

**WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR - PLANNING, PUBLIC PROTECTION AND GOVERNANCE**

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2021/0071/LB
Location: Northaw House Coopers Lane Northaw Potters Bar EN6 4NG
Proposal: Repair, refurbishment and conversion of Northaw House to form 11 apartments (including refurbishment of existing single caretaker's flat) and underground parking area, the Ballroom Wing to form 2 dwellings, the Stable Block to form 1 dwelling, refurbishment of existing dwelling at Oak Cottage, construction of 2 new Gate Lodge dwellings, 4 new dwellings on the East Drive, 3 new dwellings within the Walled Garden, 7 new dwellings within the Settlement Area, refurbishment of the Walled Garden, refurbishment of access routes and reinstatement of old route, provision of hard and soft landscaping, car parking and supporting infrastructure.

Officer: Mr William Myers

Recommendation: Refused

6/2021/0071/LB

Context	
Site and Application description	<p>The site consists of a block of land of some 10.5 hectares with the eastern boundary abutting the Conservation Area of Northaw. The local area is characterised by mature woodland, but Northaw House is located on a small ridge, and therefore enjoys extensive views, in particular to the east across the valley of the Cuffley Brook.</p> <p>Northaw House was listed Grade II in 1972. There are informal grounds to the front and rear of the building, and flanking the present entrance driveway, from Coopers Lane to the west. The main façade of the house can be seen from Judges Hill to the north, on the top of the rise. Within the grounds there are a number of outbuildings, including a gardener's cottage (Oak Cottage), a substantial walled garden, and, to the east, a stable building which is listed Grade II in its own right.</p> <p>This two storey brick stable block has a slate roof and clock turret with ball finial and weather vane. The building is flanked by a derelict single storey building and an open fronted carhouse which joins the rear of the Victorian conservatory to the main house. The house itself includes two other main elements, namely a later three storey west wing, and a two storey ballroom wing. These elements are arranged around a small courtyard area, but both are physically joined to the main house.</p> <p>This application follows an approval of planning application 6/2019/0218/LB which provided permission for the following:</p> <p><i>“Conversion of Northaw House to form 11 apartments (including refurbishment of existing single caretaker's flat) and underground parking area, the Ballroom Wing to form 2 dwellings, the Stable Block to form 1 dwelling, refurbishment of</i></p>

	<p><i>existing dwelling at Oak Cottage, 3 dwellings within the Walled Garden, 7 dwellings within the Settlement Area, refurbishment of the Walled Garden, refurbishment of access routes and reinstatement of old route, provision of hard and soft landscaping, car parking and supporting infrastructure”</i></p> <p>In summary the main differences proposed as part of this application include those listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two additional gate houses, with one being near the eastern entrance of the site and the other being near the western entrance of the site • Four new dwellings to the east of Northaw House, in currently open land between the House and the eastern entrance to the site <p>It is important to note that the applicant has already commenced the consent 6/2019/0218/LB on the site.</p>
<p>Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)</p>	<p>CA - Conservation Area: NORT; - Distance: 0</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House, built in 1698, now office. Painted - Distance: 0</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Stables. Mid-late C18. Red brick. Hipped slate - Distance: 0</p> <p>PAR - PARISH (NORTHAW AND CUFFLEY) - Distance: 0</p> <p>Wards - Northaw & Cuffley - Distance: 10.48</p> <p>DESC - BELL BAR TO BARNET 16" - Distance: 0</p> <p>GAS - High Pressure Gas Pipeline(BELL BAR TO BARNET 16") - Distance: 0</p>
<p>Relevant planning history</p>	<p>Application Number: 6/2020/3439/COND Decision: Granted Decision Date: 05 March 2021 Proposal: Submission of details pursuant to condition 1 (surface water drainage) on planning permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2020/2771/COND Decision: Granted Decision Date: 05 March 2021 Proposal: Submission of details pursuant to conditions 2B & C(remediation scheme and implementation), 7(external surfaces samples), 8(final landscape plan), 10(energy & sustainability assessment) on planning permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2020/1181/COND Decision: Granted Decision Date: 20 July 2020 Proposal: Submission of details pursuant to condition 1 (surface water drainage scheme) on planning permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2020/1160/VAR Decision: Withdrawn Decision Date: 25 June 2020 Proposal: Variation of condition 25 (approved plans and details) on planning permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2020/0964/VAR Decision: Withdrawn Decision Date: 03 June 2020 Proposal: Variation of condition of 4 (approved plans) on planning permission</p>

6/2019/0218/LB

Application Number: 6/2020/0736/COND
Decision: Part Approved / Part Refused Decision Date: 12 May 2020
Proposal: Submission of details pursuant to condition 1 (surface water drainage scheme) and 5 (arboricultural method statement) on planning permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ

Application Number: 6/2019/0217/MAJ
Decision: Granted
Decision Date: 07 January 2020
Proposal: Conversion of Northaw House to form 11 apartments (including refurbishment of existing single caretaker's flat) and underground parking area, the Ballroom Wing to form 2 dwellings, the Stable Block to form 1 dwelling, refurbishment of existing dwelling at Oak Cottage, 3 dwellings within the Walled Garden, 7 dwellings within the Settlement Area, refurbishment of the Walled Garden, refurbishment of access routes and reinstatement of old route, provision of hard and soft landscaping, car parking and supporting infrastructure

Application Number: 6/2019/0218/LB
Decision: Granted
Decision Date: 10 January 2020
Proposal: Conversion of Northaw House to form 11 apartments (including refurbishment of existing single caretaker's flat) and underground parking area, the Ballroom Wing to form 2 dwellings, the Stable Block to form 1 dwelling, refurbishment of existing dwelling at Oak Cottage, 3 dwellings within the Walled Garden, 7 dwellings within the Settlement Area, refurbishment of the Walled Garden, refurbishment of access routes and reinstatement of old route, provision of hard and soft landscaping, car parking and supporting infrastructure

Application Number: S6/2013/1225/FP
Decision: Granted
Decision Date: 29 October 2013
Proposal: Change of use from offices (Use Class B1) to residential (Use Class C3)

Application Number: S6/2004/0573/FP
Decision: Granted
Decision Date: 01 October 2009
Proposal: Conversion, alteration and change of use of northaw house to single residential unit, stable block to 1 residential unit, ballroom wing to 3 residences, seven new build dwellings; (3 of which live / work) extension, alterations and refurbishment of oak cottage, plus associated car parking, driveway and access and landscaping, including some demolition

Application Number: S6/2004/0572/LB
Decision: Granted
Decision Date: 01 October 2009
Proposal: Conversion, alteration and change of use of northaw house to single residential unit, stable block to 1 residential unit, ballroom wing to 3 residences, seven new build dwellings; (3 of which live / work) extension, alterations and refurbishment of oak cottage, plus associated car parking, driveway and access and landscaping, including some demolition

	Application Number: 6/2020/0718/COND Decision: Granted Decision Date: 04 May 2020 Proposal: Submission of details pursuant to condition 2 (scheme of remediation) 3 (archaeological written scheme of investigation) 4 (environmental management plan for the construction period) and 6 (bat survey) on planning permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 4	Object: 25	Other: 1
Publicity	Site Notice Display Date: 3 February 2021 Site Notice Expiry Date: 24 February 2021 Press Advert Display Date: 3 February 2021 Press Advert Expiry Date: 24 February 2021		
Summary of neighbour responses	<p>The application was advertised by means of a press notice, neighbour notification letters and site notices. Twenty five representation have been received, objecting to the application. These are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design of the development would be incongruous with its surroundings and the heritage assets on the site • The development would result in built form spreading into previously developed land which would adversely impact on the openness of the Green Belt and would be unacceptable in the Green Belt • No very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm that the proposal would have on the Green Belt • A recent appeal demonstrates new housing around Northaw is inappropriate within the Green Belt • The new dwellings to the east of Northaw House would be clearly visible from outside the site because it is on the crest of a hill • The proposal additional dwellings to the east of Northaw House would represent a form of ribbon development • The proposal would have unacceptable impact on the landscape character area • The proposed increase of a further six dwellings represents overdevelopment of the site • There is no justification for the additional dwellings proposed • Proposal represents development by stealth • If the developer now considers that the previously approved scheme is unviable they should look to sell the site • The development is within an unsustainable location in terms of access to services and transport links • The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site and would result in an increased flood risk • The development would result in an increase in vehicle movement to and from the site and the proposed access points to the site would have unacceptable impact on highway safety • The development would result in ecological harm • The proposal provides no affordable housing • The development would put pressure on schools and other local services • Restoration of the heritage assets on the site would be insufficient to amount to a very special circumstance that would overcome harm 		

	<p>caused by this application</p> <p>Four representations have been received in support of this application and these are summaries below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed would result in the restoration of the heritage assets which have been allowed to fall into disrepair of a number of years • The proposal will hopefully secure the future of the heritage assets on the site • The proposal would provide much need housing
<p>Consultees and responses</p>	<p>Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council – Major objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This objection is on the basis of three key area of concern which are; Green Belt harm; impact of the proposed development on the landscape character area which the site is within; concerns about the submitted viability appraisal. <p>Conservation Officer - Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is considered that the proposed development would have a less than substantial harm to the heritage assets on the site and that even if the proposed development could be considered to amount to enabling development that less harmful options to deliver the additional housing should be explored. <p>Hertfordshire Gardens Trust – Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The addition of more houses as detailed in this application would seriously harm not only the Northaw House landscape but those of Nyn Park setting and the open approach to Northaw village. The density of housing being proposed for this site is not appropriate for this rural setting within the Green Belt contrary both to the provisions of the NPPF (Chapters 13 and 16) and WHBC's own policies on heritage and Green Belt. The latest Green Belt Review undertaken on behalf of WHBC does not propose new housing developments within Northaw. We object to this current proposal. <p>HCC Historic Environment Advisor – No objection, subject to conditions</p> <p>Cadent Gas Limited – No objection</p> <p>Historic England – No comment</p> <p>Joint Committee of the National Amenity Societies – No comment</p>
<p>Relevant Policies</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPPF Others</p>	
<p>Main Issues</p>	
<p>Restoration of Listed Building</p>	<p>The NPPF at paragraph 202 says that Local Planning Authority's should "assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development that would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disadvantages of</p>

departing from these policies”.

Policy SADM 15 of the Emerging Local Plan (2016) sets out the Council’s Heritage policy, including guidance for proposals that affect designated heritage assets and the wider historic environment. This Policy states that proposals which result in less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will be refused unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location significantly outweigh that harm and the desirability of preserving the assets, and all feasible solutions to avoid and mitigate that harm have been fully implemented.

Further to the above Historic England publication “Enabling Development and Heritage Assets” 2020 provides detailed guidance on this topic. As this document provided additional guidance on how local planning authorities should consider enabling development, it is considered that this is a material consideration for this application.

This guidance states that as defined in paragraph 202 of the NPPF, enabling development is development that would not be in compliance with local and/or national planning policies, and not normally be given planning permission, except for the fact that it would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset.

While paragraph 202 of the NPPF is clear that enabling development may be acceptable in certain circumstances, the Historic England guidance states that both applicants and decision-makers in such proposals will wish to bear in mind the holistic approach to the historic environment within the NPPF. Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. When considering the impact of proposals on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation, and any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.

The case for enabling development rests on there being a conservation deficit. Simply put, this is the amount by which the cost of repair (and conversion to optimum viable use if appropriate) of a heritage asset exceeds its market value on completion of repair or conversion, allowing for appropriate development costs.

Under the enabling development mechanism, decision-makers will usually require market testing to explore the possibility of different owners or different uses providing an alternative to enabling development, thereby reducing the scale of enabling development needed.

The sums of money generated through enabling development are provided to directly solve the conservation needs of the place, not to solve the financial needs of the present owner, to support/finance a business or to compensate for the purchase price paid for the site. The amount of enabling development that can be justified will be the minimum amount necessary in order to address the conservation deficit and to secure the long-term future of the assets.

The defining characteristic of enabling development is that it would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset if other reasonable efforts have failed, and the balance articulated in NPPF paragraph 202 is met. For example the future conservation of the asset is secured and the disbenefits of departing

	<p>from conflicting planning policies are outweighed by the benefits.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Historic England guidance states that even when it is clear that enabling development is the only way to secure the future conservation of the heritage asset, a decision-maker will still need to assess whether the heritage and any other public benefits it would secure would outweigh the disbenefits of departing from planning policy (NPPF, paragraph 202). Considerations in that assessment will include the importance and significance of the heritage asset(s), the nature of the planning policies that would be breached, the severity of the breach or breaches, whether the asset(s) have been subject to deliberate neglect and giving great weight to the asset's conservation (see NPPF paragraphs 184 to 202).</p> <p>The applicant has stated that the additional dwellings proposed within this application are required in order to enable restoration of the heritage assets on the site and that it would amount to enabling development. They have stated that the reason why the development permitted by consent 6/2019/0218/LB is insufficient to enable the restoration of these heritage assets is because of inaccuracies within BNPP viability appraisal of the previous scheme and due to additional costs. In support of this position the applicant has provided a viability appraisal which indicates that the proposed development is the minimum necessary to facilitate the restoration of the heritage assets within the site.</p> <p>It is important to note that BNPP's viability appraisal found that the twenty five dwellings proposed and approved within 6/2019/0218/LB, were the minimum necessary to enable the restoration of the heritage assets on site and therefore constituted enabling development.</p> <p>As part of their application the applicant has submitted a further viability appraisal to support this position. As a result the Council has appointed a speciality viability consultant, Aspinal Verdi, to appraise the viability appraisal submitted by the applicant. This assessment of the applicant's viability appraisal data has concluded that the 25 dwelling scheme granted as part of 6/2019/0218/LB is still viable and that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed additional units represent the minimum amount of development necessary to enable the restoration of the heritage assets on the site.</p> <p>As a consequence of the above, it is apparent that the additional dwellings proposed as part of this application are not necessary for the applicant to deliver a viable scheme for the developer. On this basis, a conservation deficit does not exist and therefore, enabling development is not required. Accordingly, it is judged in this case that the scale of enabling development proposed is not justified, with the result that the proposal is contrary to the NPPF, Policy SADM15 of the Council's Emerging Local Plan 2016 and Historic England's publication "Enabling Development and Heritage Assets" 2020.</p>
<p>Impact on the character and setting of the listed building and adjoining listed buildings</p>	<p>Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 states that the local planning authority shall have "special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses". The specific historic environment policies within the NPPF are contained within paragraphs 184-202. Paragraph 192 of the NPPF, 'In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:</p>

The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;

The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and

The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness'

Paragraph 193 of the NPPF outlines that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, 'great weight' should be given to the asset's conservation and the more important the asset the greater the weight it should be given. Paragraph 195 states that where proposed development will lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, Local Planning Authorities should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm. Where the harm is considered less than substantial Paragraph 196 states that this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The NPPF therefore does allow for a degree of harm to a heritage asset in particular circumstances.

The application is for the conversion Northaw House to form 11 apartments (including refurbishment of existing single caretaker's flat) and underground parking area, the Ballroom Wing to form 2 dwellings, the Stable Block to form 1 dwelling, refurbishment of existing dwelling at Oak Cottage, construction of 2 Gate Lodge dwellings, 4 new dwellings on the East Drive, 3 dwellings within the Walled Garden, 7 dwellings within the Settlement Area, refurbishment of the Walled Garden, refurbishment of access routes and reinstatement of old route, provision of hard and soft landscaping, car parking and supporting infrastructure.

In summary the main differences proposed as part of this application, when compared to that approved by 6/2019/0218/LB include those listed below:

- Two additional gate houses, with one being near the eastern entrance of the site and the other being near the western entrance of the site
- Four new dwellings to the east of Northaw House, in currently open land between the House and the eastern entrance to the site

Northaw House is grade II listed and dates from 1698 (list entry no. 1100970). It is of red brick construction with rendered elevations under a slate mansard roof. The main house is two storeys with attics and a cellar. The original part is formed of the middle five bays, with extensions and additions made throughout the 18th and 19th centuries to enlarge the house. To the north west of the house is an 18th century service wing (now known as the Ballroom Wing) and to the south western corner a three storey Edwardian service block. To the east is the stable block, also grade II listed, and dating from the mid-late 18th century and constructed in red brick under slate roofs with a prominent cupola (list entry no. 1100971). To the west of the house there is a walled garden and gardeners' cottage (Oak Cottage).

As this application does not seek to materially alter the proposal within this scheme which were already approved within permission 6/2019/0218/LB it is

judged that it would be reasonable and appropriate to still conclude that these aspects of the development would still result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the heritage assets on the site. As a consequence, this analysis has not been repeated here because it is considered that the previous considerations on these matters still stand.

With regards to the proposed new dwellings which are in addition to those already approved, these are considered below.

It is proposed that two houses at each entrance have been designed in an attempt to create new gate houses at these entrances. These buildings would be single storey, with white rendered walls and grey slate roofs. In an attempt to make these new buildings appear as traditional features they are of a modest scale and are designed in a manner which attempts to reflect Northaw House, although simplified, as is expected of gate lodges. While it may be possible to have 'gatehouse type' structures within the site it is considered that the eastern gatehouse should be set further east in a less prominent position and that both should be provided with smaller domestic boundaries. It is considered that while the principal of these buildings could be acceptable it is judged that the proposed eastern lodge in particular should be in a less prominent position and should have a smaller domestic curtilage. While this harm is not significant it is considered that it amounts to less than substantial harm.

The four dwellings to the east of Northaw House are considered to be the most inappropriate. This is because while it would appear from historic records that there may at one time have been historic buildings in this location, as these buildings have long since been demolished and their form, as well as use is unknown, it is not considered that they do not provide a precedent or a basis for the proposed dwellings. Furthermore, it is considered that as this area of the site has long been open land that this forms part of the setting of Northaw House. As a consequence, it is judged that the construction of dwellings, with their associated domestic curtilages, within this land which has long been free from built form, would detract from both the setting of the heritage assets on the site which has existed for over a century, namely Northaw House and the Stables building. While it is considered that this harm would be significant it is not considered that it would amount to substantial harm with the result that it is judged that these dwellings would result in less than substantial harm.

The scheme sees the retention, repair and reuse of the grade II listed Northaw House, grade II listed stable block and curtilage listed walled garden and secures a viable long-term use to ensure their future maintenance and conservation. The conversion of the house and the stable block does result in some 'less than substantial harm' as the subdivision of the house impedes its historic layout and its original use as a large single dwelling. The loss of historic fabric, although minimised as far as possible, also causes some harm. Development within their setting also causes some degree of 'less than substantial harm'. Although efforts have been made to mitigate this harm through the location of new buildings and their detailing and design, it is not considered, for the reasons discussed above, that the proposed additional six dwellings achieve this. This harm is in addition to the less than substantial harm identified through the additional 6 houses, which would result from the previously approved development around these heritage assets. Furthermore, as the viability analysis for this development has demonstrated that the proposal does not amount to the minimum level of development necessary,

	<p>and therefore does not constitute enabling development, it is judged that the additional harm which would result from this proposal is unnecessary.</p> <p>As a consequence of the above, although the proposed development would provide some benefits, notably the heritage benefits arising from the scheme, namely the repair and reuse of the grade II listed buildings, it is considered that as these dwellings would result in less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets and they would not amount to the minimum level necessary to enable this repair and restoration, that this same benefit could be achieved through consent 6/2019/0218/LB with less harm to these designated heritage assets.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the applicant has failed demonstrate that there is sufficient public benefit to outweigh the less than substantial harm which would result from the development. The scheme therefore conflicts with paragraph 196 of the NPPF and SADM15 of the Council's Emerging Local Plan 2016.</p>
Conclusion	
<p>The proposed development would materially harm the setting of the Grade II Listed Buildings and whilst this is less than substantial harm, it is not considered that there are sufficient public benefits which would outweigh the harm on the setting and significance of this designated heritage asset. The proposal is therefore contrary to the above relevant policies.</p>	

Reason for Refusal:

1. The proposed development would materially harm the setting and significance of the Grade II Listed Buildings and whilst this is considered to result in less than substantial harm, public benefits to outweigh the identified harm do not exist. As such the proposal is contrary to SADM15 of the Emerging Local Plan 2016; National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
KMC001-01		Site Access Visibility Part1	11 January 2021
KMC001-02		Site Access Visibility Part2	11 January 2021
KMC001-001-3		Proposed Highway Improvements	11 January 2021
16254_PL04		Basement Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL05		Ground Floor Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL0		First Floor Plan	11 January 2021

6		
16254_PL0 7	Second Floor Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL0 8	Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL0 9	Existing Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL1 0	Existing Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL1 1	Existing Sections	11 January 2021
16254_PL1 2	Ballroom Wing Existing Floor Plans	11 January 2021
16254_PL1 3	Ballroom Wing Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL1 4	Ballroom Wing Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL1 5	Stable Block Existing Ground Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL1 6	Stable Block First Floor Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL1 7	Stable Block Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL1 8	Stable Block Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL1 9	Stable Block Sections	11 January 2021
16254_PL2 0	Oak Cottage Existing Floor Plans	11 January 2021
16254_PL2 1	Oak Cottage Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL2 2	Oak Cottage Elevations & Sections	11 January 2021
16254_PL2 3	Northaw House Basement Plan Demolition	11 January 2021
16254_PL2 4	Northaw House Ground Plan Demolition	11 January 2021
16254_PL2 5	Northaw House First Demolition Plan	11 January 2021

16254_PL2 6	Northaw House Second Demolition Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL2 7	Northaw House Demolition Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL2 8	Northaw House Demolition Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL2 9	Ballroom Wing Floor Plans Demolition	11 January 2021
16254_PL3 0	Ballroom Wing Demolition Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL3 1	Stable Block Ground Floor Demolition Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL3 2	Stable Block First Floor Demolition Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL3 3	Stable Block Demolition Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL3 7	Proposed Ground Floor Plan Main House	11 January 2021
16254_PL3 8	Proposed First Floor Plan Main House	11 January 2021
16254_PL3 9	Proposed Second Floor Plan Main House	11 January 2021
16254_PL4 0	Proposed Roof Plan Northaw House	11 January 2021
16254_PL4 1	Proposed Northaw House Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL4 2	Proposed Northaw House Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL4 3	Ballroom Wing Proposed Floor Plans	11 January 2021
16254_PL4 4	Ballroom Wing Proposed Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL4 5	Ballroom Wing Proposed Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL4 6	Stable Block Proposed Ground Floor Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL4 7	Stable Block Proposed First Floor Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL4 8	Stable Block Proposed Roof Plan	11 January 2021

16254_PL4 9	Stable Block Proposed Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL5 0	Oak Cottage Proposed Floor Plans	11 January 2021
16254_PL5 1	Oak Cottage Proposed Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL5 2	Oak Cottage Proposed Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL53	Farm House Proposed Floor Plans	11 January 2021
16254_PL5 4	Farm House Proposed Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL5 5	Farm House Proposed Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL6 5	Walled Garden Proposed Ground Floor Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL6 6	Walled Garden Proposed Basement Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL6 7	Walled Garden Proposed Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL6 8	Walled Garden Proposed Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL6 9	Walled Garden Proposed Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL7 0	Dairy Proposed Floor Plans	11 January 2021
16254_PL7 1	Dairy Proposed Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL7 2	Dairy Proposed Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL7 4	Northaw House Proposed 3D Views	11 January 2021
16254_PL7 5	Stable Block Proposed 3D Views	11 January 2021
16254_PL7 6	Ballroom Wing Proposed 3D Views	11 January 2021
16254_PL7 7	Oak Cottage Proposed 3D Views	11 January 2021
16254_PL7 8	Farm House Proposed 3D Views	11 January 2021

16254_PL8 2	Walled Garden Proposed 3D Views	11 January 2021
16254_PL8 3	Walled Garden Proposed Aerial 3D View	11 January 2021
16254_PL8 4	Dairy Proposed 3D View	11 January 2021
16254_PL5 6	GI Proposed Floor Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL5 7	GI Proposed Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL5 8	GI Proposed Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL5 9	SU1 Proposed Floor Plans	11 January 2021
16254_PL6 0	SU1 Proposed Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL6 1	SU1 Proposed Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL6 2	SU2 Proposed Floor Plans	11 January 2021
16254_PL6 3	SU2 Proposed Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL6 4	SU2 Proposed Elevations	11 January 2021
16254_PL7 3	Proposed 3D Aerial Of Site	11 January 2021
16254_PL7 9	SU1 Proposed 3D Views	11 January 2021
16254_PL8 0	SU2 Proposed 3D Views	11 January 2021
16254_PL8 1	GI Proposed 3D Views	11 January 2021
16254_PL8 5	Proposed 3D Development Access	11 January 2021
16254_PL8 6	EDC Proposed Floor Plans	11 January 2021
16254_PL8 7	EDC Proposed Roof Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL8 8	EDC Proposed Elevations	11 January 2021

16254_PL8 9	EDC Proposed 3D Views	11 January 2021
16254_PL0 3	Proposed Site Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL9 0	EDC Proposed Garage Floor Plans	11 January 2021
16254_PL9 1	EDC Proposed Garage Elevations	11 January 2021
	Standard Gratings Plan	11 January 2021
02	Landscape Masterplan Part 1	11 January 2021
03	Landscape Masterplan Part 2	11 January 2021
	H6CA Headwall Closed Couple Grating	18 January 2021
1046CCEX XXXDRC00 1	Drainage Plan	20 January 2021
1046CCEX XXXDRC00 2	Proposed Drainage General Arrangement Plan	20 January 2021
1046CCEX XXXDRC00 3	Proposed Drainage General Arrangement Plan	20 January 2021
1046CCEX XXXDRC00 4	Proposed Drainage Details	20 January 2021
1046CCEX XXXDRC00 5	Proposed Pond Sections	20 January 2021
16254PL01	Site Location Plan	20 January 2021
16254PL02	Site Block Plan	20 January 2021

1. POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT

The decision has been made taking into account, where practicable and appropriate the requirements of paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework and material planning considerations do not justify a decision contrary to the development plan (see Officer's report which can be viewed on the Council's website or inspected at these offices).

Determined By:

Mrs Sarah Smith
26 May 2021

