiry in respect of the proposed stopping up of public right of way.

Land between Junctions 16 and 17 of the M25, near Chalfont St Peter [APP/X0415/W/21/3272171]

Outline application for the erection of a motorway service area including a facilities building, fuel filling station and up to 100-bedroom hotel. 2-week inquiry with issues including metropolitan Green Belt (VSC), landscape, BMV land, veteran trees and ancient woodland, biodiversity, and aviation safety. Represented the Appellant, led by Satnam Choongh.

Awards







Memberships

- RTPI
- PEBA

Appointments

- Past Chair of the RTPI South Coast Young Planners Network Steering Group
- PEBA Committee member

Qualifications

- LLB (Hons) Bristol
- MSc FPC (Open)
- BVC, Bristol Institute of Legal Practice
- Civil and Commercial Mediator, ADR Group

12

Birmingham

103 Colmore Row Birmingham B3 3AG

DX: 16075 Fountain Court Birmingham Telephone: +44 (0) 121 606 0500 London

Fifth Floor 7 Savoy Court London WC2R 0EX

DX: 449 London Chancery Lane Telephone: +44 (0) 207 420 7500 Bristol

30 Queen Square Bristol BS1 4ND



Statutory appeals and Judicial Review

Leanne has experience acting and advising on both judicial review and statutory appeals to the High Court and above. Early advice can be invaluable and Leanne's advice is comprehensive and accessible.

Extra Information

Leanne regularly delivers seminars and training across a broad range of planning topics. As a qualified trainer, she is able to produce more bespoke packages for local authorities, businesses and other organisations.

In addition to her instructions, as past Chair of the South Coast Young Planners Network Leanne remains an active member of the RTPI. She has been invited to speak at seminars and to judge awards.

Encouraging access to the profession is extremely important to Leanne and she frequently speaks at schools as well as to students. She has previously filmed a segment for the RTPI's project with Fun Kidz Radio "Agent Plan-IT" to encourage school aged children to engage with planning. Leanne is also an active mentor.