



Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 12 March 2024

Site visit made on 12 March 2024

by Helen O'Connor LLB MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/W1850/W/23/3316691

Lower Daffaluke, Daffaluke Road, Glewstone, Ross-on-Wye HR9 6BB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Simon North against Herefordshire Council.
 - The application Ref P222006/F is dated 30 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of 1 stone barn (listed by curtilage), to provide holiday accommodation. Demolition of one tin barn (unlisted), to be re-built to provide holiday accommodation and laundry/bike storage area. Raising the south roof of a 'pig-shed' building (unlisted), to the ridge height of the North roof, installing solar panels, no change of usage. Associated work to the site including demolition of blockwork pens. Regularisation of the location of the completed Private Treatment Plant.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W1850/Y/23/3316692

Lower Daffaluke, Daffaluke Road, Glewstone, Ross-on Wye HR9 6BB

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Simon North against Herefordshire Council.
 - The application Ref P222007/L is dated 20 June 2022.
 - The works proposed are the conversion of 1 stone barn (listed by curtilage), to provide holiday accommodation. Demolition of one tin barn (unlisted), to be re-built to provide holiday accommodation and laundry/bike storage area. Raising the south roof of a 'pig-shed' building (unlisted), to the ridge height of the North roof, installing solar panels, no change of usage. Associated work to the site including demolition of blockwork pens.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed, and planning permission is refused for the conversion of 1 stone barn (listed by curtilage), to provide holiday accommodation. Demolition of one tin barn (unlisted), to be re-built to provide holiday accommodation and laundry/bike storage area. Raising the south roof of a 'pig-shed' building (unlisted), to the ridge height of the North roof, installing solar panels, no change of usage. Associated work to the site including demolition of blockwork pens. Regularisation of the location of the completed Private Treatment Plant.
2. Appeal B is dismissed, and listed building consent is refused for the conversion of 1 stone barn (listed by curtilage), to provide holiday accommodation. Demolition of one tin barn (unlisted), to be re-built to provide holiday accommodation and laundry/bike storage area. Raising the south roof of a 'pig-

shed' building (unlisted), to the ridge height of the North roof, installing solar panels, no change of usage. Associated work to the site including demolition of blockwork pens.

Applications for Costs

3. At the hearing the appellant confirmed that his written application for costs against Herefordshire Council was withdrawn. There were no other applications for costs made.

Preliminary Matters

4. The appeals relate to development and works at Little Daffaluke, a Grade II listed building (list entry no. 1288457). The description of the proposal is similar for both the planning appeal (Appeal A) and the listed building consent appeal (Appeal B) save for the reference to a private treatment plant in appeal A. To reduce repetition, I have dealt with both appeals together in this decision letter. I have borne in mind my statutory duties in respect of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) as appropriate.

Main Issues

5. The main issue common to both appeals is the effect of the proposals on the significance and special interest of Little Daffaluke, a Grade II listed building and any other relevant designated heritage assets.
6. In relation to Appeal A, additional main issues are the effect of the development on the River Wye Special Area of Conservation (SAC), protected species and highway safety.

Reasons

Listed buildings

Special interest and significance

7. Little Daffaluke is a detached farmhouse probably dating from the 15th century and described at the hearing as a cruck-framed hall house. It is constructed using a timber frame in sandstone rubble with an asbestos slate roof and brick stacks. Aside from a recent side extension, it comprises a single storey with attic on a rectangular plan. Therefore, the significance and special interest of the listed building is derived in part from its historic fabric and architectural interest as an example of a traditional Herefordshire farmhouse.
8. A further part of its heritage value lies in its countryside setting and the configuration of the wider former farmstead. This is because they give some insight into the likely social and economic standing of the historic occupants of the farmhouse and the way they used the surrounding land. Hence, the rural and agricultural context and traditional stone buildings that were associated with the farmhouse enrich its significance and special interest.
9. This includes the traditional stone barn that is the subject of these appeals. It lies perpendicular to the farmhouse and close to the west such that it forms part of a yard configuration with it. Although not as old as the farmhouse, there is no dispute that this building is a longstanding structure within its curtilage.

Consequently, it forms part of the listed building at Little Daffaluke as it falls within the definition set out in section 1(5) of the Act.

10. Although there have been additions to the southern and western elevations and a replacement of the original roof covering, the main body of the two-storey stone barn is clearly discernible as a substantial traditional agricultural building. This is owing to its distinctive rectangular narrow footprint, simple linear form and relatively limited openings. The openings that are present feature predominantly on the eastern principal elevation, which is oriented towards the farmhouse and yard. I observed that these comprised simple timber doors and timber framed mullion unglazed openings in-keeping with the rural character of the barn. The overall configuration reflects the barn's close relationship with the farmhouse, and it is probable that it would have been easily and often accessed by its occupants.
11. The internal division of space, upper floor with lime-ash floor and remnants of machinery give further clues as to its probable functional historic use as part of a working farm. This may have included workshops, cider production, storage of apples and/or grain or other produce.
12. The plainer architecture of the barn building contrasts with that of the farmhouse, reflecting its former function, but its scale and quality of materials reinforce the likely status of the overall farmstead. The probable surviving historic fabric at the barn include its external and internal stone walling, lime-ash floor and timber roof trusses. Furthermore, the massing and form of the stone barn are intrinsic components of its traditional agrarian character. These factors in turn enhance the historic and architectural value of the listed farmhouse.
13. In addition, there is a Grade II former field barn to the northwest of the appeal site (list entry no. 1214577). This building, known as Bramley Barn, is now in separate ownership from the farmhouse and has been converted to residential use. Nevertheless, there was a consensus at the hearing that the building would have historically been part of the farmstead with Little Daffaluke. Dating probably from the 18th century and constructed from sandstone rubble, it possesses notable architectural and historic value.
14. The size of these stone barns, their form, positioning and respective distances from the farmhouse tell a story about how the land was farmed, and give clues as to the social and economic structure of the rural community at that time. My observations were that collectively with the farmhouse they form a historic group and lie within each other's setting. Historic value is derived from their arrangement and inter-relationship with each other and the landscape. Accordingly, the rural and agricultural surroundings of the listed buildings enhance an appreciation of that history. As such, the setting of the listed buildings forms an important component of their special interest and significance.

The effect on listed buildings

15. The proposals would change the use of the stone barn at Little Daffaluke to an overtly domestic one, to provide holiday accommodation. Of serious concern would be the resultant reorientation of the building such that the main entrance would be on the western elevation, with a covered entrance porch and associated parking being provided on this side of the building. It follows that

there would be increased activity on the western side of the barn. Such an arrangement would undermine the hierarchy of the principal eastern elevation and weaken the building's obvious and functional relationship to the farmhouse.

16. Linked to that are the number and nature of new openings that would feature on the western elevation. It was confirmed at the hearing that there would be six new wall openings as well as five rooflights in the western elevation. Moreover, the existing first floor opening on that elevation would be infilled. Hence, the overall composition of the barn would be dramatically altered, with a regularity and number of openings that would seriously weaken its identity as an agricultural building. The number of additional openings and rooflights would harmfully disrupt the solid to void ratio at the appeal building which is partly characterised by its relatively limited openings. The harm would be particularly obvious when the building was internally lit.
17. Furthermore, the proposed ground and first floor layouts would create bedrooms and bathrooms that would fail to respect the traditional subdivision and spaces within the barn. The internal stone walls would have several openings created within them, and it is not convincingly shown that the positions of either internal or external stairs reflect historic points of accessing the upper part of the structure. Moreover, some historic fabric would be likely lost owing to new external and internal openings.
18. Consequently, the proposals would be harmful to the architectural interest of the barn and to an extent would cause a deterioration in its historic fabric. By making it harder to visually discern the historic functional use of the appeal building, the unsympathetic alterations would undermine the special interest and significance of Little Daffaluke as a designated heritage asset. For similar reasons it would also erode part of the setting that contributes towards the special interest and significance of Bramley Barn.
19. I acknowledge that other elements of the proposals would not cause harm to the significance of Little Daffaluke or Bramley Barn. The proposed studio structure is of a modest scale and simple form that would replace an existing larger tin barn in poor condition. Blockwork pens would be removed. Furthermore, despite the proposed increase in height and introduction of a solar array, the rudimentary agricultural qualities of the pig sheds would remain broadly similar. Overall, these factors would have a marginally beneficial impact on the settings of the listed buildings.
20. The Council accepted at the hearing that there would be some harm arising from the sub-division of internal space and loss of historic fabric, which was not disputed by the appellant. For the reasons outlined, with respect to the stone barn, I do not consider that the proposals would be proportionate or sympathetic. Instead, I find that the development and works would have a detrimental impact on the special interest of Little Daffaluke and Bramley Barn. Hence, this would run counter to the expectations of sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act which require me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.
21. It follows that the proposals would harm the significance of two designated heritage assets. In the terminology of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), in both cases I find that the proposals would cause less than

substantial harm to their overall significance. In these circumstances, paragraph 208 of the Framework requires the harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposals including, where appropriate, securing the optimum viable use of the asset.

Heritage balance

22. Both main parties assert there would be some heritage benefit to the stone barn arising from the proposals. Chief amongst those cited was a new use being secured for the building. It was also highlighted that the proposals would retain the lime-ash floor, would secure the removal of 20th century lean-to extensions on the western elevation of the building and improve the extension on the southern elevation.
23. The stone barn is not in active agricultural use, which has not assisted its condition. The proposals would be likely to bring investment and regular maintenance to the fabric of the listed building by reinstating an active use. Moreover, it would allow a range of future occupants to appreciate the heritage value of the building at first hand.
24. Nevertheless, whilst I accept that risks of physical deterioration of heritage assets are best addressed through ensuring they remain in active use, that ought to be consistent with, rather than at the expense of, their heritage value. I am not persuaded that securing the principal benefit inevitably necessitates compromising on those qualities that are important to the barn's significance. This is reinforced by references made to permission being granted for the conversion of the stone barn to two holiday letting units in 1998. Although this is no longer extant, it strongly suggests that there are alternative ways of providing such accommodation.
25. Consequently, even if tourism represents the optimum viable use, I am not persuaded that similar public benefits could not otherwise be achieved without the extent of harm identified. This tempers the weight afforded to this public benefit.
26. The proposal to remove the lean-to extensions on the western elevation would not be problematic. However, they are at least utilitarian and low-key in appearance and therefore, reinforce the secondary nature of the western elevation, unlike the proposals. The alterations to the southern extension do not primarily concern important historic fabric. As such, the heritage benefits to the stone barn would be minor.
27. As previously outlined some marginal improvement to the setting of the listed buildings would result from other aspects of the proposals, which attracts favourable weight.
28. There would be economic benefits associated with the provision of holiday accommodation, which would provide income and employment as part of a rural business. Potentially the wider local economy may benefit from increased tourist activity. Shorter term economic benefits would also be associated with the construction phase.
29. Potentially, increased planting associated with the proposals would result in biodiversity net gain and the solar array would be likely to bring some environmental benefits by providing a source of renewable energy.

30. Taking these factors together, given the relative minor scale of the proposals, the cumulative extent of public benefits would be modest, and I attribute them moderate positive weight. Balanced against this is the great weight¹ given to the less than substantial harm to each designated heritage asset. Hence, I find that the sum of public benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets identified. Conflict therefore arises with the historic environment protection policies within the Framework.
31. Accordingly, I find that the works and development would conflict with policies SS6 and LD4 of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011-2031, October 2015 (LP) which, amongst other things, require proposals to conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings in a manner appropriate to their significance. Additionally, there would be conflict with policies RA5 and E4 of the LP insofar as support for the reuse of rural buildings and tourism development is subject to proposals avoiding harm to the significance of heritage assets.

SAC

32. The proposed development seeks retrospective consent for a package sewage treatment plant (PTP) previously installed to serve part of the farmhouse. The PTP is designed to serve 20 persons and discharges to a watercourse along the southern boundary. It is proposed that the PTP would also provide foul drainage for the holiday accommodation. At the hearing the appellant stated that he proposes to fully connect the farmhouse to the PTP, as older parts of the dwelling still use the historic foul drainage system.
33. The appeal site is within the catchment of the River Wye, which is part of the SAC. It lies about 6.4km from the SAC hydrologically. The SAC designation reflects the geologically mixed catchment which provides a variety of habitats, including those suitable to support increasingly rare aquatic flora and fauna. The SAC is recognised under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Regulations).
34. Increasing phosphorus levels associated with discharge from development are having an adverse impact on the water quality of the River Wye, which in turn threatens the health of the protected habitats and associated species in the SAC. Advice from Natural England (NE)² indicates that the SAC is in an unfavourable declining condition. The Council explained at the hearing that the appeal site lies in the Impact Risk Zone for the SAC identified by NE.
35. The main parties at the hearing agreed that for the purposes of the Regulations, it should be assumed that the surface and foul water discharges arising from the development would have a likely significant effect upon the SAC. In these circumstances, the Regulations specify that before granting permission, an appropriate assessment of the implications of the proposals must be undertaken. Furthermore, permission can only be granted having ascertained that the development will not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC.
36. The product specification and testing information provided for the installed PTP indicates generally that the effluent discharged to the watercourse would

¹ Paragraph 205, National Planning Policy Framework

² Letter dated 1.3.24

contain some phosphorus. The Council's natural environment officer described the make and model of the PTP installed as a domestic, mid-range system in terms of its performance. Hence, the foul drainage arrangements associated with the proposals would be likely to increase the level of phosphorus discharged from the appeal site into the watercourse, which ultimately flows into the River Wye and the SAC. No specific mitigation measures are proposed to address phosphorus levels discharging to the watercourse.

37. The Council confirmed at the hearing that they consider that the proposals would not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC. This is owing in part to a combination of the small scale of the development, and the site's hydrological distance from the SAC. They contend that the small amount of additional phosphorus would be so diluted that it would have a negligible effect on the water quality of the SAC. They further point out that NE have not advised that the SAC is in a failing condition, and that they have not objected to the proposal.
38. However, I am required under the Regulations to consider the effect of the proposal both alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Furthermore, an appropriate assessment must contain complete, precise and definitive findings which are capable of removing all reasonable scientific doubt as to the absence of adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. This is a high threshold, and so where doubt remains, it cannot benefit the appellant.
39. The SAC is in an unfavourable condition which risks a loss of biodiversity. Furthermore, this situation is worsening as signified by the relatively recent downgrading of its status to 'declining' in May 2023. Hence, this is a context sensitive to the cumulative impact of development, even if individually they may comprise small scale proposals that only add a small amount of additional phosphorus.
40. It follows that it is important to fully understand the likely impact arising from other projects and plans that may affect the SAC. Based on the written evidence before me and that given verbally at the hearing, I am not assured that once cumulative impacts are also considered, there would be no adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC.
41. In coming to this view, I have taken account of the comments from NE. Their most recent letter³ points out that they previously responded with a 'no objection' and that the earlier response⁴ and details still stand. However, the earlier response related to the Council's appropriate assessment undertaken at that time. This was on the premise that additional foul water generated by the proposals would be managed through an existing PTP with capacity. Indeed, the PTP was not included as part of the description of development at that point. Therefore, I am not confident that it included an assessment of the 'existing' PTP as it ought to have done given that retrospective consent is sought.
42. The appellant asserts that fully connecting the farmhouse to the PTP would represent a betterment in comparison to the existing situation. However, uncertainty remains as to what the existing foul water arrangements comprise, and therefore, what its present implications for the SAC are. Consequently,

³ Letter dated 1.3.24

⁴ Letter dated 8.8.22

although possible, a betterment cannot be assumed. It follows that the extent of any improvement has not been objectively shown which prevents a meaningful comparison. Accordingly, this attracts little weight.

43. Consequently, having undertaken an appropriate assessment necessary under the Regulations, I am unable to find that the development contains complete, precise, and definitive findings with respect to water quality, which are capable of removing all reasonable scientific doubt as to the absence of adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC. Hence, based on the available evidence, an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC cannot be ruled out.
44. Neither do I consider that it has been shown that there are no alternative solutions, or imperative reasons of overriding public interest to justify the development under the Regulations. In these circumstances the Regulations indicate that permission must not be granted. Moreover, paragraph 186a of the Framework confirms that if significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.
45. Accordingly, I find that the proposal conflicts with policies SS6, LD2, SD3 and SD4 of the LP as it is not shown that in relation to water quality, the development would have no adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC. Amongst other things, these policies require development that does not compromise the integrity of Special Areas of Conservation and does not cause an unacceptable risk to water quality.

Protected species

46. Part of policy LD2 of the LP broadly seeks to ensure that proposals do not cause harm to protected species. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)⁵ reinforces that planning authorities need to consider the potential impacts of development on protected and priority species, and the scope to avoid or mitigate any impacts when considering planning applications.
47. The planning application (Appeal A) was accompanied by an ecology survey report⁶ which has been amended and updated for the appeal (dated June 2023). In terms of protected species, bats and great crested newts (GCN) were given further consideration. Three species of bat were found to be using the stone barn for summer (non-maternity) day resting roosts. The ecology report includes a mitigation plan⁷ to address methods of working and compensation measures. These include measures to provide bat boxes and lighting design. It also confirms that a European Protected Species Licence would need to be separately obtained. The Council's natural environment officer accepts that planning conditions could be used to secure the mitigation and there was no substantive evidence given at the hearing to undermine those findings.
48. The ecology report also identifies that GCN are likely to be present in local ponds, which is consistent with representations received from local residents. There is an area around the stone barn which provides suitable habitat for GCN, and this would be reduced as a result of the proposals. However, given its distance from ponds, it is unlikely that harm would be caused to GCN if suitable care is taken.

⁵ Paragraph 016 Reference ID: 8-016-20190721

⁶ Prepared by Environmental Methods

⁷ Appendix 1

49. In these circumstances, standard non-licensed precautionary working methods to protect GCN are proposed and are set out in Appendix 2 of the ecology report. Although misgivings have been raised as to whether the likely effect on GCN has been accurately assessed, the Council's natural environment officer confirmed at the hearing that she is firmly of the view that sufficient reasonable avoidance measures could be secured to avoid harm to GCN. I attribute greater weight to her evidence on this point given her local knowledge and expertise.
50. On that basis, I am assured that the proposals would suitably avoid adverse impacts on protected species such that it would accord with the development plan requirements and advice in PPG.

Highway safety

51. Paragraph 115 of the Framework stipulates that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
52. Policy SS4 of the LP states, amongst other things, that the efficient and safe operation of the network should not be detrimentally impacted by new development. In addition, where practicable, proposals should be accessible by and facilitate a genuine choice of modes of travel. Policy MT1 of the LP sets out further principles covering movement and transportation. These include that the local highway network can absorb the traffic impacts without adversely affecting the safe and efficient flow of traffic, or that traffic impacts can be managed to acceptable levels to reduce and mitigate any adverse impacts from the development.
53. The proposals would create two units of holiday accommodation which would be likely to generate some vehicular traffic. This would necessitate the use of the existing road network close to the appeal site which generally comprise narrow, partly winding rural lanes, often with hedgerows either side. They are unlit, with no designated footways, infrequently maintained and possess limited passing opportunities to accommodate two-way traffic.
54. At the hearing it was broadly agreed that the immediate road network was lightly trafficked, which in turn encourages the use of the lanes by recreational walkers, cyclists and sometimes horse riders. Furthermore, the conditions tend to mean that most drivers must exercise caution and proceed at relatively low speeds. Nevertheless, when opposing motor vehicles do meet, this can be problematic and result in inconvenience for all road users, and sometimes difficult manoeuvring.
55. The likely number of trips generated by the proposal would be in the region of 2-4 off-peak movements per holiday unit per day. The Council confirmed at the hearing that the appeal site could resume an agricultural use, with its attendant vehicular movements. By comparison, there would be little difference in the overall number of vehicle movements generated by the appeal proposals. However, agricultural traffic could involve larger vehicles or trailers. It is probable that future holiday unit occupants would exercise caution as they would generally be unfamiliar with the road conditions. Furthermore, they may seek to undertake recreational walking and/or cycling whilst on holiday.

Overall, the evidence does not show that the local highway network could not absorb the traffic movements generated by the proposal.

56. I accept that the local road network is not ideal, but paragraph 109 of the Framework recognises that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas and states that this should be taken into account in decision-making.
57. At the hearing, the Highway Officer confirmed that the manoeuvring required to allow motor vehicles to pass was not inherently unsafe, and that drivers would be likely to adapt their driving to reflect the rural road conditions. On that basis, her view was that there would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, to which I attribute considerable weight.
58. Taking the above factors together, I am assured that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety and any residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be marginal. Accordingly, the proposal would broadly accord with policies SS4 and MT1 of the LP.

Other Matters

59. Amongst other matters, policy SD1 of the LP requires development proposals to safeguard residential amenity for existing and proposed residents. Concerns were raised that the holiday accommodation could have a harmful impact on the living conditions of existing residents owing to noise and disturbance arising from music, fireworks, open fires and external lighting. However, the extent of holiday accommodation is modest with the buildings separated by a considerable distance from the nearest dwellings. The appellant and Council outlined how such impacts could be adequately controlled through planning conditions. On that basis, I am assured that the living conditions of existing residents would not be unreasonably compromised.
60. In making my determination I have had regard to the representations made in support of the proposal but have addressed the matters raised in my consideration of the main issues.

Conclusions

61. Overall, I find that the development and works would conflict with the statutory provisions set out in the Act; the historic environment policies within the Framework; as well as heritage and design policies in the development plan. There are not wider public benefits sufficient to outweigh the harms identified. Furthermore, in relation to Appeal A, an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC cannot be ruled out, and following an appropriate assessment, the Regulations indicate that permission must not be granted.
62. Planning law requires applications for planning permission (Appeal A) be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The public benefits outlined in relation to the first main issue are equally relevant to this overall planning balance. Furthermore, the proposals would be beneficial to the appellant and his family. Nevertheless, I do not find that those material considerations carry enough weight to justify making the decision other than in accordance with the development plan.

63. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed, and planning permission refused; and that Appeal B should fail and listed building consent be refused.

Helen O'Connor

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Simon North	Appellant
Mrs North	Appellant
Mr Ian Kilby	Planning Advisor

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr J Evans	Senior Planning Officer
Mr Simon Withers	Development Manager
Mr Joyce	Historic Building Consultant
Miss Fran Lancaster	Principal Natural Environment Officer
Mrs Jill Tookey-Williams	Highway Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Mr Mark Ebbutt	Local Resident - Objecting
Mrs Aleksandra Ebbutt	Local Resident - Objecting
Mr Max Clark	Local Resident - Objecting
Mrs Jenny Clark	Local Resident - Objecting
Miss Karen Webb	Local Resident - Supporting
Mr Thomas Allan	Local Resident - Supporting

DOCUMENTS HANDED IN AT THE HEARING

1. Copy of Building Regulations Completion Certificate dated 6.3.24, reference 09D556.
2. List of four suggested planning conditions agreed by the main parties as a revision to the Statement of Common Ground.