

7. S73 APPLICATION – REMOVAL OF CONDITION 10 ON NP/DDD/0613/0542 AND MODIFICATION OF S106 LEGAL AGREEMENT UNDER S106A TO REMOVE CLAUSES 2 AND 3 OF THE SECOND SCHEDULE AT QUARTERS FARM, BUXOPLAS MANUFACTURING LTD, QUARTERS FARM, HAZLEBADGE (NP/DDD/0719/0755, SPW)

APPLICANT: MR STEPHEN MYCOCK

Summary

1. The applicants are seeking removal of

- the personal restrictions on the existing permissions on the site and
- removal of the requirement to remove the buildings and reinstate the land if the use ceases.

The proposal is considered against the policies of the development plan and any other material considerations in the body of this report and recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

Site and Surroundings

2. Quarters Farm lies in the open countryside to the east of the B6049 1.6km south of Bradwell and 4.8km north of Tideswell. Originally a working farm, the holding comprises of a detached farmhouse, traditional outbuildings, a large range of modern portal framed buildings laid in a courtyard arrangement and approximately 46.36 hectares of land approximately half of which is steeply sloping rough grazing land. An enforcement case remains active in relation to an unauthorised dwelling at the site.
3. The farm lies in the bottom of a dry valley dominated by Durham Edge (the edge below the Camphill gliding airfield) and Bradwell Edge to the west.
4. A small rise to the west of the farmstead screens it from most views from the public highway. The site is however prominent in views from Tophole Road and from public footpaths in the area one of which runs up the lane and along the western edge of the site.
5. The site is accessed via a narrow 400m long tarmac access track which joins the B6049 on the outside of a sharp bend. This access serves the application site, the adjacent farmhouse and two bungalows which lie immediately to the north of the site.
6. Buxoplas is a local company established by the applicant's family. It produces high quality plastic extrusion products for a variety of industries both nationally and internationally. The site is based on a typical Peak District Farm, with a mixture of modern and traditional limestone buildings. The use was established in the western most building was the subject of a successful planning appeal in 1987. The appeal limited the business use to this one single building and contained other restrictive conditions designed to ensure that the existing farm holding remained the dominant land use.
7. Subsequently, the Buxoplas business expanded into the other farm buildings in the complex to such an extent that this is now the sole business. For the last decade the farmland has been let to another farmer. The business has operated from the site for

approximately 30 years and a Certificate of Lawfulness was issued for the other buildings for purposes ancillary to the plastic extrusions business.

8. For the purposes of the Development Plan the site is outside any designated settlement boundary.

Proposal

9. The proposal is to remove the personal ties and reinstatement of the land requirements. To achieve this the applicants have applied to remove the relevant conditions (over two planning consents via two separate S73 applications) and vary the 2014 S106 legal agreement.
10. This application specifically relates to the 2014 permission and associated S106 legal agreement.
11. The proposal is to remove condition 10 on NP/DDD/0613/0542 which reads as follows –

10. The extension hereby approved shall be removed and the existing buildings and surrounding land shall be restored to their former condition if the use hereby permitted ceases.

12. The reason given for this condition is set out below –
Permission has been granted as an exception to the National Park Authority's normal policy because of the applicant's personal circumstances. When that use ceases the removal of the buildings will allow the original character and appearance of the site to be restored.
13. The proposal also seeks to vary the S106 legal agreement which was entered into. This change is explained in the application to allow for succession planning, by removing the personal nature of the legal agreement, so that younger family members can take the business forward.
14. The request to vary the legal agreement seeks removal of clauses 2 and 3 (the obligations) in the second schedule of the legal agreement which currently read as follows –

1. The whole of the Land including all the buildings thereon and the Extension shall be kept in common ownership.

2. The use permitted by the Planning Permission shall be carried on only by Mr James Raymond Mycock, Mr Phillip Steven Mycock and shall be for a limited period being the period during which the Land is Occupied by these named individuals.

3. When the Land ceases to be occupied by the individuals named in paragraph 2 of this schedule, the use permitted by the Planning Permission Shall cease and all materials and equipment brought on to the Land in connection with the use shall be removed.

15. Another S73 planning application has been submitted at the same time as this one to remove planning conditions with similar affect from the 1988 planning appeal of NP/WED/187/5 (T/APP/L1046/A/87/071621/P2).

RECOMMENDATION:

16. **A. That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions and/or modifications and,**
 17. **B. That the S106 be varied to remove clauses 2 and 3 of schedule 2.**
-
1. The development hereby approved shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted plans and specifications numbered 1314-01 Rev A Proposed elevations; 1314-02 Rev A Proposed Block Plan; 1314-05 Existing & Proposed Floor Plan; and the amended drawings numbered Amended Site Plan and Amended Location Plan which were received by this office on 19 July 2013 subject to the following conditions and/or modifications:-
 2. The building and its extension shall be used solely for purposes relating to the development, production and storage of extruded plastic tubing and for no other purposes. Notwithstanding the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the use shall be limited to that specified in this condition and for no other purposes.
 3. The sheeting for the doors, walls and roof of the extension shall be factory colour-coated to BS 5252 Ref. No. 12 B 29 (dark green) and thereafter the sheets shall not be repainted or replaced other than that colour without the prior written approval of the National Park Authority.
 4. All external timberwork shall be stained dark brown or black and shall be permanently so maintained.
 5. A dry limestone dashed render shall be applied to any exposed concrete block work prior to the development hereby permitted being brought into use.
 6. There shall be no external storage of materials or goods in connection with the development hereby permitted.
 7. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans a detailed scheme for landscaping (including tree planting, drystone and retaining walling and any structures which shall be faced in rubble limestone as necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority within 2 months of the date of this permission being granted. Once approved, the planting or seeding shall be carried out to the reasonable satisfaction of the Authority within the first planting seasons following completion or occupation of the extension. Any trees dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased shall be replaced within the next planting season with trees of an equivalent size and species or in accordance with an alternative scheme agreed in writing by the Authority before any trees are removed.

8. **Prior to the disposal of any spoil arising from the works, precise details of the disposal shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority. All spoil shall then be disposed of in accordance with the approved details.**
9. **The use hereby permitted shall only be conducted between 6am and 8pm on weekdays and 8am and 6pm on Saturdays and at no time at all on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.**
9. **The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until a scheme for external lighting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the National Park Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details and permanently so maintained.**

Key Issues

18. Whether the planning conditions/obligations are still necessary and do they meet the relevant tests in the NPPF?
19. Whether the conditions/obligations are required by current development plan policies.

History

1987 – WED0187005 – Extension to and change of use of agricultural building for light industrial use. Refused but subsequently granted on appeal. Planning conditions included that the use was personal to the applicants, Stephen and Raymond Mycock, and that the extension permitted would be removed if the use permitted ceased.

1989 – WED0289096 – Replacement of porch/utility room. Granted with conditions.

1989 – WED1189641 – Erection of offices and toilets. Granted with conditions.

2006 – NP/DDD/0506/0440 – Use of the building for industrial storage, ancillary to existing approved use. Withdrawn

2006 – NP/DDD/0706/0673 – Lawful development certification for an existing use. The use of buildings for purposes ancillary to the plastics extrusion business in contravention of conditions no 2 (NP/WED/187/5) and the use of yard areas as above. Granted.

2007 – NP/DDD/1206/1162 – Extension of existing building for industrial use. Granted with conditions.

2007 – NP/DDD/0707/0617 – Extension of existing building for industrial use. Revised scheme. Granted with conditions.

2008 – NP/DDD/0408/0289 – Erection of office, including demolition of existing building. Granted with conditions.

2012 – NP/DDD/0812/0834 – Extension to existing factory unit. Granted with conditions.

2014 – NP/DDD/0613/0542 – Contrary to officer's recommendation planning permission was granted for the extension to an existing manufacturing building. 85m x 18-30m wide. This was granted subject to a S106 legal agreement, the one which is now sought to be

varied. The minutes of that meeting record that the purposes of the S106 was to tie the extension to existing buildings on the site and the adjoining 115 acres of farmland.

2016 – Enforcement enquiry in relation to an unauthorised dwelling. Quarters Cottage. Enforcement file 16/0165.

2019 – Pre application advice. The applicant's summary of that meeting explains they intend to incorporate the business and allow for succession planning therefore they need to remove the personal ties and the reinstatement conditions. The reinstatement conditions were explained to create a theoretical liability for the business. Buxoplas are content to keep restrictions which require the factory and the wider farmland to be kept in common ownership and also content to keep the restrictions which require the buildings only to be used for plastics extrusion. The note of the meeting explains that the Authority accepts the principle of removal of the personal tie and the removal of the reinstatement requirements. Also reminded that conditions 8, 9 & 12 of the 2014 permission still remain to be discharged. Also the recent unauthorised residential conversion was queried, but agreed that this is a separate matter.

Consultations

Derbyshire County Council (Highway Authority) - Condition 10 was not imposed at the request of the Highway Authority, in the interests of highway safety. There are therefore no highway objections in principle to the removal of the condition.

Derbyshire Dales District Council – No response to date.

Hazlebadge Parish Meeting - We refer to the following applications NP DDD 0719 0755 NP DDD 0613 0542 and NP DDD 0719 0761. As Parish Council we ask for the following stipulations to be met *stipulation remains condition of names and successors" and NOT BUXOPLAS or name of the business - reason name or business could be sold. * Condition 7 & 10 NOT to be removed as detrimental to property namely QUARTERS FARM for the following reasons - Custodians of QUARTERS FARM which has historical value and has impact on future generations of NOT restoring as previously agreed to former "QUARTERS FARM" this would also impact on the nature and conservation of this land which has always been agricultural farmland *Breaching of Planning Section 171A of the town and planning ACT 1990 namely non compliance of Landscaping Conditions not met on application NP DDD 0613 0542 issued 4Mar14 *impact of increased vehicular access to the business with additional traffic generation and impact on road safety this is down a public footpath. Please note all of above.

Representations

20. One representation has been received which objects to the scheme. They object to the removal of condition 10 on the basis that if the family decide eventually to dispose of the business with the existing structure intact, then this would allow someone else to run a potentially unsuitable business from these premises. They do recognise any change of use would require separate planning consent but nonetheless the removal of conditions 10 does to an extent partly facilitates this.

Main Policies

21. National Park designation is the highest level of landscape designation in the UK. The Environment Act 1995 sets out two statutory purposes for national parks in England and

Wales:

- (i) Conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage.
- (ii) Promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public

When national parks carry out these purposes they also have the duty to:

Seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the national parks.

- 22. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, GSP4, DS1, L1 & E2.
- 23. Relevant Local Plan policies: DMC3, DME2, DME5, DME7, DME8, DMT5.

National Planning Policy Framework

- 24. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced a significant proportion of central government planning policy with immediate effect, the revised version was published in 2019. The Government's intention is that the document should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Policies 2019. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF.
- 25. Para 115. Of the NPPF states that 'great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.'
- 26. Para 55 of the NPPF explains - Planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. Agreeing conditions early is beneficial to all parties involved in the process and can speed up decision making. Conditions that are required to be discharged before development commences should be avoided, unless there is a clear justification.
- 27. Para 56 Planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:
 - a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - b) directly related to the development; and
 - c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Peak District National Park Core Strategy

28. Policy GSP1 sets out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park's objectives having regard to the Sandford Principle, (that is, where there are conflicting desired outcomes in achieving national park purposes, greater priority must be given to the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, even at the cost of socio-economic benefits). GPS1 also sets out the need for sustainable development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed.
29. Policy GSP3 sets out development management principles and states that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.
30. GSP4: Planning conditions and legal agreements states;
 - A. To aid the achievement of its spatial outcomes, the National Park Authority will consider the contribution that a development can make directly and/or to its setting, including, where consistent with government guidance, using planning conditions and planning obligations.
31. Policy L1 identifies that development must conserve and enhance valued landscape character and valued characteristics, and other than in exceptional circumstances, proposals in the Natural Zone will not be permitted.
32. E2: Businesses in the countryside -

Proposals for business development in the countryside outside the Natural Zone and the named settlements in policy DS1, must take account of the following principles:

 - A. Businesses should be located in existing traditional buildings of historic or vernacular merit in smaller settlements, on farmsteads, and in groups of buildings in sustainable locations. However where no suitable traditional building exists, the reuse of modern buildings may be acceptable provided that there is no scope for further enhancement through a more appropriate replacement building.
 - B. On farmsteads, or groups of estate buildings, small scale business development will be permitted provided that it supports an existing agricultural or other primary business responsible for estate or land management. The primary business must retain ownership and control of the site and building, to ensure that income will be returned to appropriate management of the landscape.
 - C. Business use in an isolated existing or new building in the open countryside will not be permitted.

D. Proposals to accommodate growth and intensification of existing businesses will be considered carefully in terms of their impact on the appearance and character of landscapes.

E. Ancillary retail operations must be small scale and principally offering for sale goods which are produced at the premises (see also policy HC5).

Beyond this policy and policies RT1, RT2 and RT3, there is no scope for setting up new businesses in the countryside.

Development Management Policies

33. DME2 Farm diversification

- A. Development will be permitted if there is clear evidence that the new business use will remain ancillary to the agricultural operation of the farm business, meaning that the new business use is a subsidiary or secondary use or operation associated with the agricultural unit.
- B. New buildings may be permitted if the proposed development cannot be appropriately located in existing buildings of cultural heritage significance, or in other buildings which remain appropriate within the farm building group.
- C. Development will be permitted to remove a stand-alone building and replace it with a new building within the building group provided the scale, massing and use of the new building is appropriate, it respects the historic form and character of the building group, and the existing building has no cultural heritage significance.
- D. New or expanded buildings for non-farming uses that generate income to support the farm business will be permitted provided there is no net harm to any valued characteristics of the building group or valued landscape character as evidenced by the Landscape Strategy and Action Plan.
- E. Where proposals for farm diversification are otherwise acceptable, the Authority will consider removing permitted development rights to limit the range of uses permissible, where to do so would be necessary, reasonable and consistent with national policy. (This policy does not apply to buildings justified for agricultural purposes, which, either through the prior notification procedure or a planning application, are legitimate forms of development on farms).

34. DME5 Use Class B1 employment in the countryside outside Core Strategy policy DS1 settlements

- A. Planning permission for a Use Class B1 employment use in an existing building will be granted provided that any adverse effect on a building with cultural heritage significance, and on the valued characteristics and amenity of the area can be mitigated including, but not exclusively, by the application of the following criteria:
- i. restriction to the specific activity applied for; and
 - ii. a specified and agreed scale, intensity and type of activity, including vehicular movements and hours of operation; and
 - iii. a specified and agreed arrangement of parking and/or storage of vehicles, equipment and materials.
- B. For the particular use permitted, and where necessary and appropriate:
- (i) permitted development rights (particularly for further buildings or structures) are removed; and/or
 - (ii) permission is time limited for a temporary period of (usually) 2 years; and/or in the case of personal permissions, the permission is restricted to the personal

benefit of the occupant of the building only.

C. If any combination of these mechanisms proves to be ineffective in practice, a further permission will not be granted.

35. DME7 - Expansion of existing industrial and business development not involving farm diversification.

B. Outside Core Strategy policy DS1 settlements, expansion of existing industrial and business development will only be permitted where:

- (i) it is of a modest scale in relation to the existing activity and/or buildings; and the scale and type of development can be accommodated without adversely affecting the residential amenity and valued characteristics of the area or traffic safety and circulation;
- (iii) it does not adversely affect, and wherever possible, secures the enhancement of the site as well as the future management of the valued characteristics of the site and adjoining land; and
- (iv) proper consideration has been given to the possibilities of conserving and enhancing landscape character by using, modifying or extending existing buildings.

C. In all cases, the impacts on residential amenity and valued characteristics from operating hours, lighting and noise will be considered.

36. DME8 - Design, layout and neighbourliness of employment sites including haulage depots

A. Where development for employment purposes is acceptable in principle, it will only be permitted where every practicable means is used to minimise any adverse effects on the valued characteristics and amenity of the surrounding area. Particular attention will be given to:

- (i) visibility from vantage points; and
- (ii) site access, vehicular circulation and parking; and
- (iii) site layout and use of open space surrounding buildings; and
- (iv) storage of vehicles or other equipment; and
- (v) Landscaping and other screening, and whether, in the landscape proposed, it is an appropriate method to mitigate adverse impact on the landscape; and
- (vi) noise and proposed times of operation.

B. Where necessary, planning conditions will restrict future growth and intensity of the activities on site.

Assessment

37. Development Management Policy DME2 relates to farm diversification. While this business started out as farm diversification it has expanded into the surrounding buildings. The expanded use lawful following the grant of the Lawful development certificate in 2006. The scale of the business no longer represents a form of farm diversification and the surrounding land is rented out to another agricultural enterprise. However, the site retains common ownership of the surrounding land, and this is already controlled by the S106 legal agreement associated with the planning permission granted in 2014 for extension to the premises and which links in with the requirements of DME7. The policy consideration of DME2 E to remove permitted development rights remains applicable to limit the use as approved in 1988, and ensures that the use operating from the site is compatible with its open countryside location which could potentially be harmed by other business uses.

38. It will therefore be necessary to remove permitted development rights for the change of use to other business uses. The condition is also required because there are currently permitted development rights under class P (A) for light industrial units to change to dwellings (subject to criteria) and at this location and within these types of buildings, such development would be wholly contrary to the policies of the Development Plan.
39. Policy DME5 relates to B1 uses in the countryside outside of settlements. It is permissive of such proposals in existing buildings, subject to the criteria of the policy. Policy DME7 allows for expansion of existing business development not involving farm diversification in the open countryside where it cannot be accommodated within existing buildings and provided there is no harm to landscape or other valued characteristics. Although this proposal is not related to an existing building, and was for an extension the policy requirements of DME5 are still considered to be applicable to control the nature of the use. In particular the requirement of DME5A (i) to restrict the use to the specific activity applied for; (ii) to control hours of operation and (iii) for no external storage of materials or goods.
40. The 1988 and 2014 planning permissions allow only a B1 use, despite plastic extrusion being normally a B2 general industrial use. In 1988 however, when granting the appeal, the application was for a light industrial use and the inspector used planning conditions specifying that the extension shall be used for the development, production and storage of extruded microwall plastic tubing and for no other purposes (including any other purposes in Class B1 of the schedule to the Town and country planning) use classes order 1987), or in any provision equivalent to that class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that order. This specific type of plastic extrusion (microwall plastic tubing) carried out on the site is more akin to a B1 use in the way it operates and has been controlled this way since it was approved in 1988, the inspector noting that the operation of the plastics extrusion business were quiet and involved no offensive smells or waste products.
41. The 2014 decision included a requirement to remove the building when the use ceased and for the permission to be personal.
42. Previous applications have had this restriction applied and in particular the 1988 one granted at appeal. Those restrictions were imposed by way of planning conditions by the planning inspectorate. The resolution from committee for the 2014 decision was to require a legal agreement tying the extension to existing buildings on the site and the adjoining 115 acres of farmland and a list of conditions.
43. The planning inspector considered the proposal at that time would be both contrary to adopted policies and cause harm to landscape as well as local amenity and highway safety from increased traffic movements. Whilst this would normally warrant refusal the Inspector concluded an exceptional approval was justified based on the very special circumstances in the case which centred upon the personal technical expertise of the applicants. This supported the applicants need to personally supervise the process which therefore had to be located in close proximity to the Tideswell base. In the absence of any other available buildings to meet the special need an extension at Quarters farm was justified despite the harm to landscape. For these reasons the Inspector concluded it to be reasonable for the use to be personal and the extension to be removed when no longer required, conditions which the appellant's had indicated they were prepared to accept.
44. Having considered the relevant policies in the Development Plan, the way the business has expanded, via a lawful development certificate and more recently with the 2014 permission, we conclude that the scale of the operation is no longer one that could justifiably be limited to being personal. It has clearly grown beyond farm diversification, so there is no policy basis to limit the use to being personal only. It is considered that adequate control of the

site in planning terms can be ensured by limiting the use and retaining the site and surrounding land in common ownership (common ownership by the existing 2014 S106). Furthermore the use of a personal condition would not meet current guidance in the NPPG. Which explains the following for personal conditions (015) –

Planning permission usually runs with the land and it is rarely appropriate to provide otherwise. There may be exceptional occasions where development that would not normally be permitted may be justified on planning grounds because of who would benefit from the permission. For example, conditions limiting benefits to a particular class of people, such as new residential accommodation in the open countryside for agricultural or forestry workers, may be justified on the grounds that an applicant has successfully demonstrated an exceptional need.

A condition limiting the benefit of the permission to a company is inappropriate because its shares can be transferred to other persons without affecting the legal personality of the company.

45. Officers consider that both condition 10 of the decision notice and clauses 2 and 3 of the S106 can be removed as requested. It will not increase the impact of the site nor cause any additional amenity issues. Conditions which limit the use to the specific type of plastic extrusion and an obligation that the buildings and surrounding land remain in common ownership provide sufficient planning control over the site. Given that the personal nature of the existing permission is not necessary and therefore it would not be reasonable to continue to apply this, there is no need for the condition which requires that the land be reinstated as the use will not cease at the point that a named person ceases to have an interest in the development.
46. It will still be necessary for the legal S106 legal agreement to keep the buildings and surrounding land in common ownership. This is a policy requirement as set out in DME7, B, (iii) which only allows business development in the countryside where amongst other things it does not adversely affect, and wherever possible, secures the enhancement of the site as well as the future management of the valued characteristics of the site and adjoining land. The only way to ensure that the valued characteristics of the site and adjoining land remain in control of the business operating from the site is to secure common ownership. It will also be necessary for amenity reasons as the plastics extrusion business operates in such close proximity the dwelling on the site and if they were not in common ownership there could otherwise be an amenity issue.
47. The public representations are noted. In particular there is a concern raised that removing condition 10 may enable another unsuitable business to start up from the site. However although officers recognise that it would enable another business to operate from the site, the conditions would limit the use to the specific type of plastics extrusion so anything other than this would need a further planning application, which could be dealt with on its merits.
48. The parish meeting's comments are also noted. In particular their comments about not making the permission attached to the business are noted, however the application is submitted to remove the personal tie altogether and for the reasons explained above is found to be acceptable. It is not necessary to limit the use to a person or business as adequate control can be achieved on the site by limiting the use to that specifically being granted and ensuring common ownership of the buildings and surrounding land. Officers have found that it is not necessary to require the buildings to be removed when no longer required for the reasons set out above and the proposal is not considered to increase traffic movements at the site. It is noted that the highways authority have not objected to the scheme. The parish council do raise an important issue about the landscaping, there are outstanding conditions which relate to landscaping, the planning condition would need to be restated if this application were approved.

Conclusion

49. It is therefore considered to be acceptable to remove reinstatement requirements set out in condition 10 and the personal nature of the 2014 permission by varying the S106 legal agreement to remove clauses 2 and 3 of schedule 2.
50. The other conditions are restated where they still serve a purpose and are updated as necessary.

Human Rights

51. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.
52. List of Background Papers (not previously published)
53. Nil
54. Report Author – Steven Wigglesworth, Planner.