

Landmark Chambers

Barrister CV


Dan Kolinsky KC



Contact us

clerks@landmarkchambers.co.uk

+44 (0) 20 7430 1221



Dan Kolinsky KC

Call: 1998 Silk: 2015

dkolinsky@landmarkchambers.co.uk

Dan's practice covers planning, local government, public law and rating. He is an experienced Supreme Court advocate and is noted for his advocacy, teamwork and clarity. Dan sits as a Deputy High Court judge and Recorder. He is a CEDR-accredited mediator.



Expertise

Planning, Environment, Public and Administrative, Rating and Valuation

Contact Practice Managers

Ben Connor

020 7421 2483

bconnor@landmarkchambers.co.uk

Michael Gooch

020 7421 1305

mgooch@landmarkchambers.co.uk

Jonathan Barley

020 7421 2480

jbarley@landmarkchambers.co.uk

Richard Bolton

020 7421 1392

rbolton@landmarkchambers.co.uk

Practice Summary

Dan is an experienced advocate at all levels of the Court system, tribunals, and inquiries. His clients include central government, local government, developers, interest groups, ratepayers, commercial organisations, individuals, and NGOs.

He has appeared in leading cases on affordable housing, planning contributions, green belt and the interpretation of planning policy including two planning Supreme Court cases. He has appeared in six Supreme Court rating cases.

Planning: Dan is an experienced planning inquiry advocate. He has extensive experience in High Court planning cases for claimants, developers, local and central government. He has particular expertise in regeneration projects in London, for example the regeneration of the **Elephant and Castle** (Southwark) and **High Road West Masterplan** (Haringey) and affordable housing viability, for example representing LB Islington in the **Parkhurst Road** case. He accepts instructions on behalf of developers, local planning authorities, statutory bodies, local groups or any other participant in the planning process. He has appeared as advocate in the Supreme Court in two recent cases; **Lambeth v Secretary of State**, and **R (Samuel Smith Old Brewery) v North Yorkshire County Council**. He was advocate for the successful local planning authority in the leading case on NHS planning contributions **R (University Hospitals of Leicester NHS) v Harborough District Council**. He advises planning authorities in respect of local plans and infrastructure projects.

Rating: Dan frequently appears in non-domestic rating cases acting for ratepayer, valuation officers and billing authorities. He has considerable experience in cases relating to whether the rating list entries are correct, exemption issues, completion notices, unoccupied rates disputes, valuation issues and collection/enforcement. He has appeared in six recent Supreme Court cases (**Nuffield Health, Cardtronics, Iceland, Monk, Woolway and UKI Kingsway**). He was made an honorary member of the Rating Surveyors' Association in 2017. He has recorded a series of rating podcasts linked below:

- [The Supreme Court's decision in the ATM cases – key points](#)
- [Completion Notices](#)
- [Using judicial review to bring rating challenges](#)
- [Preparing expert evidence in rating cases](#)
- [Collection and enforcement of non-domestic rates](#)
- [Home offices and non-domestic rates](#)
- [Rating law history.](#)

Environment: Dan has extensive experience of High Court challenges to complex environmental projects (including waste facilities) – acting for and against the decision making bodies

Public Law (including Local Government): Dan is a versatile public lawyer who has acted in a wide range of areas across all aspects of judicial review, local government, regulatory law, welfare benefits and funding challenges. He is a suitable choice for a case which needs an experienced advocate who is willing to work as part of a team and bring clarity and focus to the oral presentation of a case. He advised the Airports Commission throughout his process. Before he took silk, he served on the Attorney General's Panel of Junior Counsel (A, B and C panels) for 12 years.

Advocacy before Tribunals: Dan has extensive experience appearing in before the Upper Tribunal and First-tier Tribunals across a full range of areas including education, care standards and all aspects of social security law.

Mediation and Other Projects: Dan is interested in mediation (participating or acting as mediator) and is willing to be considered for specific projects which required an experienced KC with his skill set and experience

Approach to Work: Dan's style is collaborative and unstuffy. He wants to understand what his clients are seeking to achieve and establish clear parameters about what is realistic. He manages his time to deliver the best service possible for his clients.

Life outside of Chambers: Dan is a keen cyclist and enjoys walking. He has been involved in school governance for 18 years and was the Chair of the Board of Directors of BMAT Education, an 11 school multi-academy trust based in Essex and East

London.

Planning

High Court Planning cases:

- Dan appeared as advocate for North Yorkshire County Council in their successful appeal to the Supreme Court concerning the meaning on openness in national planning policy for mineral extraction in the green belt (***R (Samuel Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster)) v North Yorkshire County Council*** [2020] UKSC 3).
- Advocate for the Secretary of State in the Supreme Court case of ***Lambeth v Secretary of State*** [2019] 1 WLR 4317 concerning the interpretation of planning conditions.
- ***R (Parkhurst Road Limited) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2018] EWHC 991 (Admin) – successfully acted for Islington in leading case on approach to benchmark land value in determining affordable housing viability.
- Dan acted as advocate for the successful local planning authority (together with NHS specialist David Lock KC) in the leading case on NHS planning contributions ***R (University Hospitals of Leicester NHS) v Harborough District Council*** [2023] EWHC 263 (Admin). Holgate J decided that the Claimant had not established that there would be a funding gap in its representations to the Defendant planning authority. He held that Harborough District Council had acted lawfully in granting planning permission without the contribution. This is the first time that the High Court has considered the approach to s.106 contributions in respect of NHS services. The decision adds valuable guidance in respect of an issue which has been live at planning appeals in recent years.
- ***R (Tottenham Hotspur FC) v LB Haringey*** [2023] EWHC 2569 (Admin) – acted for Haringey in its successful defence of a judicial review challenge brought by Spurs to the grant of planning permission for the High Road West masterplan regeneration scheme.
- ***RB Kingston-upon-Thames v SSLUHC*** [2023] EWHC 2055 (Admin) – acted for Kingston in its successful High Court challenge to quash the grant of planning permission for a traveller site in the green belt.
- ***R (Flynn) v London Borough Southwark*** [2019] EWHC 3575 and 2021 EWCA Civ 827 – acted for Southwark Council successfully defending this judicial review challenge to the redevelopment of the Elephant and Castle shopping centre and wider area in the Planning Court and Court of Appeal.
- ***Sharp v Environment Agency*** [2017] 1 WLR 3789 (CA) – acted for Environment Agency successful defence of a challenge to its exercise of powers of entry to undertake flood defence works.
- ***Broadview Energy Developments Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2016] EWCA Civ 562 – acting for the Secretary of State successfully defending apparent bias challenged based on contact between local MP and minister in parliament. The case gives leading guidance on how MPs should conduct themselves in lobbying on behalf of their constituents.
- ***Aldergate Properties Ltd v Mansfield DC*** [2016] EWHC 1670 (Admin) – represented Claimant in successful judicial review challenge to the planning authority's approach to the sequential test for retail development.

- ***R. (on the application of Spitalfields Historic Trust Ltd) v Mayor of London*** [2016] EWHC 1006 (Admin) – acted for the Mayor of London in successful defence of the first challenge to the exercise of his powers to act as local planning authority.
- ***R. (on the application of Nicholson) v Allerdale BC*** [2015] EWHC 2510 (Admin) – represented the Claimant in challenge to noise conditions imposed in motor sport testing planning permission.
- ***R. (on the application of Powell) v Brighton Marina Co Ltd*** [2015] EWCA Civ 650 acted for Defendants (led by Richard Drabble KC) successfully defending judicial review claim (at first instance and in the Court of Appeal) concerning the redevelopment of Brighton Marina.
- ***Turner v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2015] EWCA Civ 582 – acting for the Secretary of State in his successful defence (at first instance and in the Court of Appeal) of challenge to the redevelopment of the Shell Centre which alleged apparent bias in the way that the Planning Inspector had conducted the planning inquiry.
- ***Ecotricity (Next Generation) Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2015] EWCA Civ 657 – acting for the Secretary of State in successful defence of challenge to wind turbine development at first instance and in the Court of Appeal.
- ***Battersea Park Action Group*** – represented residents group in judicial review challenge concerning the future of Formula E event at Battersea Park.
- ***Arsenal Football Club Plc v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2014] EWHC 2620 (Admin) – represented Arsenal in High Court planning challenge relating to concerns at the Emirates Stadium.
- ***R (on the application of Trashorfield Ltd) v Bristol City Council*** [2014] EWHC 757 (Admin) – represented for local action group challenging redevelopment of current Bristol Rovers stadium as supermarket.
- ***R (Ashley) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2012] EWCA 559 – acted for the Claimant who succeeded in the Court of Appeal in contending that the planning Inspectorate had breached the principles of natural justice in determining a planning appeal by written representations in circumstances which gave him no opportunity to comment upon expert noise evidence which had been adduced by the developer.
- ***R (Halebank Parish Council) v Halton Borough Council*** [2012] EWHC 1889 – acting for the Parish Council in their successful judicial review challenge to Halton BC's grant of planning permission for a large warehouse (for Amazon). The Parish Council also succeeded in their argument that they were entitled to a protective costs order in these proceedings.
- ***R (Sellars) v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council*** [2013] EWHC 5673 (Admin) – acted for claimants successfully challenging by way of judicial review the grant of a certificate of lawfulness in respect of the flying of model aircrafts.
- ***Stadium Holdings (No 2) Limited v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2013] EWHC 3548 (Admin) – acted for the Claimant in its successful s.288 challenge to enforcement action against an advertising display.
- ***Kensington and Chelsea RBC v of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2010] EWCA 1466 – acted for the developer who succeeded in the Court of Appeal in upholding an Inspector's approach to viability in granting planning permission for residential development without a contribution to affordable housing. The Secretary of State had conceded the claim but the grant of planning permission was restored by the Court of Appeal.
- ***Islington LBC v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2014] EWHC (Admin) – acted for successful developer resisting challenge brought by the claimant to the grant of planning permission for the redevelopment of

the public house, The Good Intent.

- **R (Gray) v LB Southwark** [2012] EWCA Civ 1738 – acted for Southwark in the High Court and Court of Appeal successfully resisting the claimant’s challenge to the grant of permission for the redevelopment of London Bridge station.
- **R (Godfrey) v LB Southwark** [2012] EWCA 500 – acted for Southwark in the High Court and Court of Appeal to their successful defence of this challenge to the redevelopment of a site at Canada Water. This is a leading case on the limited scope for legitimate expectations in planning cases.
- **Hertfordshire County Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government** [2012] EWCA Civ 1473 acting for the Secretary of State in the Court of Appeal and High Court successfully defending the Inspector’s decision that there had been no breach of planning control due to the intensification of activity at a scrap yard.
- **Williams v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government** [2013] EWCA Civ 958 – acting for Secretary of State successfully defending in the Court of Appeal an Inspector’s decision requiring the demolition of an agricultural building erected in breach of planning control.
- **Aston v State for Communities and Local Government** [2013] EWHC 1936 – represented the Secretary of State successfully defending this s.288 challenge to the lawfulness of the EIA screening process and other grounds.
- **R (Ortona) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government** [2009] EWCA Civ 863 [2010] 1 P&CR 15 – represented the successful claimant in the High Court and Court of Appeal proceedings of the s.288 claim quashing the Planning Inspector’s decision on grounds of apparent bias.
- **R (Rooff) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government** [2011] EWCA 435 – represented the Secretary of State in the High Court and Court of Appeal in respect of this challenge under s.21 of the Land Compensation Act 1961 to the terms of the certificate of appropriate alternative development granted to the Claimant in respect of the acquisition of its site for the purposes of the 2012 Olympics.
- **R (Murrell) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government** [2010] EWCA Civ 1367 – acted for the Secretary of State in the High Court and Court of Appeal in respect of this s.288 challenge to the refusal of prior approval for an agricultural building under the General Permitted Development Order. The case raises issues of importance in respect of the nature of permitted development rights.
- **R (Majed) v LB Camden** [2010] J.P.L. 621 (CA) – represented the interested party who successfully opposed the quashing of planning permission despite an error by the council in the consultation process. This is a leading case on the scope for legitimate expectations arising from promises in statements of community involvement.
- **R (Aldergate Projects Ltd) v Nottinghamshire County Council** [2009] JPL 939 – acted for successful Claimant quashing the County Council’s grant of planning permission to itself for the redevelopment of Mansfield bus station.
- **R. (on the application of Springhall) v Richmond upon Thames LBC** [2007] 1 P. & C.R. 30 (CA) – represented the successful local planning authority in the High Court and Court of Appeal in this leading case on delegated decision making powers.
- **R. (on the application of Tratt) v Horsham DC** [2007] EWHC 1485 (Admin) – represented the successful claimant in challenge quashing the council’s decision because of defective summary reasons for the grant of planning permission.

- **Roy Granville Thomas v Welsh Ministers** [2009] EWHC 1734 (Admin)- represented the claimant in this successful s.288 challenge to quash the refusal of advertising consent.
- **R. (on the application of East Hertfordshire DC) v First Secretary of State** [2007] EWHC 834 (Admin); [2007] J.P.L. 1304 – acted for Secretary of State in case concerning the scope of issue estoppels in planning enforcement cases.
- **R. (on the application of Pridmore) v Salisbury DC** [2005] 1 P. & C.R. 32 – represented the successful claimant in the judicial review to quash the grant of planning permission due to defects in the notification procedure.
- **R. (on the application of Chisnell) v Richmond upon Thames LBC** [2005] EWHC 134 (Admin); J.P.L. 2005, Aug, 1103-1105– represented the successful claimant in challenge quashing the council’s decision because of defective summary reasons for the grant of planning permission.
- **Harris v First Secretary of State** [2007] EWHC 1847 (Admin); [2008] J.P.L. 538 – acted for Claimant in High Court challenge concerning the specific health impact of telecoms mast on a vulnerable claimant.
- **R. (on the application of Islington LBC) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government** [2008] EWHC 1289 (Admin) – acted for LB Islington in its High Court challenge concerning the application by the Secretary of State of their affordable housing policy.
- **Nero Holdings v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government** [2009] EWHC 749 (Admin) – represented Secretary of State in his successful defence of High Court challenge to decision to uphold an enforcement notice served on Café Nero due to breaches of Epping Forest District Council’s retail frontages policy.
- **MR Dean & Sons (Edgware) Ltd v First Secretary of State** [2007] EWCA Civ 1083; [2008] A.C.D. 13 [2008] JPL 973 – represented the successful Secretary of State in the High Court and Court of Appeal (led by Nathalie Lieven KC) in case which gives guidance on decision making under PPS1 and the immateriality of the impact on ransom value in determining planning applications.
- **R. (on the application of Bedford) v Islington LBC** [2003] Env LR 22 – acted for Arsenal FC in their successful defence of this High Court challenge to the planning permission granted for the Emirates stadium (led by Christopher Katkowski KC).
- **R. v Tower Hamlets LBC Ex p. Barratt Homes Ltd** [2000] J.P.L. 1050 – High Court challenge to legality of affordable housing policy (led by Christopher Lockhart-Mummery KC and Christopher Katkowski KC).

Infrastructure

Notable experience:

- Dan represented the London Borough of Islington in the Parkhurst Road inquiry in which the Council successfully argued that the developer’s affordable housing offer was insufficient. This is a leading case on the approach to benchmark land value in affordable housing viability assessments. He also appeared for Islington in the successful defence of the developer’s High Court challenge to that decision [2018] EWHC 991 (Admin).
- Secured planning permission on appeal for Welbeck Land for 125 houses in Faringdon, Vale of White Horse (issues at inquiry included s.106 contributions and affordable housing viability).
- Successfully represented Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea at the inquiry into the proposed redevelopment of the William Sutton Estate which clarified the expectations for affordable housing in the context of the regeneration of social

housing estates.

- Represented the Mayor of London at the inquiry into a proposed SRFI at Howbury Park. The Mayor succeeded in his opposition to the scheme.
- Represented the London Borough of Enfield at the London Plan Examination in Public in 2019.
- Knockholt Station yard – acted for waste transfer station successfully obtaining planning permission for the continued operation of a waste transfer station on a site within the green belt.
- Pentonville Road – acted for LB Islington successfully opposing the redevelopment proposal on the grounds of its impact on neighbouring properties on daylight and sunlight grounds.
- Former Moorfields School – acted for LB Islington successfully opposing a redevelopment proposal on grounds including its impact on the heritage asset, Bunhill Fields.
- Cambridge Argos – secured consent for mezzanine expansion to out of centre store.
- Michael Shanly Homes – secured various consent for housing schemes, secured award of costs against local planning authority for seeking unreasonable s.106 contributions.
- Represented London Boroughs of Islington, Southwark, Lewisham, Lambeth, Waltham Forest, Hounslow, and Richmond at planning inquiries for mixed use schemes within London – examples include Canada Water site E and Mulberry Business Park (resisted mixed use schemes), 185 Park Street – resisted tall building adjacent to Tate Modern, resisted modification of s.106 agreement in respect of railway link bridge in Walthamstow, represented LB Islington in respect of redevelopment proposals in respect of the Turnmills site in Clerkenwell.
- Recent experience of inquiries involving brownfield housing sites, listed building and conservation issues, affordable housing viability, enforcement, noise, trees, contentious s.106 contributions, waste, sheltered housing for the elderly, student accommodation, country houses, telecommunications masts, gypsy sites and travelling showmen’s winter quarters.

Local Plans

Dan represented the London Borough of Enfield at the London Plan EiP in 2019. He has experience of advising a number of London Boroughs in the preparation of their local plans.

Environment

Notable cases:

- Dan appeared as advocate for North Yorkshire County Council in their successful appeal to the Supreme Court concerning the meaning on openness in national planning policy for mineral extraction in the green belt (***R (Samuel Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster)) v North Yorkshire County Council*** [2020] UKSC 3).
- ***Sharp v North Essex Magistrates Court and Environment Agency*** [2017] 1 WLR 3787 (CA) – represented the Environment Agency successfully defending a challenge to the exercise of its powers of entry to undertake floor defence works in the Court of Appeal and High Court.

- ***R. (on the application of Powell) v Brighton Marina Co Ltd*** [2015] EWCA Civ 650 acted for Defendants (led by Richard Drabble KC) successfully defending judicial review claim (at first instance and in the Court of Appeal) concerning the redevelopment of Brighton Marina.
- ***Energie Est Lds v Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change*** [2013] EWHC 3026 – acted for the Secretary of State successfully resisting the Claimant’s challenge to the decision that the Claimant’s product was certified under the Microgeneration Certification Scheme.
- ***Aston v State for Communities and Local Government*** [2013] EWHC 1936 – represented the Secretary of State successfully defending this s.288 challenge to the lawfulness of the EIA screening process and other grounds.
- ***Hertfordshire County Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2012] EWCA Civ 1473 acting for the Secretary of State in the Court of Appeal and High Court successfully defending the Inspector’s decision that there had been no breach of planning control due to the intensification of activity at a scrap yard.
- ***Ardley Against Incineration v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2011] EWHC 2230 – acted for the Secretary of State successfully resisting this challenge to the grant of planning permission for an energy for waste facility.
- ***Coronation Power v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2011] EWHC 2216 (Admin) – acted for the Secretary of State successfully defending the decision to refuse planning permission for wind turbines at a sensitive site in Cornwall.
- ***Harrison v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2009] EWHC 3382 (Admin); [2010] Env. L.R. 17 – acted for the Secretary of State successfully resisting challenge to planning enforcement decision in the High Court. This case raised important issues in respect of the relationship between planning control and pollution control regimes.
- ***Palm Developments v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2009] 2 P&CR 16 – acted for the successful Secretary of State defending this High Court challenge. This is the leading case on what constitutes a “tree” with the tree preservation order legislation.
- ***R (Mageean) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2010] EWHC 2652 (Admin) and [2011] EWCA 863 – represented the Claimant in this s.288 claim in the High Court and Court of Appeal in this challenge to the Secretary of State’s grant of planning permission for a wind turbine. The claim was based on the failure to re-consider a screening direction that an environmental impact assessment was not required which had been made several years earlier and prior to the designation of a world heritage site in the locality of the proposed development.
- ***R (Dry) v West Oxfordshire DC – High Court*** [2010] EWHC 1758 (Admin); Court of Appeal [2010] EWCA Civ 1143 – represented the Claimant (instructed by Richard Buxton solicitors) in this challenge to the legality of the District Council’s grant of planning permission for 100 houses. The challenge focussed on the Council’s application of the sequential test in PPS 25 for allocating sites to the lowest area of flood and the Council’s environment impact assessments decision making process.
- ***R (Lewes Friends of the Earth) v East Sussex CC*** [2009] Env LR 11 – acting for developer successful resisting this judicial review challenge into grant of planning permission for incinerator in Newhaven (led by David Holgate KC).
- ***R. (on the application of Wandsworth LBC) v Secretary of State for Transport*** [2005] EWHC 20 (Admin); [2006] 1 E.G.L.R. 91 [2005] JPL 1635 – acted for partly successful claimants in challenge to the legality of the Civil Aviation White

Paper (led by David Smith).

- ***R. (on the application of Fisher) v English Nature*** [2005] 1 W.L.R. 147 – Court of Appeal decision relating to sites of scientific importance and their relationship with special protection areas under EU legislation (led by David Holgate KC).
- ***R. (on the application of Little) v Secretary of State for Trade and Industry*** [2002] EWHC 3001 (Admin) – acted for developers successfully defending challenge to grant of planning permission for electricity generating station (led by Christopher Katkowski KC).

Public and Administrative

Notable cases:

- ***Broadview Energy Developments Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2016] EWCA Civ 562 – acting for the Secretary of State successfully defending apparent bias challenged based on contact between local MP and minister in parliament. The case gives leading guidance on how MPs should conduct themselves in lobbying on behalf of their constituents.
- ***Turner v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*** [2015] EWCA Civ 582 – acting for the Secretary of State in his successful defence (at first instance and in the Court of Appeal) of challenge to the redevelopment of the Shell Centre which alleged apparent bias in the way that the planning Inspector had conducted the planning inquiry.
- ***Sanders v Airports Commission*** [2013] EWHC 3754 (Admin) – represented for the Airports Commission in its successful defence of this judicial review claim brought on behalf of Stop Stansted expansion contending that the Airports Commission's process had been tainted by apparent bias.
- ***Energie Est Lds v Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change*** [2013] EWHC 3026 – acted for the Secretary of State successfully resisting the Claimant's challenge to the decision that the Claimant's product was certified under the Microgeneration Certification Scheme.
- ***Rowley v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*** [2007] 1 W.L.R. 2861 – acted for Secretary of State in leading case establishing that the Child Support Agency does not owe a duty of care so as to give rise to negligence liability in respect of the assessment or enforcement of child support maintenance (led by Nigel Giffin KC).
- ***Rhondda Cynon Taff CBC v Watkins*** [2003] 1 W.L.R. 1864 – acted for Council in this Court of Appeal case regarding the raising of public law defences and the process of acquiring land compulsorily (led by Joseph Harper KC).
- ***Gorlov v Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales*** [2002] EWHC 2202 (Admin); [2003] A.C.D. 1 – acted for claimant in this challenge to the ICA's conduct of disciplinary proceedings (led by Joseph Harper KC).
- ***R. (on the application of Mooney) v Southwark LBC*** [2006] EWHC 1912 (Admin); (2006) 9 C.C.L. Rep. 670 – acted for claimant in community care judicial review.
- ***Alcoa Minerals of Jamaica Inc v Broderick*** [2002] 1 A.C. 371 (Privy Council) – acted for claimant in these proceedings relating to the mitigation and the assessment of damages (on appeal to the Privy Council from the Court of Appeal of Jamaica) (led by John Cherryman KC).

Human Rights and Civil Liberties

Notable cases:

- ***M v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*** [2006] 2 A.C. 91 – acted for Secretary of State in this House of Lords case concerning approach to ambit and article 8 (concerned challenge to the treatments of same sex relationship within child support formula) (led by Philip Sales KC)
- ***J. M. v. UK*** (*Application no. 37060/06*) – acted for UK government in these Strasbourg proceedings following the decision of the House of Lords in *M v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions* [2006] 2 A.C. 91.
- ***Gallagher (Valuation Officer) v Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints*** [2008] 1 W.L.R. 1852 (HL) – acted for the Valuation Officer in case concerning challenge by Mormon Church to imposition of tax (non-domestic rates) on the Mormon Temple at Preston (led by Tim Mould KC).
- ***Francis v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*** [2006] 1 W.L.R. 3202 (CA) – represented Secretary of State in this Court of Appeal case relating to an article 14 challenge relating to entitled to social security benefit in the form of a maternity grant under the Social Fund Maternity and Funeral Expenses (General) Regulations 1987 Reg.5.
- ***Bexley LBC v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions*** [2001] EWHC Admin 323; [2001] J.P.L. 1442 (Note) – human rights challenge to legality of CPO (led by Christopher Lockhart-Mummery KC).
- ***R. (on the application of Friends Provident Life Office) v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions*** [2002] 1 W.L.R. 1450 – human rights challenge to local authority decision making establishes objectors to planning process have their article 6 rights engaged (led by Christopher Katkowski KC).
- ***Tonbridge and Malling BC v Davis*** [2004] EWCA Civ 194 – acted for travelling showmen in human rights challenged to the grant of an injunction against them for breaches of planning control (led by Richard Drabble KC).

Local Government including Local Government Finance

Notable cases:

- ***R (Luton BC and others) v Secretary of State for Education*** [2011] EWHC 217 (Admin)– acted for Luton BC and Nottingham City Council in their successful judicial review challenges to the withdrawal of funding for BSF (Building Schools for the Future) projects (led by Richard Drabble KC).
- ***Basey v Oxford City Council*** [2012] EWCA Civ 115 – represented the successful claimant in the Upper Tribunal and Court of Appeal in this leading case on the meaning of sheltered accommodation within the housing benefit regulations (instructed by the Child Poverty Action Group).
- ***North Somerset Council v Honda Motor Europe Limited and others*** [2010] EWHC 1505 (QB); [2010] R.A. 285 – represented Martin Graham, one of the Defendants, in this test case on the recoverability of non-domestic rates where there had been delays in their enforcement by the billing authority. This was a test case heard in the High Court over seven days. Mr Graham's case succeeded and the judge ruled that none of the rates at issue were recoverable from him. The case gives guidance on the approach to prejudice in cases of attempted recovery by billing authorities who have not acted promptly.

- ***Chilton Merryweather (VO) v Hunt and others*** [2009] Env LR 16; [2008] RA 357 – acted for listing officer in his successful appeal to the Court of Appeal in respect of grounds for review of council tax bands (led by Tim Mould KC).
- ***R (Bridgnorth District Council) v Secretary of State for Social Security*** (led by Richard Drabble KC) acted for successful Claimants who challenged the legality of the Secretary of State’s approach to the recovery of overpaid housing benefit subsidy. The claim was conceded by the Secretary of State during the High Court proceedings and a new policy subsequently published. He acted (also with Richard Drabble KC) in the subsequent litigation in ***R. (on the application of Isle of Anglesey CC) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*** [2003] EWHC 2518 (Admin); [2004] B.L.G.R. 614 and ***R. (on the application of Lambeth LBC) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*** [2005] EWHC 637; [2005] B.L.G.R. 764.
- ***Durham CC v Darlington BC*** [2003] EWHC 2598; [2004] B.L.G.R. 311 – acted for Darlington Borough Council in these High Court proceedings relating to the challenge to the arbitrator’s award made in their favour following an arbitration to determine unresolved financial and property consequences of this local government reorganisation.

Social Security

Notable cases:

- ***Basey v Oxford City Council*** [2012] EWCA Civ 115 – represented the successful claimant in the Upper Tribunal and Court of Appeal in this leading case on the meaning of sheltered accommodation within the housing benefit regulations (instructed by the Child Poverty Action Group).
- ***M v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*** [2006] 2 A.C. 91 – acted for Secretary of State in House of Lords proceedings concerning alleged discrimination against same sex couples in the application of aspects of the child support maintenance formula (led by Philip Sales KC).
- ***Hinchy v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*** [2005] 1 W.L.R. 967 – acted for Secretary of State in his successful appeal to the House of Lords in respect of the recovery of overpaid benefits (led by Richard Drabble KC).
- ***Secretary of State for Work and Pensions v Yates*** [2009] EWCA Civ 479; [2009] Pens LR 217 – acted for Secretary of State in his successful appeal to the Court of Appeal concerning the uprating of pensions paid to persons abroad.
- ***Moyna v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*** [2003] 1 W.L.R. 1929– acted for Claimant in House of Lords case relating to the “cooking test” for lower rate disability living allowance care component. This is a leading case on the scope for review of tribunals in social security cases. (led by Richard Drabble KC in the House of Lords proceedings).
- ***Campbell v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*** [2005] EWCA Civ 989 – Court of Appeal case concerning absence of appeal rights for incapacity appeals under international arrangements with Jamaica (led by Richard Drabble KC).
- ***R. (on the application of Steele) v Birmingham City Council*** [2006] 1 W.L.R. 2380 (CA) and ***R(Balding) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*** [2008] 1 W.L.R. 564 (CA) – acted for the Secretary of State in this pair of cases relating to the relationship between bankruptcy and the recovery of overpaid benefit.
- ***R. (on the application of Barber) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions*** [2002] EWHC 1915 (Admin); [2002] 2 F.L.R. 1181 – acted for Claimant in challenge relating to child benefit in shared care arrangements (led by Richard Drabble KC).

Dan appeared in the following Court of Appeal cases relating to social security:

- **Batty v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions** [2005] EWCA Civ 1746 (acting for Claimant).
- **Secretary of State for Work and Pensions v Miah** [2003] 4 All E.R. 702 (CA) (acting for Claimant).
- **Tula Miah v The Secretary of State for Social Security** [2002] EWCA Civ 592(acting for Claimant).
- **Casewell v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions** [2008] EWCA Civ 524; [2008] 11 CCL Rep 684 (acting for Claimant).
- **Fryer-Kelsey v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions** [2005] EWCA Civ 511 (for Secretary of State).
- **Secretary of State for Work and Pensions v Menary-Smith** [2006] EWCA Civ 1751 (for Secretary of State).

Rating and Valuation

Notable cases:

- **Nuffield Health v LB Merton** (Supreme Court Hearing March 2023) – acted for charity in leading Court of Appeal case on approach to public benefit for the purpose of mandatory charitable relief from rates – successful in High Court proceedings obtaining declaration as to its entitlement to mandatory charitable relief and securing the repayment of overpaid rates and upheld the Court of Appeal. Appeared as advocate for Nuffield Health in the Supreme Court hearing in March 2023.
- **Cardtronics UK Limited and others v Sykes (VO)** [2020] UKSC 21 – appeared as advocate for Cardtronics who were successful in the Supreme Court opposing the separate rateability of ATMs in convenience stores in this test case (Dan acted for Cardtronics at all stages of the litigation).
- **Iceland Food Ltd v Berry (VO)** [2018] 1 WLR 1277 – represented Iceland in its challenge to the rateability of air handling plant. Dan represented Iceland throughout the proceedings including acting as advocate in its successful appeal in the Supreme Court.
- **Monk v Newbiggin (VO)** [2017] 1 W.L.R. 851 – represented the Rating Surveyors Association and British Property Federation in their successful intervention in support of the ratepayers appeal in the Supreme Court. The case concerned the valuation treatment of buildings undergoing refurbishment.
- **Woolway (Valuation Officer) v Mazars LLP** [2015] UKSC 53 – represented the Valuation Officer (led by Tim Morshead KC) in seminal Supreme Court case on the identification of the hereditament in the rating list.
- **UKI (Kingsway) Limited v Westminster City Council** [2018] UKSC 67 – Acted for the ratepayer throughout the proceedings including in the Supreme Court – test case on the service of completion notices.
- **Jackson (VO) v Canary Wharf Ltd** [2019] UKUT 136 (LC) – represented successful ratepayers in follow up case to Monk concerning the valuation of major office buildings undergoing refurbishment.
- **Ricketts (VO) v Cyxtera Technology UK Ltd** [2021] UKUT 265 (LC) – acted for ratepayer in valuation case about when space within a data centre is capable of beneficial occupation.
- **Interoute Vtesse Limited v Gidman (VO)** [2020] UKUT 0013 (LC) – appeared for successful valuation officer in case about the valuation of telecommunications networks and whether the approach was in breach of EU law.

- **Lamb v Go Outdoors Ltd** [2015] UKUT 366 (LC) – represented Go Outdoors in valuation dispute before the Upper Tribunal.
- **Hardman v British Gas Trading Ltd** [2015] UKUT 53 (LC) – acted for valuation officer (led by Tim Morshead KC) in case concerning valuation of power stations and the appropriate assumptions to make in respect of the hypothetical tenancy in the statutory rating hypothesis.
- **GPS (Great Britain) Ltd v Bird (VO)** [2013] UKUT 527 (LC) (also known as Fosse Park) – represented seven retailers who succeeded in their contention that the rateable value of their retail warehouses at Fosse Park should be reduced by 10% to reflect a material change of circumstances constituting the improvement to retail facilities in Leicester city centre when the Highcross extension opened.
- **Aviva Investment Properties v Whitby (VO)** [2013] UKUT 430 (LC) – represented ratepayers who succeeded in contending that warehouse properties should be deleted from the rating list in the absence of the service of a completion notice as they were not capable of beneficial occupation.
- **Jamieson (VO) v Eon plc** [2013] UKUT 369 (LC) – represented Eon plc who succeeded in its contention that Enfield power station and the pipeline serving it should be entered into the rating list as a single hereditament.
- **Esso v Walker (VO)** [2013] UKUT 52 (LC) – represented the valuation officer in these proceedings concerning how a motorway service station should be entered in the rating list.
- **Kenya Aid Programme v Sheffield City Council** [2013] 3 WLR 422 (DC) – represented the ratepayer charity in this leading Divisional Court case on charitable relief for occupied property.
- **Porter v Gladman (VO)** [2011] UKUT 204 – represented the successful ratepayer in this leading case which decided that office premises could not be entered into the rating list without the service of a completion notice where they were not in a physical state that rendered them capable of beneficial occupation.
- **North Somerset Council v Honda Motor Europe Ltd and Martin Graham** [2010] EWHC 1505 (QB) – represented the successful ratepayer, Mr Graham, in his defence of this claim for the recovery of rates. This is the leading case on the circumstances in which a billing authority can recover rates where there have been delays in serving demand notices.
- **Harrods v Humphries (VO)** (2013 VTE decision)– represented the successful valuation officer in the Valuation Tribunal proceedings relating to the correct rateable value of Harrods.
- **Gallagher (Valuation Officer) v Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints** [2008] 1 W.L.R. 1852 (HL)– acted for the Valuation Officer throughout this litigation which established that the Mormon Temple at Preston was not exempt from rates. Acted as advocate in the Lands Tribunal and Court of Appeal; led by Tim Mould KC in the House of Lords.
- **Leda Properties v Howells (VO)** [2009] RA 165 – represented the Valuation Officer in the Lands Tribunal and successfully opposed the ratepayers' appeal in respect of a proposal to delete the entry of a computer centre from the rating list on grounds of obsolescence.
- **Ebury (VO) v Central Methodist Church** [2009] R.A. 239 – rateability case concerning whether a café and bookshop within church complex were exempt from rates as part of a church hall.
- **Tuplin (VO) v Cheetham** [2010] R.A. 217 – acted for successful Valuation Officer in proceedings concerning whether DIY livery stables qualified for exemption from rates under the relevant agricultural exemption provisions.

- **Trunkfield (VO) v LB Camden** [2010] UKUT 291 (LC) – acted for successful Valuation Officer in this case to determine whether adjoining offices should be entered on the rating list as a single hereditament or 2 separate hereditaments
- **Allen (VO) v Mansfield District Council** [2008] RA 338 – acted for successful Valuation Officer in case relating to the rateability of district heating systems.
- **Selfridges Retail Ltd v Humphries (VO)** [2010] R.A. 260 – acted for Valuation Officer in this case to determine the rateable value of Selfridges department store in Oxford Street (led by Tim Mould KC).
- **Harrods Ltd v Baker (Valuation Officer)** [2007] R.A. 247 acted for Valuation Officer in this case to determine the rateable value of Harrods department store in Oxford Street (led by Tim Mould KC).
- **Tully v Jorgensen (Valuation Officer)** [2003] R.A. 233 – acted for successful ratepayer in this test case on the rateability of home offices.

Qualifications

Dan graduated from Wadham College, Oxford with a first class degree in jurisprudence.

Before coming to the Bar, he taught contract law at Queen Mary and Westfield College and Mansfield College, Oxford and completed 2-year training contract at Anthony Gold Solicitors. He has also been a Judicial Assistant to the Court of Appeal.

Recommendations

"Dan is very dedicated, hard-working and picks up things immediately.", "He provides very sensible advice on difficult technical matters."

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2024

"He is fantastic - a real star."

Rating and Valuation, Chambers and Partners, 2024

"He is one of the most naturally clear written advocates and a brilliant lawyer."

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2024

"Very effective both as advocate and in consultation."

Local Government (including Rating Law), Legal 500, 2024

"Dan possesses great awareness and insight, and is approachable, practical, and thorough. Advocacy is certainly one of Dan's strong points. His delivery is precise, focused, friendly and effective."

Planning, Legal 500, 2024

"Brilliant. Very approachable and proactive, Dan is very clever and knows his subject inside and out. A pleasure to work with and an excellent advocate – clear, measured and persuasive."

Legal 500, 2024

"One of the top dogs of rating." "Dan provides a great blend of powerful advocacy work and analysis, coupled with an approachability that clients very much value." "He's a personable and professional adviser, and a knowledgeable and talented advocate."

Rating and Valuation, Chambers and Partners, 2023

"Dan continues to be a favourite. He has the right mix of expertise and personal skills to get the most out of clients and to put forward arguments clearly and effectively." "He is a really formidable advocate, who is clear, concise and excellent."

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2023

"He has been particularly brilliant and attentive." "He is very impressive, no-nonsense and reassuringly client-friendly." "Dan has the right mix of expertise and personal skills to get the most out of clients and to put forward arguments clearly and effectively."

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2023

"Dan combines a ferocious intellect with clear and well structured advocacy, always presented in a friendly, readily accessible manner. He is also genuinely good at working with opponents. He is a hugely impressive practitioner."

Planning, Legal 500, 2023

"An excellent advocate at every level from the Valuation Tribunal to the Supreme Court, coupled with detailed knowledge and understanding of the law of rating. Also very good with clients and approachable in consultation. Excellent all round."

Local Government, Legal 500, 2023

"Very thorough and calm, he presents complex things clearly and methodically in court and is a very effective advocate."

Environment, Legal 500, 2023

"Dan is a distinguished advocate. In consultation with clients, he provides sound advice in an engaging manner."

Legal 500, 2023

"An outstanding advocate who has the ability to make things clear." "He is extremely authoritative in a wide range of local government areas. He has complete trust of his clients and the court."

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2022

"He is exceptionally reasonable, has a really good knowledge of rating and is genuinely very highly regarded." "He is the rating guru." "He has comprehensive knowledge of the law of valuation."

Rating and Valuation, Chambers and Partners, 2022

"He has a real intellect but wears it lightly." "Engages well with the court."

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2022

"Dan is excellent. Super knowledgeable, approachable, and a real team player. There is nothing he does not know about business rates, really understand all aspects, is very bright and a pleasure to work with."

Local Government, Legal 500, 2022

"Dan is able to formulate complex arguments in a palatable way. An engaging advocate loved by clients who is a pleasure to work with. Highly recommended."

Planning, Legal 500, 2022

"He has a punchy advocacy style and gets his points across with vigour, ... is .. knowledgeable, approachable and a real team player."

Environment, Legal 500, 2022

"He has an excellent understanding of the law coupled with an engaging and approachable presence in consultation, and first class advocacy. A great all-round set of skills."

Property Litigation, Legal 500, 2022

"He's an experienced, knowledgeable and effective advocate." "He applies razor-sharp analysis to matters and gets to the heart of the issues involved."

Rating and Valuation, Chambers and Partners, 2021

"He's always well prepared and is realistic in the points he takes and how he takes them." "You can really trust his advice. He's also very practical, clever and good on his feet."

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2021

"He's very practical, clever and very good on his feet. He has finely honed skills and he finds a safe way through." "He's excellent. Very calm and personable with clients."

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2021

"An excellent understanding of rating law, coupled with an approachable manner in consultation. Clients like this combination. Well organised and well presented advocacy at all levels from the Valuation Tribunal to the Supreme Court."

Local Government, Legal 500, 2021

"Dan has a formidable intellect and ability to the heart of the matter. He is hugely dynamic in his case work and in reaching out to clients. He is irresistible in oral advocacy, because he combines superb presentational skills with the structural integrity and logic of his argument."

Planning, Legal 500, 2021

"He has a first-class brain and an encyclopaedic knowledge of the law in the area."

Property Litigation, Legal 500, 2021

"An excellent advocate who is very good with clients."

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2020

"Always delivers on time on a succession of controversial and sensitive issues. Extremely knowledgeable and reliable." "Very easy to work with and very clear with his advice."

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2020

"His work is always of the highest standard."

Legal 500, 2020

"He combines good advocacy with an excellently approachable presence with clients."

Planning, Legal 500, 2020

"Intelligent, knowledgeable, personable, diligent and a good team player."

Planning, Legal 500, 2019

"Offers an excellent mix of legal analysis and high quality skills as an advocate."

Legal 500, 2019

"Dan is excellent, he is very good in court, with clients and is very very bright."

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2019

"We rate him very highly in terms of grasping the issues and being a pleasure to work with. He has a good attention to detail and a strong intellect."

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2019

"He is an extremely talented junior QC, who is very astute, articulate and knowledgeable."

Legal Directory, 2018

"He's absolutely excellent on complex matters with multiple issues and witnesses. Great with local authorities and very good on important viability cases, he inspires confidence."

Legal Directory, 2018

"Personable and hardworking."

Legal Directory, 2018

"He's very impressive in terms of his advocacy."

Planning and Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2018; Environment, Planning and Property, Legal 500, 2018

"A brilliant advocate who is assertive in court without coming across as difficult. He is extremely approachable and very down-to-earth."

Legal Directory, 2018

"Exceptionally talented advocate and a master of detail. He is extremely practical and works exceptionally well with retail clients. His unfussy and clear approach is appreciated by clients and those instructing in equal measure."

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2017

"He is very personable, efficient and, in terms of drafting, he delivers very quickly." "He is reliable and has a good rapport with clients."

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2017

"Considerably experienced in High Court planning disputes."

Planning, Legal 500, 2017

"Enthusiastic, down-to-earth and a forceful advocate." "Fantastic grip of the detail" "Client-friendly approach."

Administrative and Public Law, Chambers and Partners, 2016

"Very hands-on approach" "Dealt with technical matters in a very clear and concise way." "Very composed and authoritative" "Very good to work with."

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2016

"Very good at thinking on his feet." "Very approachable, constructive and pleasant to deal with."

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2016

"Intellectually strong and very user-friendly."

Legal 500, 2016

"He relates to clients really well. He explains what is going to happen and what it means for them. In court he is very persuasive."

Admin and Public Law, Chambers and Partners, 2015

"Straightforward, very thorough and someone who takes a very sensible and logical approach." "Has an ability to think on his feet, combined with great judgement."

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2015

"He is always totally prepared, gives commercially astute and succinct advice, and can always be relied on. Clients love him."

Legal Directory, 2015

"His pleadings, advocacy and opinions are of exceptional quality. He is a real team player, and a firm favourite of clients and instructing solicitors who favour pragmatic solutions."

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2015

"Provides very well thought out and helpful advice."

Administrative Law, Legal 500, 2015

"Adept at getting to the nub of an issue."

Environment, Legal 500, 2015

"An extremely versatile lawyer."

Planning, Legal 500, 2015

"Very thorough and deals with difficult cases with good humour."

Local Government and Administrative Law, Chambers and Partners, 2014

"He is highly intelligent, diligent, helpful and reliable."

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2014

"Bright and Approachable"; a "Standout" junior.

Public Law, Legal 500, 2014

"A first port of call" for "Heavyweight, High-value matters in planning."

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2013

"A junior of choice, "Particularly for a planning judicial review.""

Public Law, Chambers and Partners, 2013

"Very bright" "A favourite of solicitors due to his "straightforward, down-to-earth approach.""

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2013

"Standout junior" with "enviable reputation for his local government and general public law work"; "Brilliant to deal with," sources highlight his "ability to cut through the detail and get to the heart of a case" "Thorough and reliable in all he does."

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2012

"Great potential" "A fine performer with excellent judgement."

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2012

“Regularly undertakes judicial review work, acting for claimants, local and central government, and pressure groups.”

Public Law, Chambers and Partners, 2012

“The “clever and meticulous” Dan Kolinsky has a busy public law practice alongside his mainstream planning and environment practice.”

Public Law, Chambers and Partners, 2011

“Extremely bright and a joy to work with” “Commended for his work on rating, planning inquiries and planning and environmental judicial reviews.”

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2011

Known for “rolling his sleeves up and getting on with it”

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2011

“Quite frankly is excellent. It is the lack of airs and graces, and the fact that he is so down to earth that makes him a pleasure to work with.”

Legal 500, 2011

“Combines tenacity and a winning mentality with a pleasant manner, and his areas of expertise include planning and local government.”

Public Law, Chambers and Partners, 2010

“Although the set is primarily recognised for its dominance in planning it has a number of extremely able barristers who take on a variety of local government work. The “very thorough” Dan Kolinsky is one such name”; “ He is highly sought after.”

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2010

“Incredibly bright and thorough with a great sense of humour – he’s doing very strong work at the set.”

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2010

“Bright and articulate advocate and draftsman”

Legal 500, 2010

Admired for “never giving up and working incredibly hard to find the killer point in any case.” A talented advocate, he is respected for his “formidable intellect and nice manner in court.”

Public Law, Chambers and Partners, 2009

“A veritable star of the local government scene “a good example of this set’s talented juniors”. His practice focuses on planning but he also advises on a range of other matters including local government reorganisation, finance and rates, rating and social

security.

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2009

“Thorough and responsive” “Highly regarded for his public law expertise.”

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2009

“Practice involves acting for all sides in judicial review proceedings”

Public Law, Chambers and Partners, 2008

“An incredible intellect and judgement to match” “Without a doubt, the man you want if you have a tricky case”

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2008

“A sharp and switched on team player who is incredibly reliable”

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2008

“An excellent advocate” “Really a pleasure to work with”

Public Law, Chambers and Partners, 2007

“Incredibly thorough and astute” “Juggles inquiry and court appearances”

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2007

“Wildly intelligent”

Public Law, Chambers and Partners, 2007

“High ?yer”

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2007

“Truly excellent” “Brilliant advocate”

Public Law, Chambers and Partners, 2006

“A delight to work with”, “Clients appreciate his accomplished manner in the courtroom”

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2006

“High ?yer”; “Good with clients and does not miss a trick”

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2006

“Accomplished and pleasant to work with” “Known for his High Court challenges”

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2005

"Extremely helpful and bright" "Building a varied public law practice"

Public Law, Chambers and Partners, 2005

"Absolutely superb" "Ability to handle highly complex and technical cases coupled with a pleasant, capable manner" "Favourite with solicitors"

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2005

"Rapidly growing profile"

Local Government, Chambers and Partners, 2003/04

"Unbelievably mature intellect as well as possessing the common touch"

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2003/04

"Team player" "Extremely able but wears it lightly"

Planning, Chambers and Partners, 2002/03

Cases and inquiries

07 08 23 Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames v SSLUHC and Williams [2023] EWHC 2055 (Admin)

22 06 17 Parkhurst Road Appeal Decision on Benchmark Land Value
