

Response ID

Submitted to Permitted development rights: schools, assets of community value, defence and conservation
Submitted on 2026-08-05 14:55:01

Respondent Details

About you

Name:

Email address:

Postal address (including postcode):

Cannon Bridge House, 25 Dowgate Hill, London EC4R 2YA

Please indicate whether you are responding as an individual or on behalf of an organisation

Organisation

If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please provide the name of the organisation in the box below

Name of organisation:

Historic England

Position in organisation:

Please indicate in what capacity you are responding to this consultation (please only select one)

Other

Schools affected by RAAC

1. Do you agree that the existing temporary Class CB of Part 4 permitted development right should be extended by two years to 24 October 2028?

Yes

Please provide your reasons.:

Given the need for the works to be undertaken, we support this two year extension. We hope that these works will now be able to be completed within this longer time period. We note that need for Listed Building Consent, where relevant, will remain unaffected.

Impact Assessment

2. Do you think that the proposed extension of the temporary permitted development right schools affected by RAAC could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. It would be helpful if you could specify whether your comments relate to a) business, b) local planning authorities, or c) communities, or a combination.:

Public Sector Equality Duty

3. Do you think that the proposed extension of the temporary permitted development right for schools affected by RAAC could give rise to any impacts on people who share a protected characteristic? (Age; Disability; Gender Reassignment; Pregnancy and Maternity; Race; Religion or Belief; Sex; and Sexual Orientation).

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

Assets of community value

4. Do you agree that Class B of Part 11 should be amended to exclude assets of community value and, in future, sporting assets of community value?

Yes

Please provide your reasons. :

We fully support the proposal to exclude assets of community value in this way. These are assets that have been recognised locally for the value they provide to their local community and so providing additional protection in this way seems entirely appropriate.

However, we also feel that consideration should be given to providing this same level of protection to assets that have been locally listed because of the architectural, historical, or cultural value they bring to their local community. Locally listed assets are identified because of the significance of the building or structure, significance that is lost if they are demolished. We believe there is value in undertaking further analysis on how excluding locally listed buildings from Class B or Part 11 could be an effective way of protecting important assets, thereby strengthening local decision making.

Impact Assessment

5. Do you think that the proposed change in relation to the Class B of Part 11 permitted development right could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. It would be helpful if you could specify whether your comments relate to a) business, b) local planning authorities, or c) communities, or a combination.:

Public Sector Equality Duty

6. Do you think that the proposed removal of assets of community value and, in future, sporting assets of community value from the Class B of Part 11 permitted development right could give rise to any impacts on people who share a protected characteristic? (Age; Disability; Gender Reassignment; Pregnancy and Maternity; Race; Religion or Belief; Sex; and Sexual Orientation).

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

Development by the Crown on closed defence sites

7. Do you agree that the permitted development right is amended to allow an increase in the total floor space of any buildings for use as single living accommodation via erection or extension beyond 25% of the total floor space?

Don't know

Please provide your reasons. :

It is unclear what assessments have been undertaken to understand the impact of this proposal, in particular the impact of the potential extensions would have on the significance of listed buildings, or the wider historic character of places. This could be mitigated through measures that ensure design of any extension is of suitable quality and is sympathetic with historic character of the wider area.

8. If yes, should this be an increase to:

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

9. Do you agree that the permitted development right is amended to allow an increase in the total floor space of any non-residential building via erection or extension beyond 35% of the total floor space?

Don't know

Please provide your reasons. :

It is unclear what assessments have been undertaken to understand the impact of this proposal, in particular the impact of the potential extensions would have on the significance of listed buildings, or the wider historic character of places. This could be mitigated through measures that ensure design of any extension is of suitable quality and is sympathetic with historic character of the wider area.

10. If yes, should this be an increase to:

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

11. Do you agree that the prior approval should no longer be triggered by a cumulative footprint of 4,000 square metres and instead by the scale of individual proposals?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

12. If yes, do you agree that the permitted development right is amended to instead require an application to the local planning authority for determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority is required as to siting and scale where an individual development is above a threshold of:

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

13. Do you agree that Class TA of Part 19 is amended to allow extensions or alterations within 15 metres of the perimeter of the closed defence site?

Don't know

Please provide your reasons. :

It is unclear what assessments have been undertaken to understand the impact of this proposal, in particular the impact of the potential extensions would have on the significance of listed buildings, or the wider historic character of places. This could be mitigated through measures that ensure design of any extension is of suitable quality and is sympathetic with historic character of the wider area.

14. Do you agree that where the development is more than 25 metres from the perimeter of the closed defence site, Class TA of Part 19 is amended to allow:

(i) the erection of new buildings from 12 metres to up to 18 metres in height?

Don't know

Please provide your reasons. :

It is unclear what assessments have been undertaken to understand the impact of this proposal, in particular the impact of the potential extensions would have on the significance of listed buildings, or the wider historic character of places. This could be mitigated through measures that ensure design of any extension is of suitable quality and is sympathetic with historic character of the wider area.

(ii) extensions or alterations of up to 18 metres or up to the height of the existing building, whichever is lesser?

Don't know

Please provide your reasons. :

It is unclear what assessments have been undertaken to understand the impact of this proposal, in particular the impact of the potential extensions would have on the significance of listed buildings, or the wider historic character of places. This could be mitigated through measures that ensure design of any extension is of suitable quality and is sympathetic with historic character of the wider area.

15. Do you agree that the definitions of 'closed defence sites' and 'non-residential buildings' should be amended so as to refer to sites and buildings (respectively) used wholly or mainly for purposes connected with defence?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

Impact Assessment

16. Do you think that the proposed change in relation to the Class TA of Part 19 permitted development right could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

Public Sector Equality Duty

17. Do you think that the proposed changes to the permitted development right for Crown Development on a closed defence site could give rise to any impacts on people who share a protected characteristic? (Age; Disability; Gender Reassignment; Pregnancy and Maternity; Race; Religion or Belief; Sex; and Sexual Orientation).

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

Development of conservation measures within Environmental Delivery Plans

18. It is proposed that Natural England and operators on its behalf benefit from a national grant of planning permission for the implementation and maintenance of conservation measures within an EDP amounting to development. Do you agree?

No

Please provide your reasons. :

As currently proposed, the PDR could have very wide application, conveying a right (as articulated in paragraph 49) to a range of stakeholders under circumstances that could lead to harm to heritage significance due to inadequate safeguards in place. The PDR needs to be tightly described to ensure that this provision does not have unintended consequences.

We recognise the positive role that heritage management practices can play in supporting biodiversity and nature recovery, as set out in our Joint Statement with Natural England and the National Lottery Heritage Fund on Integrating the Management of the Natural and Historic Environment. In this Joint Statement we also recognise that by integrating the management and protection of our historic and natural environment we can achieve much more for people, nature, places and the economy.

We have concerns about PDR being granted on designated heritage assets, and for development affecting their setting, where this could have an impact on their significance, and whether there is sufficient understanding of those potential impacts.

There are legislative duties relating to designated heritage assets as set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and, when in force the provisions set out in section 102 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023. Very careful consideration will be required as to the extent to which these special regard duties could be complied with.

Consultation on EDPs, and the proposed prior approval for siting and appearance alone may not be enough of a safeguard to ensure that heritage assets are not put at risk, and therefore as we set out in our responses below we recommend that the proposed PDR is not granted on designated heritage assets, even with prior approval, or where there is a potential impact on significance from a development with the setting of designated heritage assets.

More clarity would be welcome in paragraph 51 on what is meant by the Secretary of State taking “remedial action” where an EDP is revoked. For example, would the PDR also be revoked if the EDP is no longer in place?

Historic England would welcome the opportunity to explore these potential impacts in more detail.

Development of conservation measures within Environmental Delivery Plans: land designation based exclusions and prior approvals

19. It is proposed that any national grant of planning permission would not apply on the site of a scheduled monument. Do you agree?

Yes

Please provide your reasons. :

We support this proposed exception. In addition, we recommend this be broadened to include also non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are considered to be of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments.

20. It is proposed that if any part of the development is in a conservation area, prior approval on the impact of the siting and appearance of the development on the character and appearance of the conservation area would be required. Do you agree?

No, development should not be permitted in a conservation area

Please provide your reasons. :

We are concerned that granting permitted development rights within conservation areas would create an elevated risk of harm to their character and appearance. It may also undermine the statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing that character or appearance. Without appropriate safeguards, it is difficult to see how that duty can be discharged robustly.

Paragraph 57 states that the local planning authority “may consult Historic England (and other relevant statutory consultees) as part of the prior approval process”. If the permitted development right is retained in conservation areas, consultation with Historic England should be mandatory within our statutory remit.

21. It is proposed that if any part of the development is in a World Heritage Site, prior approval on the impact of the siting and appearance of the development on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site would be required. Do you agree?

No, development should not be permitted in a World Heritage Site

Please provide your reasons. :

We are concerned that granting permitted development rights within World Heritage Sites would pose a significant risk to assets of the highest international importance. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, planning policies and decisions must reflect relevant international obligations and statutory requirements, including the UNESCO World Heritage Convention.

When implemented, section 102 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 will extend this duty to a wider range of designated heritage assets, including World Heritage Sites. This is consistent with the NPPF requirement to give great weight to an asset's conservation. It is therefore unclear how the proposed changes could be applied in all cases in a manner consistent with those duties.

Paragraph 57 states that the local planning authority "may consult Historic England (and other relevant statutory consultees) as part of this prior approval process". If the permitted development right is retained within World Heritage Sites, consultation with Historic England should be mandatory.

22. It is proposed that if any part of the development is on the site of a registered park, garden or battlefield, prior approval on the impact of the siting and appearance of the development on the special historic interest of the asset would be required. Do you agree?

No, development should not be permitted on the site of a registered park, garden or battlefield

Please provide your reasons. :

The NPPF requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets when assessing the impact of development on their significance. Once commenced, section 102 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 will require special regard to be given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing relevant assets and their settings, including registered parks and gardens and registered battlefields. It is unclear how the proposed changes could be applied in all cases consistently with these requirements.

Registered parks and gardens and registered battlefields can contribute to biodiversity and nature recovery through integrated management of the historic and natural environment. However, we are concerned that the proposed permitted development right could cause harm within registered parks and gardens, where special historic interest and significance are closely bound to designed landscapes. Works such as landscaping, excavation, deposits, works to watercourses, fencing and new structures, which would otherwise require planning permission, could significantly affect their integrity and historic significance.

We have similar concerns in relation to registered battlefields. Their special historic interest is closely linked to landscape, topography and, in many cases, archaeological remains. The proposed works could therefore adversely affect their integrity and significance.

Given the potential level of impact on the significance of registered parks and gardens and registered battlefields, prior approval limited to siting and appearance would not provide a sufficient safeguard. Historic England would welcome the opportunity to discuss these risks in more detail.

Paragraph 57 states that the local planning authority "may consult Historic England (and other relevant statutory consultees) as part of this prior approval process". If the permitted development right is retained for registered parks and gardens or registered battlefields, consultation with Historic England should be mandatory within our statutory remit. The Gardens Trust should also be consulted on proposals within registered parks and gardens of all grades.

23. It is proposed that if any part of the development is on the site of a protected wreck, prior approval on the impact of the siting and appearance of the development on the historical, archaeological or artistic importance of the protected wreck would be required. Do you agree?

No, development should not be permitted on the site of a protected wreck

Please provide your reasons. :

Section 102 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023, when in force, will extend this duty to a wider range of designated heritage assets, including protected wrecks. This duty is echoed in the great weight that should be given to an asset's conservation in the NPPF and in the UK Marine Policy Statement, and it is difficult to see how these proposed changes would comply with those duties in all cases.

We have concerns about a PDR being granted on a site of a protected wreck, given the potential for harm arising.

Paragraph 57 states that the local planning authority "may consult Historic England (and other relevant statutory consultees) as part of this prior approval process". Should the PDR be retained on the site of a protected wreck, we would look for consultation with Historic England to be required.

24. It is proposed that if any part of the development is on the site of a listed building or land within its curtilage, prior approval on the impact of the siting and appearance of the development on the building, its setting or any feature of special or historic interest which it possesses would be required. Do you agree?

No, development should not be permitted on the site of a listed building or land within its curtilage

Please provide your reasons. :

We are concerned that granting permitted development rights on the site of a listed building, or within its curtilage, would create an elevated risk of harm to the building's significance. It may also conflict with the statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting, and any features of special architectural or historic interest. Without appropriate safeguards, it is difficult to see how that duty could be discharged robustly.

Paragraph 57 states that the local planning authority “may consult Historic England (and other relevant statutory consultees) as part of this prior approval process”. If the permitted development right is retained for the site of a listed building or land within its curtilage, consultation with Historic England should be mandatory within our statutory remit.

25. Where development is subject to prior approval on the basis of land designation, this would apply in respect of most of the permitted development proposed in this consultation chapter (with the exception of temporary development for surveys and investigation, as set out in paragraphs 90-92). Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

26. It is proposed that development be permitted in protected landscapes with no prior approval process. Do you agree?

No, development should not be permitted in protected landscapes

Please provide your reasons. :

We are concerned that granting permitted development rights for designated heritage assets within protected landscapes, or for development affecting their setting, would create a significant risk of harm to their significance. This risk arises from the nature and potential scale of the works proposed. Beyond the direct impact on designated heritage assets, their cultural heritage significance and character are integral to protected landscape designation and contribute to landscape beauty, distinctiveness, public enjoyment, national value and nature recovery. It is unclear how the proposed changes would comply with relevant statutory duties or with national policy in the NPPF. Our reasons are set out in response to the questions above relating to each class of designated heritage asset.

27. Beyond the mechanisms already outlined in paragraph 59, should we seek to control the development of conservation measures on land where it may restrict future development and land uses?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide details of how such controls would function and what types of safeguarded or allocated land they should apply to.:

Development of conservation measures within Environmental Delivery Plans: landscaping

28. It is proposed that landscaping, including excavations and deposits, be permitted. Do you agree?

Don't know

Please provide your reasons. :

We are concerned that granting permitted development rights for works to designated heritage assets, or for development affecting their setting, would create a significant risk of harm to their significance.

As set out above, works such as landscaping, excavation and deposits could affect designated heritage assets of all types. It is unclear whether the proposals provide sufficient recognition of, or safeguards against, those impacts.

Prior approval limited to siting and appearance would not provide an adequate safeguard. We therefore recommend that the proposed permitted development right should not apply to designated heritage assets, or to development affecting their setting where there is potential harm to significance.

Historic England would welcome the opportunity to discuss these impacts in more detail.

29. It is proposed that removing minerals from the site and bringing waste materials on to the site should be conditioned as set out in paragraph 62. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

30. It is proposed that prior consultation with the Environment Agency on flood risks as set out in paragraphs 63 and 64 would be required. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

31. It is proposed that landscaping, including excavations and deposits, are not subject to any conditions or limitations on their overall size or scale. Do you agree?

No

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered no, please provide details of any proposed size or scale conditions or limitations. :

We have concerns about PDR being granted on designated heritage assets, and for development affecting their setting, where this would have an impact on their significance, on the basis of the potential impact of the works that would be included in the proposals. As set out above, we are concerned about the potential impact of landscaping works, including excavation and deposits, on designated heritage assets of all types. The scale and nature of such works would determine the extent of potential harm, including where development affects the setting of designated heritage assets.

Prior approval limited to siting and appearance would not provide an adequate safeguard. We therefore recommend that the proposed permitted development right should not apply to designated heritage assets, even with prior approval, or to development within their setting where there is potential harm to significance.

Historic England would welcome the opportunity to discuss these impacts in more detail.

32. It is proposed that a contamination screening assessment and, depending on the outcomes of the assessment, prior approval on contamination risk as set out in paragraphs 66 and 67 would be required. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

33. Are there any other conditions or limitations that should apply to landscaping, including excavations and deposits?

Yes

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide details of the additional conditions or limitation and any supporting evidence. :

We are concerned that granting permitted development rights for works to designated heritage assets, or for development affecting their setting, would create a significant risk of harm to their significance.

As set out above, landscaping works, including excavation and deposits, could affect designated heritage assets of all types. The design, scale and nature of such works would determine the extent of potential harm, including where development affects the setting of designated heritage assets.

Prior approval limited to siting and appearance would not provide an adequate safeguard. We therefore recommend that the proposed permitted development right should not apply to designated heritage assets, even with prior approval, or to development within their setting where there is potential harm to significance.

Historic England would welcome the opportunity to discuss these impacts in more detail.

Development of conservation measures within Environmental Delivery Plans: fences, footpaths, and small structures etc.

Fences, gates, walls or other means of enclosure

34. It is proposed that the development of fences etc. as set out in paragraph 70 should be permitted. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

35. Are there any other conditions or limitations that should apply to the development of fences etc.?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide details of the additional conditions or limitation and any supporting evidence. :

Footpaths, cycleways and bridleways

36. It is proposed that the development of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways as set out in paragraphs 72 and 73 be permitted. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

37. Are there any other conditions or limitations that should apply to the development of footpaths, cycleways or bridleways?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide details of the additional conditions or limitation and any supporting evidence. :

Small scale structures

38. It is proposed that the development of structures should be permitted. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered no, please specify which structures your comment relates to.:

39. It is proposed that the development of a pole, post or mast and any associated structure (for the purposes of wildlife monitoring and habitat creation) to be mounted above ground level on it (or on a tree, existing structure or building) be limited in terms of size and height as set out in paragraphs 75 and 76. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons and be clear if it relates to the pole etc. or the associated structure. :

40. It is proposed that the development of structures at ground level for the purpose of providing a wildlife habitat (or a purpose ancillary to a wildlife habitat, such as access or monitoring) be limited in terms of size as set out in paragraph 77. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

41. It is proposed that the development of structures below ground level for the purposes of providing wildlife habitats and monitoring be limited in terms of size as set out in paragraph 78. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

42. It is proposed that any structure developed at or below ground level for the purposes of blocking ditches, diverting watercourse or flooding land be limited to a maximum of 1 metre in height above the prevailing land level. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

43. It is proposed that the maintenance, improvement or other alteration of an existing structure should be conditioned as set out in paragraph 81. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

44. Are there any other conditions or limitations that should apply to the development of such structures?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide details of the additional conditions or limitation and any supporting evidence. :

Above ground slurry stores

45. It is proposed that the replacement, improvement or alteration of an existing above ground slurry store; and the erection, construction, improvement or alteration of above ground slurry store covers be permitted. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered no, please specify whether your comment relates to above ground slurry stores or slurry store covers.:

46. It is proposed that the height, size and siting of above ground slurry stores and covers be limited to the parameters as set out in paragraph 84 and 85. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

47. Are there any other conditions or limitations that should apply to the development of above ground slurry stores or covers?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide details of the additional conditions or limitation and any supporting evidence. :

Development of conservation measures within Environmental Delivery Plans: public access to suitable alternative natural greenspaces (SANGs)

48. It is proposed that the development of a single vehicular access, of up to 10 car parking spaces, structures for cycle parking, height barriers and pay and display machines in connection with an EDP SANG be permitted. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered no, please specify which element your comment relates to.:

49. It is proposed that the development of any hard surfacing be conditioned as set out in paragraph 87. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

50. It is proposed that Natural England be required to seek prior approval on transport, highways and access impacts prior to commencing the development of a vehicular access or car park as set out in paragraph 88. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

51. It is proposed that the existing electric vehicle recharging permitted development rights (Class D and Class E of Part 2 of the General Permitted Development Order) be amended as set out in paragraph 89. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

52. Are there any other conditions or limitations that should apply to the development of a single vehicular access, of up to 10 car parking spaces, structures for cycle parking, height barriers, and pay and display machines?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide details of the additional conditions or limitation and any supporting evidence. :

Development of conservation measures within Environmental Delivery Plans: temporary buildings, plant, machinery and apparatus for survey or investigation

53. It is proposed the development of temporary buildings, plant, machinery and apparatus in, over, or under land, for the purposes of survey or investigation set out in paragraphs 91 and 92 should be permitted. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons.:

54. Are there any other conditions or limitations that should apply to the development of temporary buildings, plant, machinery and apparatus for the purposes of survey or investigation?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide details of the additional conditions or limitation and any supporting evidence. :

Development of conservation measures within Environmental Delivery Plans: use of land and existing buildings

55. It is proposed that any land and buildings on that land, be permitted to be used for the purposes of conservation in accordance with proposals in an EDP, as set out in paragraphs 93 – 95. Do you agree?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

56. Are there any other conditions or limitations that should apply to the use of land, and buildings upon that land, for the purposes of conservation measures in accordance with proposals in an EDP?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide details of the additional conditions or limitation and any supporting evidence. :

Development of conservation measures within Environmental Delivery Plans: additional comments

57. Should any other development be permitted to be undertaken by Natural England for the purposes of implementing conservation measures in accordance with proposals in an EDP and maintenance of the site?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide details of the development and any supporting evidence. :

58. Are there any other conditions or limitations (including prior approvals or land exclusions) that should apply to development permitted for the purposes of implementing conservation measures in accordance with proposals in an EDP and maintenance of the site?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. If you have answered yes, please provide details of the conditions and limitations and any supporting evidence. :

Development of conservation measures within Environmental Delivery Plans: impact assessment, Public Sector Equality Duty, and Environmental Principles Assessment

Impact assessment

59. Do you think that permitted development flexibilities proposed to support the development of conservation measures within an EDP could impact on: a) businesses b) local planning authorities c) communities?

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. It would be helpful if you could specify whether your comments relate to a) business, b) local planning authorities, or c) communities, or a combination.:

Public Sector Equality Duty

60. Do you think that permitted development flexibilities proposed to support the development of conservation measures within an EDP could give rise to any impacts on people who share a protected characteristic? (Age; Disability; Gender Reassignment; Pregnancy and Maternity; Race; Religion or Belief; Sex; and Sexual Orientation).

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :

Environmental Principles Assessment

61. Do you think that permitted development flexibilities proposed to support the development of conservation measures within an EDP could give rise to environmental impacts that should be considered against the five environmental principles? (integration, prevention, rectify at source, polluter pays, and precautionary).

Not Answered

Please provide your reasons. :