

BUSINESS CASE

Summary

Asset Management Plan review of the management of the Authority owned Stanage/North Lees Estate as a priority because the current farm tenants (Derby College) are due to leave 29 September 2006.

This business case recommends that the partnership approach, as embodied in the Stanage Forum, should continue to be built upon for the longer term future management of the Estate. Due to the urgency presented by the current farm tenants leaving, it is recommended that, in the short-term, we should seek someone else to manage the day-to-day running of the farm (as a tenant or partner) and use the opportunity to seek alternative management of some of the buildings on site, thereby releasing capital and saving revenue expenditure. It is considered that these new arrangements will not preclude investigating greater partnership working, including as part of corporate investigation into possible trust status, as an over-arching objective.

Business Need & Strategic Fit

The Stanage/North Lees Estate Management Plan is one of the action plans under the National Park Management Plan. It was agreed by all stakeholders through the Stanage Forum process and approved by the Authority in October 2002. It sets out the objectives for the Estate over a 10 year period. It embodies the National Park Management Plan principles of sustainability and partnership and is an integrated plan which contributes to a whole range of National Park objectives. The Plan contains a number of objectives for the farm on the ground. During 2005/06 these were reviewed by NPA officers and the Stanage Forum Steering Group and are attached at Appendix 1.

The business need is now to review possible management options against these objectives under the Authority's asset management review principles, namely:

- Review properties against NPA objectives
- Consider other options to secure objectives
- Verify any legal constraints on disposal
- Examine how alternative management arrangements could release resources
- Consider how to focus resources on retained properties

The main issues to be addressed are:

- The land – could the management of the in-bye fields be split from the moorland
- Buildings – could we sell any of the buildings whilst continuing to conserve and enhance their historic value and without undue effect on the rest of the Estate
- Partnership working – how to build on the well established partnership way of working with farm and historic building tenants and through the Stanage Forum.

Statement of Options

Below is a list of all options considered and a summary of issues/pros and cons. Further details concerning these options and issues are presented in Appendix 2. A meeting was held with internal consultees and representatives of the Stanage Forum Steering Group on 24 April 2006 to discuss these options and their views are presented in Appendix 3.

THE LAND

Option 1 (Recommended): Keep the moorland and in-bye together

(Also favoured by Stanage Forum Steering Group – see Appendix 3 for their views).

Option 2: Sell the in-bye

Option 3: Lease the in-bye separately to the moorland

Moorland, including Stanage Edge

There are very clear reasons for the Authority owning and managing the moorland and the Edge (with its conservation designations and high visitor numbers). It might only be possible to dispose of our interest here to a very like-minded organisation but this has not been explored.

In-bye fields (pastures and hay meadows)

The reasons for retaining this are less clear. The pros and cons are listed below, with the recommendation that it should be retained (see end of the options section for details).

Woodlands

The main woodlands on the Estate are managed by the Authority's Forestry & Tree Team. It is suggested that their management should be reviewed (if necessary) after the decisions have been made about the main Estate.

Pros and cons/issues

Keeping the moorland and in-bye together	Managing the in-bye separately to the moorland (by either lease or sale)
<p>Farming Simplest to continue as now. Current farming system relies on moorland and in-bye. The sheep flock is hefted to the moor but needs in-bye land for lambing, and winter grazing.</p>	<p>Disposal of the in-bye would make the Estate less viable as a farming unit and create difficulties concerning the hefted flock. The in-bye would be fairly easy to let but the moorland on its own may not. In particular, finding someone to purchase the hefted flock (costing around £.....) could prove difficult and would restrict our market to local farmers with their own surplus in-bye land for lambing and off-wintering. The alternative of simply not grazing the moorland would have a negative impact on its conservation value.</p>
<p>Protection of core conservation objectives Direct management is the surest way of protecting the conservation value of the in-bye hay meadows and wet pastures, the wildlife links with the moorland (see further detail in Appendix 2) and building on these to achieve the agreed farm objectives over an integrated area of moorland and in-bye.</p>	<p>The conservation values of the land could be protected by agri-environment schemes and cross compliance, although the certainty of protection would be less than under direct management. The risk of loss/deterioration of 6 hay meadows and 4 wet pastures would need particular consideration. If the land is to be managed by others under agri-environment schemes, this would require monitoring and resources for that monitoring.</p> <p>Separate management would make it difficult to achieve a number of the agreed farm objectives – see detail in Appendix 2.</p>
<p>Financial – there would be no short term capital gain. There could still be revenue budget savings by building on partnerships.</p>	<p>There would be a short-term capital gain of an estimated £..... from selling the in-bye, providing funds to invest in retained property. An unpopular decision may lead to a decline in good will and reduction in the investment in time & effort of users and stakeholders.</p>
<p>Historic context Previous owner sold to the Authority so that the Estate would remain intact.</p>	<p>Concerns would have to be handled very carefully and decisions fully explained to avoid bad PR.</p>
<p>Recreation Retains the minor links that exist</p>	<p>The majority of recreation opportunities relate to the moorland. However, Ramblers would seek new open access and linking rights of way to be designated and in place on the in-bye land before any change of ownership/management (on top of those</p>

	in the agreed farm objectives).
Demonstrating best practice/education Optimum opportunity through management of both moorland and in-bye together to ideal standards.	On the in-bye land, we would be restricted to influencing others to manage it well and would have to rely on that to demonstrate management over a wide range of habitats.
Integrated management Continues to demonstrate the benefits of integration linked to National Park objectives.	Would go against this principle.
Local economy	Separation may make it more difficult to maximise the impact the Estate has on the local economy.
Practical	Division of the landholding might lead to a multiplication of disputes and disagreements.

THE BUILDINGS

The Estate has the following buildings:

- (a) North Lees Hall – a 16th Century Grade II* Listed Building - leased to the Vivat Trust for 50 years until 2038, who manage it as holiday apartments and are responsible for all repairs and maintenance.
- (b) North Lees Farmhouse – until now inhabited by the tenant's shepherd/farm manager (although has been vacant for the past 4 years due to structural changes at Derby College, the current tenants)
- (c) Cruck Barn – Grade II Listed traditional barn. Contains teaching room, toilets and limited agricultural use for hay and machinery storage and lambing.
- (d) New Barn – a modern steel framed agricultural building of some use for farming purposes but requiring major drainage work.
- (e) Cattisside Cottage – The Estate Warden's residence
- (f) Campsite building & car parks

The overall recommendations amount to building on the partnership with the Vivat Trust for some of the buildings via a mixture of sales/leases/partnerships.

Each building has been assessed in turn as to whether we could sell it/withdraw from direct management, with the following issues/pros and cons:

(a) North Lees Hall

Option 4: Sell the Hall (+ adjoining field and pig sties) on the open market

This is not currently considered to be a viable option. This is because there are few who could maintain this historic building adequately and few (if any) who would be interested in purchasing it subject to the Vivat Trust's existing lease (which does not end until 2053).

Option 5 (Recommended): Sell the Hall (+ adjoining field and pig sties) to the Vivat Trust

(Cautiously supported by Stanage Forum Steering Group – see Appendix 3 for their views).

Option 6: Maintain as now – in our ownership, leased to Vivat Trust

Issues/ pros and cons:

Retaining freehold	Selling it to Vivat Trust
Financial – capital Retains higher value in the future, once Vivat's lease expires, including potential marriage value with the farmhouse (estimated at £.....). However, this might not be until 2053 (as the Vivat Trust will almost certainly be entitled to extend their lease for a further 15 years beyond the current lease term).	Could raise capital (DV values the property at around £.....) to reinvest in Authority properties (if the Vivat Trust have the means to raise this amount, although Vivat may come forward with its own valuation based on a business plan for investment in the property)
Financial – revenue for maintenance Ongoing funding problems for repair and maintenance of this Grade II* Listed Building.	Enables Vivat Trust to raise a mortgage and funding initiatives to fully repair and maintain their own building.
Practical Ongoing vested interest in being co-operative as tenants and more accepting of our use of our neighbouring property.	As new owners, the Trust may be less co-operative regarding shared services and costs and the use of our neighbouring land and buildings, such as a working

<p>Long-term future If the Vivat Trust are unable to adequately maintain the building, we could, in theory, seek a new tenant/owner but would have to wait until they withdrew and suffer an unhappy period with bad PR etc possibly until 2053.</p>	<p>farm.</p> <p>Vivat Trust have a proven track record and ability to manage the building extremely well. In addition, a covenant could be put on the sale that the Authority must be consulted on any work to the property, including that which falls outside the planning process. However, if the Vivat Trust want to sell it on, we would have to rely on Listed Buildings legislation for protection, which, although not as strong as direct ownership, ought to be adequate. Buy-back covenants could be put on any sale but this would reduce its value, be difficult to enforce and we'd need to find the capital to buy it back, which would probably be unlikely.</p>
---	---

(b) North Lees Farmhouse

Option 7: As now, retain in our ownership and lease as a farmhouse with the land (if retained)

(Favoured by Stanage Forum Steering Group – see Appendix 3 for their views).

Option 8 (Recommended): Sell the farmhouse to the Vivat Trust

(Some support from Stanage Forum Steering Group if the right package can be put in place).

Option 9: Sell the farmhouse on the open market

(There are also other options of retaining ownership but leasing to Vivat Trust/others but these are not considered to be worthwhile options and the main issues are covered under the 3 options identified).

Comparison of issues/pros and cons (see Appendix 2 for further details):

Retaining as a farmhouse	Selling to Vivat Trust	Selling to anyone else
<p>Financial: Maximises rental income to the revenue budget.</p>	<p>Could raise capital to reinvest in retained property. (DV values it at £..... or £..... combined with the Hall, due to marriage value). However, the Trust have indicated that they would not be willing to pay as much as this open market value, as they estimate that it would cost a further £..... to fully restore the farmhouse to its original condition.</p>	<p>Realises open market capital value of around £..... but would not capitalise on £..... marriage value of combining it with the Hall.</p>
<p>Repair/maintenance: Requires around £..... expenditure to put it in good condition to re-let, which would be difficult for the Authority to raise. Ongoing maintenance would be at a minimum.</p>	<p>Enables restoration to its original condition and maximises future building repair and maintenance.</p>	<p>Unlikely to be restored to its original condition and may not be decorated/maintained in a way which complements the Hall.</p>
<p>Farming: Would demonstrate our support for small living, working farms, showing that they can still be viable with high quality environmentally-friendly produce and diversification. Retains ability to adequately supervise livestock in a high visitor area with unfenced roads (and therefore greater need).</p>	<p>Potential for some kind of partnership arrangement with Vivat concerning this building and the Hall. E.g. possibility of retaining a lease-back option but this would impact on its sale value (but potentially putting it within financial reach of the Vivat Trust). If approved in principle this will require further valuation advice. Without such a clause/arrangement would lose the opportunity for</p>	<p>Would deny opportunity for anyone to live on site and farm the land (apart from the Estate Warden at Cattisside). Potential loss of another living, working small farm to become farmland attached to a neighbouring property (thus supporting their farming but following the trend of expansion). However, the land could still attract a new entrant farmer who lives locally and doesn't need a house on site.</p>

	anyone to live on site and farm the land (as for sale to anyone else).	
Practicalities: Possible conflict between Hall tenants and farm tenants.	A logical reconnection of uses of adjoining historic buildings. If no lease-back option, loses potential for on-site presence. The issue of longer term protection would need to be addressed, i.e. if Vivat decided to sell the farmhouse on.	Selling the farmhouse loses potential for on-site presence (other than the Estate Warden at Cattisside). Greater potential for conflicting uses by introducing a third party.

(c) Cruck Barn

Option 10: As now, retain in our ownership and lease as part of the farm (if land retained)

Option 11 (Recommended): Sell (or lease or set up a partnership) to/with the Vivat Trust

(Cautious support from Stanage Forum Steering Group if the right package can be put in place – see Appendix 3 for their views).

Option 12: Sell on the open market

(There is a further option of retaining ownership but leasing on the open market but this is not considered worthy of further exploration and the main issues are covered under the 3 options identified).

Comparison of issues/pros and cons (see Appendix 2 for further details):

Retaining with the land	Selling to Vivat Trust	Selling to anyone else
Financial: No capital gain. Likely to result in more rent for the revenue budget.	Realises capital (DV values it at around £.....) but Vivat are unlikely to be willing to pay full open market value.	Potential to realise full open market capital value (DV values it at around £.....).
Farming: Retains current minimal farming use and if used more by a willing tenant/partner, could enable demolition of modern barn. Enables diversification, making this a more viable farming unit.	Potential for some kind of partnership arrangement with Vivat concerning this building and the Hall. For example, possibility of retaining a lease-back option so that Vivat could maintain the barn but it could be used by the farm. However, this would impact on its sale value. If approved in principle this will require further valuation advice. The issue of longer term protection would need to be addressed, i.e. if Vivat decided to sell the farmhouse on. Could also be restored to its original condition as an attraction in its own right.	Loss of farming use or any use in connection with the Hall.
Practicalities: Possible conflict between Hall tenants and farm tenants if developed as a bunkhouse.	A simplification of management of all historic buildings on the site. A fully restored historic barn could form an attraction in its own right.	Greater potential for conflicting uses by introducing a 3 rd or 4 th party.
Repair/maintenance A new tenant could use it as a bunkhouse, funding maintenance but not full restoration. Losehill Hall would have the option of continuing to use the teaching facilities.	Could enable full restoration to its original condition and high level of maintenance.	Unlikely to be restored to original condition. Could be maintained if an economic use could be found for it. However, there are few other uses possible in planning terms, other than a bunkhouse. Services (water, electrical supply and access) are also near their limit. Would have to rely on planning

		control to protect against inappropriate uses or disrepair.
--	--	---

(d) New barn

Not of any great consequence to the review of the management of the Estate.
The only realistic options are to manage it with the farm land or preferably, to demolish if it is not needed.

(e) Cattiside Cottage

(f) Campsite and Car Parks

It is advised that the use of these buildings / facilities are issues to be considered after the other major decisions about the Estate have been made.

PARTNERSHIPS / TRUSTS

It is considered that the partnership options below could all be pursued whatever is decided about the land and buildings above. However, it should be recognised that the more that is let or sold, the more the potential impact/restriction there may be on a partnership.

(a) Short-term

Option 13: Refresh existing partnership arrangements in the short-term

There would be an obvious short-term need to review how we work with any new tenants/partners, including how they should fit into the Stanage Forum process, the role of the Estate Warden and how they relate to the campsite, car parks and the National Park Ranger Service.

(b) Longer-term

Three options have been considered:

Option 14: Build on existing “loose partnerships” with joint working via memorandum of agreement or similar

Option 15 (Recommended): Establish a partnership or charitable trust to oversee the whole Stanage/North Lees Estate.

(Favoured by Stanage Forum Steering Group – see Appendix 3 for their views).

Option 16 (Recommended as a possible): Establish a broader partnership or Trust covering a wider area, at a landscape scale. Possibly as part of a Trust embracing other Authority properties elsewhere.

(Cautiously supported by Stanage Forum Steering Group – see Appendix 3 for their views).

Options 15 & 16: More research is necessary to weigh up potential pros and cons in full and should be investigated further as part of an Authority wide consideration of Trust potential. As part of this, it is suggested that the Authority might consider building on the Stanage Forum Steering Group by leasing the Estate to them as a more formal Trust or partnership of key stakeholders and funding partners.

There may be sense in broadening the area covered to include the Authority’s Eastern Moors Estate and, if the owners were willing to join with us, Sheffield City Council’s adjoining land towards Redmires and the Burbage Valley and the National Trust’s Longshaw Estate and land around Greens House Farm (bordering North Lees) or perhaps even wider, such as the whole SSSI. The Stanage Forum supports these as possible options.

Issues/pros and cons:

Loose partnerships	Trust for Stanage	Trust for wider area
<p>Financial: Less likely to bring in significant extra resources (as we’re already doing it wherever possible). No “teeth”.</p>	<p>Opening up further grant sources of funding and allows other partners to more readily invest in the Estate. This could save the Authority some revenue expenditure and provide greater security for future funding than just one organisation. Also likely to lead to even greater in kind commitment of voluntary time.</p>	<p>Maximises potential for pooling resources and increasing the likelihood and range of grant funding and voluntary time commitment.</p>
<p>Integration: Continues at current level</p>	<p>Integrating the Estate, campsite, car parks (and possibly woodlands)</p>	<p>Integrating the Estate, campsite, car parks (and possibly woodlands) with an even wider area. Larger area would perhaps enable different activities to be permitted in different</p>

		areas to help resolve conflicting uses.
Achievement of National Park objectives: Continues as now.	Building on good practice achieved so far by devolving more responsibility to the Forum, creating an even greater sense of "ownership" to benefit the Estate.	Greater commitment of partners through shared values/vision for the area. Potential to spread the benefits of the Stanage Forum approach. Many of the objectives contained in the Stanage/North Lees Estate Management Plan would be easily transferrable to a wider area.
Level of complexity: Simplest to continue as now.	Would be more complex but the Stanage Forum management structure and Steering Group is already in place. It might be prudent to start with Stanage and then move to a wider area if successful.	Would be more complex. Potential difficulties in getting partners with different values to agree (but the Stanage Forum has experience to build on in order to achieve this).
Securing public engagement: Stanage Forum requires ongoing support from PDNPA.	Legally binding articles of association could further protect a democratic partnership approach to working to agreed outcomes.	Legally binding articles of association could further protect a democratic partnership approach to working to agreed outcomes over a wider area. Need to mitigate against it being too big and just a talking shop and too diluted.
Practical/farming:		Such a partnership might overcome problems of "trespass" grazing with our neighbouring farm Might help establish "open moor policy", with consequent removal of fencing from neighbouring moorland.

Option 17 (Recommended as a future possible): A future partnership/Trust could manage the farming operation in-house.

Although this could be set up in the shorter term and potentially give the best conservation benefit, we have a clear steer from the Authority's Asset Management Plan principles that we should reduce direct input to land management where it is not essential to securing Authority objectives on property.

(Strongly favoured by the Stanage Forum Steering Group – see Appendix 3 for their views).

Issues/pros and cons

. This in-house option may not be favoured currently but might be considered if a partner/Trust can bring adequate resources and experience.

- **Financial: Revenue budget:** The Authority can now enter its land to DEFRA's new agri-environment scheme (The Higher Level Scheme or HLS). In the past we have not been able to and have created tenancies, so that our tenants can put the land in agri-environment schemes. Although further work on the detailed financial implications is required, detailed calculations have been made for our Eastern Moors Estate which show that a HLS in our name would generate substantially more income than the current rent from tenancies (more than enough to pay for extra farm management staff). If a like-minded partner organisation were interested in helping us to run the farming enterprise, it could then become a very viable option. This option could also make the most of "investment" of voluntary time and effort from stakeholders.
- **Financial: Capital:** There would be less need for the farmhouse, as the Estate Warden could be made partially responsible for livestock supervision. This would enable sale of the farmhouse at full market value without a lease-back clause – see above. However, there would be a need to purchase the hefted flock, at around £....., if the moorland is to continue to be grazed.

- **Achieving NP objectives:** It is the easiest way to achieve the whole range of objectives for the farm, for example including local rare breed cattle, farmed to high EQM standards and perhaps organic. There is an opportunity to genuinely manage the farm as a demonstration of best practice. However, the question has to be asked whether the burden of providing such a demonstration project should fall on the Authority. This is not a “normal” farm and requires something different to the average farm tenant to really make it work. The diversity and strength of opinion of all the interests in the Estate require careful consideration (including the neighbouring farmer on an unfenced moor). The recreational pressure on the Estate is also intense. The existing Estate Management Plan would have to be adhered to and the Stanage Forum properly engaged. This would limit the number of suitable tenants/partners and the potential for conflicts with stakeholders is great. In-house management would also be the most flexible to change and allow for experimentation with fodder crops, traditional hay baling and restoration techniques, etc. Also, Losehill Hall and others could be fully involved in making the most of educational and demonstration potential of the farm.
- **Other buildings:** We would not need to develop the barns as bunkhouses (as another tenant/owner would almost certainly want to do), therefore avoiding potential conflict with Vivat Trust’s use of the Hall.
- **Practical:** Would place additional responsibilities on the Authority, including responsibility for livestock welfare and other animal husbandry legislation. Would require more staff time to manage a working farm. It is suggested that there would be a need to employ at least a part-time shepherd/farm manager to work alongside existing staff. The market for potential tenants may be restricted as many could be put off by the number of annual sheep losses due to the unfenced roads and moorland boundary and/or there is likely to be greater pressure from a tenant for a fence to be erected (which has always been resisted as it would spoil the wild open moorland landscape). Also, experience on virtually all of our tenanted farms shows that farming for a living can direct a lower priority to conservation and a need for more control and encouragement to ensure that wider objectives are met.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following package of recommendations is considered to offer the best combination of actions in order to withdraw from some management responsibilities and raise capital under the asset management review criteria whilst still achieving National Park objectives.

THE LAND

1. Keep the moorland and in-bye land together as one farming unit. Tenders should be sought for a new Farm Business Tenant (or other partnership arrangement whereby the partner manages the farming operation). The tenancy/partnership agreement should be for 5 years (the minimum requirement for DEFRA's Higher Level Scheme). Tenders should be sought for 4 alternative arrangements simultaneously:
 - (a) For the land, new barn, farm house and cruck barn
 - (b) For the land, new barn and cruck barn
 - (c) For the land and new barn alone

Then once we know what potential interest there is, we will be better placed to make a final decision with regard to the buildings – see below.

THE BUILDINGS

2. Sell the Hall, adjoining field and pig sties to the Vivat Trust (District Valuer advises that it is worth around £.....).
3. Sell the farmhouse to the Vivat Trust, subject to a lease-back option for a farm tenant/manager's residence if required. However, the decision as to whether to sell the farmhouse to the Trust should be deferred until after tenders have been received for the farm land. If the best tender(s) rely on the farmhouse being part of their bid, then we might reconsider if their bid is of an exceptional standard in terms of meeting the agreed farm objectives.
4. Sell if possible or lease the Cruck Barn to the Vivat Trust, subject to a lease-back option but deferred until after bids have been received for the land (as for the farmhouse above).

In effect, this might constitute a partnership approach to the buildings between ourselves and Vivat Trust. It is hoped that they will be able to raise sufficient capital to purchase the three buildings. If not, other lease/partnership arrangements will need to be considered for the farmhouse and/or cruck barn.

PARTNERSHIPS

5. Refresh existing partnership arrangements in the short-term. Review how we work with any new tenants/partners once they have been selected, including how they should fit into the Stanage Forum.
6. Investigate further the pros and cons of setting up a Trust/partnership for Stanage or a wider area, as part of an Authority wide consideration. This should include consideration of whether such a trust/partnership should seek to manage the farm in-house, once the farm tenancy ends (in 5 years time).

Timescale

1. Follow-up meeting with Stanage Forum Steering Group representatives early June 2006 to communicate recommendations from RMT
2. Services Committee 30 June 2006.
3. Re-letting the land: Seek tenders as soon as possible after 30 June, with a view to getting a new tenant in place by the time Derby College, the current tenants leave, on 29 September 2006.
4. Once land tenders received, make final decision as to whether to sell the farmhouse and cruck barn – August/September 2006.
5. Unless exceptional tenders received in terms of achieving objectives and complying with asset management review criteria, sell the farmhouse and the cruck barn to the Vivat Trust. At the same time, decide whether to exercise a lease-back clause for a farm tenant/manager – by end September 2006.
6. Refresh partnership arrangements with new tenants/partners – as soon as in place, by October 2006.
7. Investigate trust/partnership potential for the Estate or a wider area – likely to take up to 2 years, so by September 2008.

Organisation & Management

Matthew Croney supported by Chris Manby to pursue negotiations
Authority-wide task team to be established to review possible trusts/partnerships.

Cost Analysis

Detailed above under options.

Risk Analysis

The recommendations above are considered to be a good compromise between withdrawing from some management responsibilities whilst still achieving national park objectives. However there are still some risks which need to be taken into account:

- The previous owner, supported by CPRE are likely to contest the sale of any part of the Estate, seeing it as fragmentation against the wishes of the owner. (Although there are no known legal constraints on us selling).
- If Vivat Trust cannot raise sufficient capital to pay at or near the open market value for any of the buildings, we will need to reconsider those options.
- The Stanage Forum Steering Group, representing all stakeholders, would rather us retain the whole Estate and manage the farm in-house but have cautiously accepted the recommendations but with some reservations.
- If we cannot appoint a new farm tenant by 29 September 2006, we will need to have a back up plan to manage the hefted sheep flock for a hold-over period until a new tenant can be put in place.

Consultations

Internal

John Lomas, Jane Chapman, Chris Manby, Paul Harrop, Sean Prendergast, Philip Naylor, John Bishop, Tony Hood, Mike Rhodes, John Keeley, John Sewell, Steve Tompkins, Suzanne Fletcher, Sarah Whiteley, Jonathan Winn, Bill Gordon.

External

Stanage Forum Steering Group representatives (see Appendix 3).

Appendix 1 – Agreed Farm Objectives

Appendix 2 – Further detail concerning the issues/pros and cons of each option

Appendix 3 – Stanage Forum Steering Group and internal consultees comments on the options