
FULL PLANNING APPLICATION – CONSERVATION REPAIRS AND ALTERATIONS TO CHURCH FARM. NEW ATTACHED GREENHOUSE ON THE EAST ELEVATION TO REPLACE MODERN OUTBUILDINGS. INTEGRATION OF SOLAR PANELS AND AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP. NEW OUTBUILDINGS AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING SEPARATE GARAGE - (NP/DDD/1124/1291)SC.

APPLICANT: MR PETER TREWHITT

Summary

1. Planning Permission is being sought for the erection of a single storey glazed extension and a series of repairs and alterations to Church Farm, Parwich, a Grade II listed detached property.
2. The Authority's Senior Conservation Officer has stated, that whilst some of the proposals would have a neutral or positive impact on the significance of the house, some would cause less than substantial harm that would not be outweighed by any public benefits.
3. In this case, parts of the scheme represent a form of development/works that are not capable of being amended in a way which would make it acceptable in its current form, therefore the application is recommended for refusal.

Site and Surroundings

4. Church Farm is a detached grade II listed building, sited towards the western edge of Parwich and within the Conservation Area of the village. The site consists of an C18 farmhouse with C19 extensions to the side and rear and a detached garage and small outbuilding.
5. Pedestrian and vehicular access is directly from the public highway. A Public Right of Way (PRoW) runs parallel with the property on its northern boundary. The nearest residential dwellings are 'Court House' adjacent to the eastern boundary of the property and 'Spenage' which is sited around 20m to the north.

Proposals

6. The proposals consist of a glazed extension in the form of a glasshouse/greenhouse to be erected on the east gable elevation of the dwelling, erection of a stone outbuilding to incorporate tool shed and oil tank, the insertion of solar panels to the roof of the main house, installation of an air source heat pump to the rear of the dwelling, re-roofing of the existing garage and the reconfiguration of interior parts and features of the property, amongst other things, these include the insertion of a partition wall between the proposed pantry and kitchen area and the removal of existing thralls and trough from the pantry space.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

7. **By virtue of its siting, design and use of materials, the glasshouse structure fails to reflect and conserve the traditional character and heritage significance of the host property and its setting within the Parwich Conservation area. Conflicting with Development Plan Policies GSP3, L3, DS1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMH7 & DMH8 in these respects. In this instance, the harm identified would not be outweighed by public benefits and therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).**
8. **By virtue of a combination of inappropriate detail and loss of historic fabric, the scheme would serve to perpetuate harm to the overall character, appearance and heritage significance of the listed building. Conflicting with Development Plan Policies L3, DS1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMH7 & DMH8. In this case, the harm identified would not be outweighed by public benefits and therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).**

Key Issues

9. The potential impact of the development on the character and appearance of the listed property, the Conservation Area, Protected Species, archaeology, neighbour amenity & highway safety.

Relevant history

10. 2019 – Enforcement case Ref: 19/0148 - Dismantling of southern boundary wall and rebuilt like for like. Inspected Feb 2025, works found to be satisfactory.
11. 2006 - Withdrawn LBC application for the installation of a satellite dish.

Consultations

12. Highway Authority – No objection.
13. Parish Council - “...*The Council supported the application’s sensitive treatment of historic features and measures to reduce the building’s environmental impact. The high quality of the plans submitted was appreciated.*”
14. PDNPA Cultural Heritage – “...*Overall, whilst many of the proposals would have a neutral or positive impact on the significance of the house, some of the proposals would cause less than substantial harm that is unlikely to be outweighed by any public benefits*” – (See Heritage section of report below).
15. PDNPA Ecology – Some impact but capable of mitigation (See Ecology section of report below).
16. PDNPA Archaeology – Some impact but capable of mitigation (See Archaeology section of report below).

Representations

17. None received.

Statutory Framework

18. 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:
- Conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage
 - Promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public
19. 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. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy and the new Development Management Policies (DMP). These Development Plan Policies provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. This application must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Relevant Core Strategy policies: GSP1, GSP2, GSP3, DS1, L3, CC1, CC2.

Relevant Local Plan policies: DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC8, DMC12, DMH7, DMT3, DMT8.

20. The Authority has adopted three separate supplementary planning documents that offers design guidance on householder development, namely the Building Design Guide (1987), Design Guide (2007) and the Detailed Design Guide on Alterations and Extensions (2014).

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

21. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration. Development plan policies relevant to this application are up-to-date and in accordance with the NPPF and therefore should be given full weight in the determination of this application.
22. Para: 189 states, that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
23. Paragraph 203 in particular states, that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be considered in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
24. Paragraph 207 states "In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance."
25. Paragraph 212 states, that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Core Strategy policies

26. GSP1, GSP2 – *Securing National Park Purposes and Sustainable development & Enhancing the National Park*. These policies jointly seek to secure national park legal purposes and duties through the conversion and enhancement of the National Park's landscape and its natural and heritage assets.
27. GSP3 – *Development Management Principles*. Requires that particular attention is paid to the impact on the character and setting of buildings and that the design is in accord with the Authority's Design Guide, the impact on living conditions of communities and development is appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park.
28. DS1 - *Development Strategy*. Supports extensions and alterations to dwellinghouses in principle, subject to a satisfactory scale, design and external appearance.
29. L3 - *Cultural Heritage assets or archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance*. Explains that development must conserve and where appropriately enhance or reveal the significance of historic assets and their setting. Other than in exceptional circumstances, development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause harm to the significance of any cultural heritage asset or its setting.
30. CC1 - *Climate change mitigation and adaption*. Sets out that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources. Development must also achieve the highest possible standards of carbon reductions and water efficiency.
31. CC2 - *Low carbon and renewable energy development*. Sets out that proposals for low carbon and renewable energy development will be encouraged provided they can be accommodated without adversely affecting landscape character or the special qualities of the National Park.

Development Management Policies

32. DMC3 - *Siting, Design, layout and landscaping*. Reiterates, that where developments are acceptable in principle, Policy requires that design is to high standards and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape. The siting, mass, scale, height, design, building materials should all be appropriate to the context. Accessibility of the development should also be a key consideration.
33. DMC5 - *Assessing the impact of development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting*. Provides detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such proposals.
34. DMC7 - *Listed buildings* - Addresses development affecting listed building, advising that applications for such development should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5. And should clearly demonstrate how these will be preserved and where possible enhanced and why the proposed works are desirable or necessary. Development will not be permitted if it would adversely affect the character, scale, proportion, design, detailing of or materials used in the listed building or would result in the loss of or irreversible change to original features.

35. DMC8 - *Conservation Areas*. States, that applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects its setting or important views into or out of the area, across or through the area should assess and clearly demonstrate how the existing character and appearance of the Conservation Area will be preserved and, where possible, enhanced. Applications should also be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 considering amongst other things, form and layout, street pattern scale, height, form and massing, local distinctive design details and the nature and quality of materials.
36. DMC12 - *Sites, features or species of wildlife, geological or geomorphological importance or all other sites, features and species*. Development will only be permitted where : (i) significant harm can be avoided and the conservation status of the population of the species or habitat concerned is maintained; and (ii) the need for, and the benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh any adverse effect.
37. DMH7 - *Extensions and alterations*. States that extensions and alterations to dwellings will be permitted provided that the proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings.
38. DMH8 (A) - *New Outbuilding and alterations and extensions to existing outbuildings in the curtilages of dwellinghouses*. States that, new outbuildings will be permitted provided the scale, mass, form, and design of the new building conserves and enhances the immediate dwelling and curtilage, any valued characteristics of the adjacent built environment and/or the landscape, including Listed Building status and setting, Conservation Area character, important open space and valued landscape character. In addition, the use of the buildings will be restricted through conditions, where necessary.

Assessment

Principle of the development

39. Generally, there are no objections to extending a dwelling, subject to a satisfactory scale, design and external appearance and where development pays particular attention to the amenity, privacy and security of nearby properties in accordance with the principles of policies DS1 & DMC3 respectively.
40. Policy DMH7 states, that extensions and alterations to a residential dwelling will be permitted provided that the proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building.
41. Whilst Policy DMH8 states amongst other things, that new outbuildings will be permitted provided the scale, mass, form, and design of the new building conserves and enhances the immediate dwelling and curtilage, any valued characteristics of the adjacent built environment, including Listed Building status, setting and Conservation Area character.
42. In addition, the Authority's Design guidance sets out, that it may be possible to add a well-designed extension, provided it would be in harmony with the original building and subject to being appropriate in scale, design and external appearance in accordance with good design principles. However, in this case, there are matters of design and conservation that are not acceptable in the current scheme, as presented in the following report.

Siting, design & materials

43. Policy DMC3 reiterates, that where developments are acceptable in principle, Policy requires that design is to high standards and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape. The siting, mass, scale, height,

design, building materials should all be appropriate to the context. Accessibility of the development should also be a key consideration.

44. Policy DMH7 states, that extensions and alterations to dwellings will be permitted provided that the proposal does not detract from the character, appearance or amenity of the original building, its setting or neighbouring buildings.
45. Policy DMH8 (A), states, that new outbuildings will be permitted provided the scale, mass, form, and design of the new building conserves and enhances the immediate dwelling and curtilage, any valued characteristics of the adjacent built environment and/or the landscape, including Listed Building status and setting, Conservation Area character, important open space and valued landscape character. In addition, the use of the buildings will be restricted through conditions, where necessary.
46. Church Farm is a Grade II listed property, located towards the western side of Parwich and within the Conservation Area of the village. The property is considered an attractive dwelling and therefore contributes positively to the street scene and the surrounding area.
47. With regard to the proposed glasshouse/greenhouse: In general, glasshouses appear out of place on traditional vernacular farmhouses, historically being more appropriate on larger status houses. In this case, the construction of a glasshouse/greenhouse on the east gable elevation of the host property, would be seen as a visually intrusive element, harming the architectural interest of the dwelling and failing to conserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area within which it is sited. This would be made more prominent, as it would clearly be seen from the adjacent PRow that runs in close proximity alongside the northern boundary of the site.
48. Consequently, by virtue of its siting and design, the glasshouse structure fails to reflect and conserve the traditional character and appearance of the host property and its setting within the village Conservation area. Conflicting with Development Plan Policies GSP3, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMH7 & DMH8 in these respects.

Heritage

49. Policy DMC5 provides detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings whilst also requiring development to avoid harm to the significance, character, and appearance of heritage assets.
50. Policy DMC7 addresses development affecting listed building, advising that applications for such development should be determined in accordance with policy DMC5 and should clearly demonstrate how these will be preserved and where possible enhanced and why the proposed works are desirable or necessary. Development will not be permitted if it would adversely affect the character, scale, proportion, design, detailing of or materials used in the listed building or would result in the loss of or irreversible change to original features.
51. Whilst Policy DMC8 states, that applications for development in a Conservation Area, or for development that affects its setting or important views into or out of the area, across or through the area should assess and clearly demonstrate how the existing character and appearance of the Conservation Area will be preserved and, where possible, enhanced.
52. The Authority's Senior Conservation Officer advises that the property's significance is derived from its architectural interest, including its external appearance, internal

planform, and the survival of historic fixtures and fittings such as internal doors, fireplaces, thrawls and a salting basin.

The following section of the report is the Conservation Officers (CO's) initial and summarised response to the submitted proposals:

53. The installation of Solar PV to the roof: In principle, the impact of mounting solar PV in the roof valley would be low and mitigated by public benefits of installing renewable energy technology. However, it was not clear how the panels would be mounted. Details therefore should be provided.
54. New greenhouse/glasshouse to east gable elevation of dwelling: In general, glasshouses are out of place on vernacular farmhouses, historically being more used and suited to larger, later houses. The construction of a glasshouse on the east gable elevation would be visually intrusive and harm the architectural interest of the building.
55. Changes to the existing single storey extension (west gable) of dwelling: Generally, some of the changes proposed would be acceptable, (new chimney breast for the Aga, ceiling removal/rooflight installation, and enlarged openings with double glazing and a half-glazed door) are generally acceptable as the side extension retains few features of interest. However, disagree with the assumption that reintroducing a partition along the line of the original external wall would enhance the building's character and therefore significance. In this case, the presence of a reused timber beam above the steel beam indicates the opening is historic and likely contemporary with the extension. Additionally, there appears no evidence that the thrawls and sink are not in an historic location. Removing them from the house would harm its architectural interest and significance.
56. First floor rear bedroom: This is proposed to be divided into an en-suite and utility room, new door from bedroom 1 and removal of door in bedroom 2. This part of the building is a relatively late addition and contributes little towards the significance of the house. However, the historic doors should not be moved.
57. New toolshed, oil tank and air-source heat pump: The proposed oil tank and air source heat pump is slightly confusing, as one would generally negate the need of the other. In this case, the question has been asked, if the amount of visual clutter in the rear yard could be reduced, with the oil tank removed?
58. Windows and rooflights: The application propose to replace some of the modern windows and glass with more historically appropriate windows, and the replacement of the large rooflights with smaller rooflights. This is considered would be an enhancement.
59. Existing garage: It is proposed to enclose the garage with a timber folding door and inserting a mezzanine floor and W.C. inside. In this case, the impact of the works would be negligible, however, works to the roof are also proposed, but it is not clear if this would include a total re-roof and the retention of traditional torching? Therefore, clarity should be sought.

The following is a paraphrased summary of the agents reply to the above: (A full and more detailed response, including images, can be found on the application web page).

60. Solar PV to the Roof: The agent confirms, that the panels would be mounted flush with the roof tiles, so avoiding any loss of historic fabric or impact on the roof structure. Providing detailed mounting specifications and drawings.
61. New Greenhouse/Glasshouse to East Elevation of the dwelling: The Agent has acknowledged that glasshouses are not historically found on traditional farmhouses and

could be visually intrusive if not designed appropriately. However, argues that the proposed glass house is lightweight and transparent in nature, which combined with the discreet location within the garden area, would minimise any visual intrusion and avoid harm to the architectural interest of the building and its context.

62. Changes to the existing side extension (west gable) of the house: The Agent has accepted the CO's assessment, that re-introducing a partition wall along the line of the original external wall of the house, may not enhance the building's significance and the view regarding the existing thravls and sink. However, argues that previous historic works to the building, and specifically regarding the supporting beams above the partition (due to extensive wet rot) means the beams currently lack the structural integrity to safely support the wall above them.
63. Significance of existing Thravls and Sink in pantry area: The Agent has suggested, that the existing stone thrawl could have been introduced in the mid/late C19, potentially as part of a commercial cheese production phase within the village. However, the stone salting trough appears remarkably clean and well-preserved, strongly suggesting the salting trough was not put in its current location until the second half of the C20. In this case, the main issue for the proposed partition is driven by a structural necessity, whilst aiming to resolve existing damp problems. In addition, the removal/relocation of the thravls and sink, (given their likely late C20 repositioning and lack of original historic context), would not cause harm to the building's significance.
64. First Floor Rear Bedroom (en-suite/utility, door moves): The comments regarding the historic doors are acknowledged and the proposal would be amended to retain the historic bedroom door in its current position.
65. New Toolshed, Oil Tank and Air-Source Heat Pump: The intention is to retain the oil tank as a backup for the existing boiler, with the ASHP as the primary heating source.
66. Windows and Rooflights: The agent are in agreement with the Authority, that the proposed replacement of modern windows and glass with more historically appropriate windows, and the replacement of large rooflights with smaller ones, would be an enhancement and that the changes would significantly improve the building's character.
67. Existing garage: The agent has confirmed that the proposals would include a total re-roof of the garage building.

Summary of Conservation Officer's final response to the above:

68. Installation details of the Solar Panels should be provided prior to fixing. In this case, should all other matters have been acceptable, this would have been conditioned according.
69. The CO restated that the proposal must be assessed on its own merits and that the addition of glasshouses are not historically found on traditional farmhouses.
70. The CO does not disagree with the date of the single storey side extension to the house (mid 1870's), but the interpretation of the date of the thravls and trough are considered questionable. The fact that the trough abuts a blockwork wall does not imply that they are contemporary. Although not 'Georgian' or in the list description, the extension, thravls and trough contribute to the architectural and historic interest of the listed building. Thravls and troughs are increasingly rare features in Peak District farmhouses and are illustrative of their former use.

71. On the structural issues: The fact that the area is beset by damp issues, only indicates that there is a damp issue that needs resolving. Reinstating the wall would not achieve this. In this case, it is considered the current arrangement could be fixed, with the timber or steelwork either being repaired or replaced, and the services rationalised. In this case, there is no evidence provided that the reinstatement of the wall is the only viable option.
72. Toolshed, oil tank and Air-Source Heat Pump: With the removal of the outbuilding to the side of the house, it would be considered an improvement to replace this with a smaller and better detailed toolshed. Overall, however, with the addition of a toolshed, oil-tank store, and a glass house, the result would be an intensification of the number of buildings in the relatively tight curtilage of the house. Moreover, it is not necessary to have two separate heating systems, and there are now plenty of examples of historic buildings heated only with air-source heat pumps.
73. Existing garage: Given the total re-roof: it would be prudent to impose a condition for the methodology of the re-roof, including that the slates are set aside for reuse, the proportion of new slates agreed with the authority following an assessment of the condition of the slates and with a sample being provided and inspected if required. It is also expected that the roof would be replaced like-for-like, including torching. Should all other matters have been acceptable all the above details would have been conditioned.

Heritage Conclusion

74. Overall, some compromise has been accepted by the CO, however, there are still concerns remaining that still constitute a clear objection. In this case, the cumulative impact of the erection of the glasshouse/greenhouse, installation of the ground floor partition wall, the loss of the thrawls and trough, construction of the overly large outbuilding to house a tool shed/oil heater and unnecessary additional backup heat source. Despite being offered opportunities to amend the submitted plans to overcome these concerns, the elements to which the Conservation Officer objects remain unchanged.
75. In this case as presented above, parts of the scheme represent a form of development/works that are not capable of being amended in a way which would make it acceptable in its current form. Contrary to Development Plan Policies GSP3, DS1, L3, DS1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMH7 & DMH8 in these respects.

Amenity

76. Policy GSP3 states, that all development must respect the living conditions of communities. Whilst policy DMC3 reiterates that where developments are acceptable in principle, particular attention will be paid to the amenity, privacy and security of the development and other properties that the development affects.
77. The nearest residential dwellings are 'Court House' adjacent to the eastern boundary of Church Farm and 'Spenage' which is sited around 20m to the north. In this case, due to the orientation and intervening degree of separation, the proposed development/works would have no adverse impact or significantly harm the residential amenity of these or any other residential dwellings in the locality, therefore accords with policies GSP3 & DMC3 in these respects

Environmental Management and sustainability

78. Policy CC1 sets out that development must make the most efficient and sustainable use of land, buildings and natural resources. Whilst Policy CC2 sets out that proposals for low carbon and renewable energy development will be encouraged provided they can be

accommodated without adversely affecting landscape character or the special qualities of the National Park

79. In this case, the inclusion of photovoltaic panels and air source heat pump, (measures which are considered address sustainability and climate change mitigation) are, due to the modest scale of development, would generally meet the requirements of policy CC1 & CC2 in these respects.

Ecology

80. Policy DMC12 states, that development will only be permitted where: (i) significant harm can be avoided and the conservation status of the population of the species or habitat concerned is maintained; and (ii) the need for, and the benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh any adverse effect.
81. Both a Preliminary Roost Assessment and a Nocturnal Bat Survey Report has been submitted in support of the application. Bats were found to be roosting in the house and the open fronted garage. However, due to the proposed works there would be a loss of some of the roosts.
82. The Authority's Ecologist has stated, that all surveys have been undertaken in line with the relevant guidelines and that an appropriate impact assessment has been undertaken along with details for appropriate mitigation/compensatory methods for all surveyed species/habitats. With this regard, a Licence from Natural England would be required to proceed with the proposed works and all mitigation and enhancement measures identified in the submitted Nocturnal Bat Survey Report should be conditioned.
83. In addition, enhancements outlined in the Preliminary Bat Survey Report are welcomed and recommended to mitigate against disturbance to birds that currently nest on site and also to deliver enhancements as per the NPPF. Consequently, and subject to all other matters being acceptable, the scheme (subject to recommended conditions) would generally comply with policy DMC12 in these respects

Archaeology

84. Policy DMC5 State amongst other things, that proposals likely to affect heritage assets with archaeological and potential archaeological interest should be supported by appropriate information that identifies the impacts or a programme of archaeological works to a methodology approved by the Authority.
85. The submitted Heritage Statement considers below ground archaeological interest, estimating the nature, extent and level of significance of that interest based on a consultation of Derbyshire Historic Environment Record. And that it meets the requirements of the NPPF with respect to archaeology. However, there is one piece of evidence for the site that the heritage statement has not considered.
86. During the rebuilding of an existing garden wall in 2019, a pre-historic arrowhead was discovered. Whilst the Authority's Senior Archaeologist considers the likelihood to be residual, the site may have potential for buried archaeological remains that pre-date the existing 18th century house and relate to the earlier development of the site and Parwich village.
87. Any such surviving archaeological remains therefore would be considered to be non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest and likely of local significance. In this case, should the planning balance be favourable, it is recommended that any harm

identified is mitigated by means of a condition for a programme of archaeological monitoring.

88. With this regard and subject to all other matters being considered acceptable, the scheme (subject to a recommended WSI condition) would comply with policy DMC5 in this instance.

Other matters

89. As a householder application, the proposals are exempt from statutory biodiversity net gain.

Conclusion

90. The proposals represent a form of development/works that is not capable of being amended in a way which would make the scheme acceptable in its current form. By virtue of its siting, design and use of materials, the glasshouse structure fails to reflect and conserve the traditional character and heritage significance of the host property and its setting within the Parwich Conservation area. Conflicting with Development Plan Policies GSP3, L3, DS1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMH7 & DMH8 in these respects. In this instance, the harm identified would not be outweighed by public benefits and therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
91. Furthermore, by virtue of a combination of inappropriate detail and loss of historic fabric, the scheme would cause undue harm to the overall character, appearance and heritage significance of the listed building. Conflicting with Development Plan Policies L3, DS1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC8, DMH7 & DMH8. In this case, the harm identified would not be outweighed by public benefits and therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Human Rights

1. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.
2. List of Background Papers (not previously published)
3. Nil
4. Report Author: Steve Coombes, South Area Planning Team.