

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

**DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2021/0072/MAJ  
**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

6/2021/0072/MAJ

<b>Context</b>	
<b>Site and Application description</b>	<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 6/2019/0217/MAJ 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 existing dwelling at Oak Cottage, 3 dwellings within the Walled Garden, 7 dwellings within the Settlement</i></p>

	<p><i>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"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Four new dwellings to the east of Northaw House, in currently open land between the House and the eastern entrance to the site</li> </ul> <p>It is important to note that the applicant has already commenced permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ on the site. This report therefore primarily focuses on the differences between this permission and that proposed within this application.</p>
<p><b>Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)</b></p>	<p>CA - Conservation Area: NORT; - Distance: 0  LBC - LISTED BUILDING House, built in 1698, now office. Painted - Distance: 0  LBC - LISTED BUILDING Stables. Mid-late C18. Red brick. Hipped slate - Distance: 0  GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 0  LCA - Landscape Character Area (Northaw Common Parkland) - Distance: 0  PAR - PARISH (NORTHAW AND CUFFLEY) - Distance: 0  ROW - FOOTPATH (NORTHAW 004) - Distance: 18.64  Wards - Northaw &amp; Cuffley - Distance: 0  DESC - BELL BAR TO BARNET 16" - Distance: 0  A4D - ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION - Distance: 0  FM00 - Flood Zone Surface Water 1000mm (18099) - Distance: 0  FM00 - Flood Zone Surface Water 1000mm (7633014) - Distance: 0  FM00 - Flood Zone Surface Water 1000mm (7633107) - Distance: 0  FM00 - Flood Zone Surface Water 1000mm (7635275) - Distance: 0  FM00 - Flood Zone Surface Water 1000mm (7633668) - Distance: 0  HEN - Existing habitat not currently qualifying under S41 NERC Act - Distance: 0  HEN - Existing S41 NERC Act habitat - Distance: 0  HEN - No known habitats present (high priority for habitat creation) - Distance: 0  SAGB - Sand and Gravel Belt - Distance: 0  GAS - High Pressure Gas Pipeline(BELL BAR TO BARNET 16") - Distance: 0</p>
<p><b>Relevant planning history</b></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</p>

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

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

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

Application Number: 6/2020/0964/VAR

Decision: Withdrawn

Decision Date: 03 June 2020

Proposal: Variation of condition of 4 (approved plans) on planning permission 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: 6/2020/0718/COND

Decision: Granted

Decision Date: 4 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

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

	<p>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</p> <p>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)</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p>		
<b>Consultations</b>			
<b>Neighbour representations</b>	Support: 0	Object: 28	Other: 0
<b>Publicity</b>	<p>Site Notices Display Date: 1 February 2021 Site Notices Expiry Date: 22 February 2021 Press Advert Display Date: 3 February 2021 Press Advert Expiry Date: 24 February 2021</p>		
<b>Summary of neighbour responses</b>	<p>The application was advertised by means of a press notice, neighbour notification letters and site notices. Twenty eight representation have been received, objecting to the application. These are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of the development would be incongruous with its surroundings and the heritage assets on the site</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• No very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm that the proposal would have on the Green Belt</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A recent appeal demonstrates new housing around Northaw is inappropriate within the Green Belt</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• The proposal additional dwellings to the east of Northaw House would represent a form of ribbon development</li> <li>• The proposal would have unacceptable impact on the landscape character area</li> <li>• The proposed increase of a further six dwellings represents overdevelopment of the site</li> <li>• There is no justification for the additional dwellings proposed</li> <li>• Proposal represents development by stealth</li> <li>• If the developer now considers that the previously approved scheme is unviable they should look to sell the site</li> <li>• The development is within an unsustainable location in terms of access to services and transport links</li> <li>• The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site and would result in an increased flood risk</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• The development would result in ecological harm</li> <li>• The proposal provides no affordable housing</li> <li>• The development would put pressure on schools and other local services</li> <li>• Restoration of the heritage assets on the site would be insufficient to amount to a very special circumstance that would overcome harm caused by this application</li> </ul>
<p><b>Consultees and responses</b></p>	<p>The following have responded advising that they have no objections to the proposal in principal, subject to conditions or obligation being applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hertfordshire County Council, Historic Environment Advisor;</li> <li>• Hertfordshire County Council, Growth Team;</li> <li>• Hertfordshire Country Council, Transport Programmes and Strategy;</li> <li>• Herts Ecological;</li> <li>• Lead Local Flood Authority;</li> <li>• WHBC, Public Health and Protection;</li> <li>• Thames Water;</li> <li>• WHBC Client Services;</li> <li>• Historic England;</li> <li>• WHBC Landscape Officer</li> </ul> <p>The following consultees were consulted and have objected. The below bullet points summarise these comments but their full comments are available on the Council's website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campaign to Protect Rural England have objected to the</li> </ul>

proposal in summary because of the harm that the additional dwellings would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt, would result in a major loss to the openness of the Green Belt and it would fail to accord with the purposes of the Green Belt. In addition, they have raised concerns about the why if the development is unviable has the applicant already commenced permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ.

- Northaw and Cuffley Parish Council have raised a major objection to the proposed development. 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.
- Hertfordshire Garden Trust - 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.
- Conservation Officer – 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.

The following consultees were consulted but provided no comments:

- Environment Agency
- WHBC Parking Services
- Affinity Water Ltd
- Cadent Gas Limited
- HCC Rights of Way (South)
- The Ramblers' Association
- Joint Committee of the National Amenity Societies
- HCC Rights of Way (North)
- WHBC - Affordable Housing
- HCC Spatial Planning & Economy Team

#### Relevant Policies

NPPF  
 D1  D2  GBSP1  GBSP2  M14  
 Supplementary Design Guidance  Supplementary Parking Guidance  Interim Policy for car parking and garage sizes  
Others: SD1, RA10, R1, R11, H2, D8

**Emerging Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016 (Key Policies):**

SP1 (Delivering Sustainable Development)  
SP3 (Settlement Strategy and Green Belt)  
SP4 (Travel and Transport)  
SP9 (Place Making and High Quality Design)  
SADM1 (Windfall Development)  
SADM2 (Highway Network and Safety)  
SADM11 (Amenity and Layout)  
SADM12 (Parking, Servicing and Refuse)  
SADM15 (Heritage)  
SADM16 (Ecology and Landscape)  
SADM34 (Green Belt Development)

**Main Issues**

**Principle of Development**

Local Plan Policy SD1 states that development will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the principles of sustainable development are satisfied and that they will accord with the objectives and policies of the Local Plan; Local Plan Policy R1 states that in order to make the best use of land in the district, the Council will require development to take place on land which has been previously used or developed; Policy GBSP2 directs new development into the existing towns and specified settlements within the district, providing that it will be limited to that which is compatible with the maintenance and enhancement of their character and the maintenance of their Green Belt boundaries. These objectives are consistent with the NPPF which supports the development of under-utilised land and buildings (para 118) and the efficient use of land (para 122). At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The site has not been allocated in the Local Plan for additional housing supply and as such comes forward as a windfall residential site where Policy H2 applies. This policy states that all applications for windfall residential development will be assessed for potential and suitability against the following criteria:

- i. "The availability of previously-developed sites and/or buildings;*
- ii. The location and accessibility of the site to services and facilities by transport modes other than the car;*
- iii. The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure to absorb further development;*
- iv. The ability to build new communities to support infrastructure and provide demand for services and facilities; and*
- v. The physical and environmental constraints on development of land."*

Policy SADM1 of the Emerging Local Plan is also relevant in regards to windfall housing development. This policy is similar to Policy H2 of the District Plan 2005 but adds that the proposal should not undermine the delivery of allocated sites or the overall strategy of the Plan; and proposals would not result in disproportionate growth taking into account the position of a settlement within the settlement hierarchy.

Although the site is located approximately 400m from Northaw village centre, it is considered given the limited service provision provided within Northaw, which is demonstrated by the fact that it does not have

any shops, the future occupiers of this development will be unable to access the majority of their service requirements from the village. As a consequence of the fact that the nearest settlement that provides an appropriately wide range of services is Potters Bar, and these services are approximately 2km from the site it is unlikely future occupiers would access these services by foot or bike. It is important to note that there are bus stops near the entrance to the site on Coopers Lane and that there are bus stops within Northaw itself on Northaw Road West which provide links to Potters Bar and Cuffley. As a consequence future occupants would have access alternative means of transport and would have to be solely reliant on a car to access services. Given the distance involved it is considered that future occupants would still be primarily reliant on the use of a car to access these and other services, but it would be reasonable to assume for some future occupiers to may use these buses to access these services.

The application site meets the requirements of criteria (i), (ii) and (iv) within Policy H2. In principle the site could be suitable for new residential development, subject to the proposals impact upon the existing environment and the development's ability provide appropriate infrastructure to appropriately support the development. These aspect of the proposed development are considered within the following section of this report.

*Green Belt*

The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt as defined by Policy GBSP1 of the District Plan. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The NPPF states, in paragraph 143 that, as with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 144 then states that substantial weight should be given to any harm in the Green Belt and that "very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. Policy SADM34, which echoes Green Belt advice in the NPPF is also applicable.

Within the settlement hierarchy of Policy SP3 of the Council's Emerging Local Plan (2016) Northaw is found within the settlement type of 'Green Belt villages'. In addition, this policy states that further development of these settlements should be considered against other Green Belt policies to assess the acceptability of the proposed development. No map is provided within Policy SP3 or the rest of the emerging Local Plan that indicates what is considered to be the extent of the village.

Given how Northaw is defined within Policy SP3 of the Council's Emerging Local Plan (2016) and the need for any development within this settlement to be assessed against other Green Belt policies it is important that Policy SADM34 of the Council's Emerging Local Plan is considered. Policy SADM34 covers all forms of development within the Green Belt. As a consequence of the nature of the proposed development it is considered that the proposed development does not accord with the requirements of the policy for development within the



Green Belt.

Paragraph 145 of the NPPF deals with the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt, and sets out a range of exceptions to the general policy which may be considered as not being inappropriate. Paragraph 146 then lists certain other forms of development that are also not inappropriate. This list includes both engineering operations and the material changes of use of land where they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and they do not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.

It is important to note that while the previously approved development on the site was found to constitute inappropriate development by definition, as well as further harm to the Green Belt because of its impact on the openness of the Green Belt and purposes of the Green Belt, as these aspects have already been permitted and the applicant has commenced this permission it is not necessary to reassess these aspect of the development here.

Further to the above, this section therefore assesses the appropriateness of the two gate houses and four new dwellings to the east of Northaw House and not the twenty five dwellings already approved as part of 6/2019/0217/MAJ.

As a consequence of the development proposed it is considered that the only exception within paragraph 145 that this development could possibly fall within is (g) because it is not considered that any of the other exceptions are relevant. This exception refers to the limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings) which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.

Whilst some of the site where the previously approved dwellings are to be located may be classed as previously developed land, a large proportion of the site is open and undeveloped. Furthermore the parts of the site where the proposed additional dwellings are to be located are currently open and undeveloped. As a consequence of the fact that the majority of the site is not previously developed the proposal would result in new built form being created on this open and undeveloped land, it is considered that the proposed development falls outside this exception.

With regards to paragraph 146 of the NPPF it is not considered that the proposed development falls within any of the exceptions listed within this paragraph.

As a consequence, it is not considered that the gate lodges and the four new dwellings fall within any of the exceptions listed within paragraphs 145 or 146, it is considered that the proposed development is by definition inappropriate and that substantial weight should be attached to this harm. In addition, it is necessary to assess whether the proposed

development preserves the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land with the Green Belt. As a consequence, paragraphs 133 and 134 of the NPPF need to be considered.

Paragraph 133 outlines that:

*“The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.”*

There is no definition of openness in the NPPF, but in the Green Belt context, it is generally held to refer to freedom from, or the absence of development.

Whilst the physical presence of any above ground development would, to some extent, diminish the openness of the Green Belt regardless of whether or not it can be seen, openness also goes beyond physical presence and has a visual aspect. In the visual sense, openness is a qualitative judgement.

Indeed, in line with *Turner v Secretary of State and East Dorset Council* [2016] judgement the concept of openness should not be limited to a volumetric approach comparing the size, mass and physical effect of openness before and after development. Such an approach would be far too simplistic and ignore the wider aspects of openness which goes beyond the physical effect of buildings or structures. Factors relevant include how built up the Green Belt is now and how built up would it be after development has taken place.

It is important to note that this approach is supported within National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) through the amendments which were made to this document in July of 2019.

The proposed increase in the residential use of the site would contrast with its existing character and appearance, resulting in a more intrusive form of development and the perception of a more developed site.

Dwellings are not, as a matter of general principle, normally regarded as contributing positively to the visual amenity of the countryside. Although the site contains a number buildings and structures the majority of the site is undeveloped and quite unobtrusive in the landscape and does not appear out of place within the site. As the majority of the new residential development would be located within Northaw House, and immediately around it, it is judged that these changes within the site would have a moderate impact on the generally open and unobtrusive nature of the wider site.

In contrast, the two gate houses at both entrances of the site and the four houses located to the east of Northaw House would be located within parts of the site that are currently open and undeveloped. In addition, the four dwellings proposed to east of Northaw House in a prominent location because they would be located on a natural ridgeline which runs from Northaw House to Northaw village. As a consequence this means that they are on land that is significantly higher than the land

to the north of site and would be visible from extensive views from outside the site from several public vantage points. As a consequence, the creation of these six additional new dwellings over those already approved, as well as their domestic curtilages would significantly alter the open and undeveloped parts of the site where they are located within.

In addition to the physical form of the new dwelling, the introduction of dwellings would markedly change the character and appearance of the parts of the site that they are located within from one that is quite typical of countryside to one that is overtly residential in nature. Although their proposed curtilages would not be extensive, outdoor areas would be likely to have an element of associated domestic paraphernalia. It is considered that the addition of further enclosing boundary treatments and ancillary domestic structures, patio areas, residential-style landscaping, play equipment, washing lines and a range of other domestic paraphernalia would be probable in the event that planning permission were granted for a residential use. All of these, as well as additional vehicles parked on the site, would be incongruous additions to the character of the site and would not in keeping with the rural landscape.

Whist permitted development rights could be removed by condition and this may go some way towards limiting the impact on the openness, character and appearance of the site. The harm would not be entirely overcome and it remains questionable how effective these measures would be especially in terms of enforceability.

As a consequence of the above it is considered that the amendments proposed within this application would mean that the proposed development would result in a substantial reduction in the openness of the Green Belt.

*Effect on the visual amenity of the Green Belt and character of the area*

With regards to the visual amenity of the Green Belt, the NPPF at paragraph 141 seeks to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity. Policies D1 and D2 of the District Plan aim to ensure a high quality of design and that development respects and relates to the character and context of the locality. In addition to the above, the NPPF sets out the view of the Government in respect of good design, indeed this is noted as forming a key aspect of sustainable development as it can contribute positively to making places better for people. In particular paragraph 130 outlines that '*permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions*'.

The site is within the Northaw Common Parkland Landscape Character Area. The Northaw Common Parkland Landscape Area is characterised by parkland features, with landscapes that have been created through the historic development of these parklands and estates. The area is predominantly rural in character with formal parkland and estate entrances being the norm. The recommended strategy for the area includes ensuring that historic hedged field boundary patterns are

retained and that any new planting improves the character of the area.

Policy RA10 for development within Landscape Character Areas states that:

*“Proposals for development in the rural areas will be expected to contribute, as appropriate, to the conservation, maintenance and enhancement of the local landscape character of the area in which they are located, as defined in Welwyn Hatfield Landscape Character Assessment.”*

As the majority of the site is predominantly open and developed, it contributes to the setting and open character of the immediate area which is rural in character. In addition, the current level of development within the site similar to that found within the historic estate which Northaw House is part of with the result that the current appearance of the site retains the historic character of this part of the landscape character area.

Although it is noted that the proposed development has been designed in a manner which attempts to limit its impact on the site, it is judged that the proposed development would fail to do this. This is because the proposed development would spread built form into a part of the site that is currently undeveloped and open. In addition, this development would result in the substantial degradation of the historic estate character which still exists within the site through the creation of new built form, as well as associated boundary treatment. Given the elevated nature of Northaw House which is visible from several public viewpoints from outside site this change in the character of the site would be particularly within the surrounding landscape. It is therefore judged that the development would be unsympathetic to the character of the area. This impact would be accentuated at night time when the lighting within the proposed dwellings would spill out into the wider area.

With regards to the purposes of the Green Belt, paragraph 134 states that the Green Belt serves five purposes which are:

- *“to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*
- *to prevent neighbouring town merging into one another;*
- *to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;*
- *to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and*
- *to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.”*

The development would not, by virtue of its scale and location, lead to the sprawl of a large built up area, result in neighbouring towns merging into one another or fail to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. The development by virtue of its residential design, appearance and layout would introduce an urban form of development into the countryside. This urbanisation of the application site would fail to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, contrary to paragraph 134(c) of the NPPF. In addition, both existing and emerging policy seeks to channel development towards larger urban areas away from

	<p>more rural locations to assist in urban regeneration. To allow this kind of residential development in the Green Belt would encourage a pattern of development in a Green Belt location that is contrary to this aim. Taking this into account, the development fails to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. This is contrary to bullet point (e) within paragraph 134.</p> <p>It is concluded that the proposal would result in harm to the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt, while also failing to serve the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. This harm is in addition to the substantial harm resulting from the development being inappropriate within the Green Belt for the reasons identified above.</p>
<p><b>Restoration of Listed Building</b></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 departing from these policies".</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

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 from conflicting planning policies are outweighed by the benefits.

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).

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 permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ 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.

It is important to note that BNPP's viability appraisal found that the twenty five dwellings proposed and approved within 6/2019/0217/MAJ, were the minimum necessary to enable the restoration of the heritage assets on site and therefore constituted enabling development.

As part of their application the applicant has submitted a further viability

	<p>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 permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ 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><b>Design and Heritage</b></p>	<p>District Plan Policies D1 and D2 aim to ensure a high quality of design and to ensure that development respects and relates to the character and context of the locality, maintaining and where possible enhancing the character of the existing area. These policies are expanded upon in the Council's Supplementary Design Guidance (SDG) which requires the impact of a development to be assessed giving regard to the bulk, scale and design of the proposal and how it harmonises with the existing building and area. These objectives are broadly consistent with the Council's Emerging Local Plan 2016 and the aims of the NPPF which considers that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;</li> <li>The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and</li> <li>The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness'</li> </ul> <p>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</p>

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 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 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 proposed additional 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, and therefore does not constitute enabling development, it is judged that the additional harm which would result from this proposal is unnecessary.

	<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 permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ with less harm to these designated heritage assets. 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> <p>Further to the above, it is noted the Council had built 1,450 homes in the period 2017/18-2019/20 against a target of 2,284 which equates to 63% of the target delivery. The Council also do not have a 5 year housing land supply. As a consequence of this, the Council should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development when determining planning applications in accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 11 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Although Paragraph 11 of the NPPF makes clear that there is normally a presumption in favour of sustainable development in such cases, it is important to note Paragraph 11(d)i) of the NPPF and footnote 6 identify designated heritage assets as assets of particular importance which should be protected. As a consequence, although it is judged that this failure of delivery is a material factor within the determination of any planning application for housing, it is considered that as the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets, as well as the other harms identified, it is not considered that this material consideration outweighs the clear reasons for refusing this application. As a consequence, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply in this instance because the application of policies in the NPPF provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed.</p>
<p><b>Impact on neighbours</b></p>	<p>The NPPF is clear that planning should be a means of finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives. This means that authorities should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</p> <p>Policies D1 and R19 of the District Plan seek to ensure that no new development would adversely affect the existing area either in terms of any built form or in terms of the operation of any uses from noise and vibration pollution.</p> <p>As a consequence proposed layout of the development and the application site's relationship with neighbouring properties it is judged that the two neighbours which may be impacted by the proposed development are the White House and the East Lodge. The reason for this is because these properties are adjacent to the parts of the site where new dwellings would be erected.</p>

With regards to the East Lodge, it is considered that the main impact from the proposed development would be caused by the erection of the proposed eastern gate house and the new access from Judge's Hill. As the proposed new dwelling would be approximately 26m from East Lodge and the new gatehouse would be a single storey dwelling, it is not judged that this new dwelling would be overbearing or result in an unacceptable loss in the levels of privacy currently enjoyed by the East Lodge. Furthermore, given the degree of separation between the two properties, as well as the fact that the new dwelling would be single storey it is not judged that it would have material impact on the levels of light that the East Lodge currently enjoys. In terms of the proposed new access it is judged that although the proposed access would allow for vehicle movements past the East Lodge, it is not judged that the number of vehicle movements would have an unacceptable impact because of the number of vehicles that would use this access. In addition, as the dwelling is already positioned within a similar proximity to an adopted road which accommodates a significantly greater number of vehicle movements occurring each day it is not just that the new vehicle movements from within the site would have an unacceptable impact.

Moving to the White House, it is judged that the main impact from the proposed would be created by the three new dwellings which are proposed within the Walled Garden. This is because the Walled Garden is adjacent to the boundary between the application site and two of the new dwellings within the Walled Garden would be within close proximity to this boundary. As all the dwellings within the walled garden would be single storey and would not exceed the height of the existing walled garden, it is not considered that these proposed dwellings would be overbearing, result in a material loss of privacy or a material loss in sunlight, or daylight.

Further to above, it is important to note that although the proposed development would increase the number of dwellings on the site by six it is not considered that this would result in an unacceptable increase from that which was previously approved within 6/2019/0217/MAJ. As a consequence, it is not judged that this part of the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the White House.

With regard to the impact of the scheme on future occupiers of the proposed dwellings, a reasonable relationship would be provided. This is because of the layout of the proposed development and because the garden sizes of the proposed dwellinghouses would be commensurate with their sizes. Although the proposed flats would not be provided with their own private gardens it is considered that the level and quality of communal space provided through the proposal would mean that they would be provided an appropriate level of amenity space. Finally, it is important to note that all the proposed units would meet the minimum space standards set out within the Nationally Described Space Standards in accordance with Policy SADM11 of the Emerging Local Plan 2016

Further to the above, it is considered that the proposed development could provide reasonable living conditions, for both neighbours and

	future occupants.
<b>Access, car parking and highway considerations</b>	<p>The proposal seeks permission for the creation of 31 dwellinghouses through the erection of sixteen new dwellinghouses and the conversion of the existing heritage assets on the site.</p> <p>Paragraph 105 of the NPPF states that if setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development; the type, mix and use of the development; the availability of and opportunities for public transport; local car ownership levels; and the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles. Paragraph 109 states that <i>“development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”</i> Saved policy M14 of the District Plan and the Parking Standards SPG use maximum standards which are not consistent with the NPPF and are therefore afforded less weight. As a consequence of the requirements within the NPPF, the Council have produced an Interim Policy for Car Parking Standards that states that parking provision will be assessed on a case by case basis and the existing maximum parking standards within the SPG should be taken as guidance only.</p> <p>As a consequence it is important to consider the Council’s SPG on Parking Standards and the Council’s Interim policy for Car Parking. Given the location of the application site and the fact that the application proposes the creation of 31 dwellings, it is important that assessment is undertaken as to whether the proposed development provides sufficient parking provision. As it is proposed that 4x 1 bedroom dwellings, 6x 2 bedroom dwellings, 10x 3 bedroom dwellings and 11x 4 bedroom dwellings would be created it is considered that the development should seek to provide 70 off street car park spaces. As it is proposed that the development would provide a total provision of 96 spaces as part of this application then it is judged that subject to an appropriate condition being imposed on any approval, which would require that this parking is allocated to residents of the dwellings, no objections are raised to this aspect of the development albeit there is an over provision.</p> <p>While it is noted that objections have been received about the likely increase of vehicle movements accessing and egressing the site, and the impact that this would have on highway safety, it is important to note that permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ allowed for the creation of twenty five dwellings on the site. While the proposed development would result in an increase vehicle movements it is not considered that this would materially change the acceptability of the proposal on these matter. Furthermore, this opinion is supported by comments which have been received by the Highways Authority who have no objection to the proposed development in principle, subject to appropriate conditions being imposed any approval.</p> <p>Further to the above and subject to the proposed conditions, it is considered that the development would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highway in accordance with the NPPF; Policy M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p>

<b>Other Material considerations</b>	
<b>Contaminated Land</b>	<p>Policy R2 states that the Council will encourage development on land that may be contaminated. However, on such sites applications must be accompanied by a full survey of the level of contamination and proposals for remediation of the site.</p> <p>It is noted that prior to the submission of this application the applicant has submitted and had approved preliminary contamination reports and suggested action which have been approved as part of the discharge of Condition 2 of permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ. As a consequence of the material which has already been approved without regards to the contamination which has already been found on the site it, as well as the additional information submitted as part of this application, it is considered that it would be reasonable and appropriate to require that the proposed works should be carried out with the documentation already approved but that as the proposal includes some amendments from that previously approved that conditions be imposed which would require a further site character appraisal be undertaken, as well as condition relating to potential unexpected finds. This position is in accordance with comments received by the Council's Public Health and Protection team. As a consequence, if this application were to be recommended for approval, it is judged that it would be reasonable to impose these conditions.</p> <p>Accordingly, subject to the imposition of the above mentioned condition, the proposal would not be contrary to policy R2.</p>
<b>Ecology</b>	<p>Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that the planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and delivering net gains in bio diversity where possible. Paragraph 175 of the NPPF goes to listed principles that Local Authorities should apply when determining a planning application. It is stated within Paragraph 175(d) of the NPPF that <i>"opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged"</i>.</p> <p>District Plan Policy R11 seeks to conserve the biodiversity of the borough and seek opportunities for enhancement to ensure no net loss of bio diversity.</p> <p>The applicant has undertaken a recent ecological appraisal of the application site and that survey has been submitted as part of this application. Hertfordshire Ecology have assessed the submitted appraisal. In summary their response is that the proposed development would be acceptable subject to conditions and to the works being carried out in accordance with the details already approved within application 6/2020/0718/COND.</p> <p>As a consequence of this advice it is considered reasonable and appropriate to require that the proposed conditions are imposed on any approval to make sure that the proposed development is acceptable in ecological terms.</p>

<p><b>Landscaping Issues</b></p>	<p>Local Plan Policy R17 seeks to protect existing trees whilst D8 requires landscaping to form an integral part of the overall design, and in this respect the high quality design required by Policy D1 and D2 would again be relevant. Landscaping is important in order to protect and enhance the existing character of the area and to reduce the visual and environmental impacts of the development.</p> <p>It is noted that some details have been provided as part of this application about the location and areas that would be used for hard and soft landscaping. In addition, it is noted that since permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ was granted the applicant has provided further landscaping details to discharge Conditions 5 and 8 of this permission which have been approved. It is important to note though that these approvals did not include the additional dwellings which are now proposed. As a consequence, it is considered reasonable and appropriate to impose conditions on any approval requiring that an updated landscaping plan, arboricultural impact assessment, and an arboricultural method statement be submitted and approved by Local Planning Authority. In addition, it is considered reasonable and appropriate to attach a planning condition, on any approval, requiring an updated tree protection plan be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.</p>
<p><b>Archaeology</b></p>	<p>Policy R29 states that the Council will require developers to undertake an archaeological assessment where the proposed development may affect remains of archaeological significance, or may be sited in an area of archaeological potential.</p> <p>The consultation response from the Historic Environment Advisor indicates that due to the heritage of the site, which includes a number of listed buildings that date back to the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Century, there is a reasonable likelihood that there could be historic works on the application site which may be disturbed as part of the proposed development. While it is noted that part of the site has already been considered previously as part of 6/2019/0217/MAJ and the subsequent discharge of Condition 3, it is considered that as the proposed development would result in additional built form that it is necessary that further work be undertaken to make sure the proposed amendment appropriately consider address the potential impact of this increase built form. It is important to note that this is in line with comments received by the HCC's Historic Advisor. As a result of this, it would be reasonable and appropriate to impose the conditions suggested by this consultee on any approval which would require an appropriate archaeological assessment of the site prior to commence, which would inform what further works are necessary.</p> <p>Accordingly, subject to the imposition of the above mentioned condition, the proposal would not be contrary to policy R29.</p>
<p><b>Waste Management</b></p>	<p>The Council's Client Services Team have been consulted as part of this application and raised no objection to the principal of the proposed development but they have requested that appropriate monies for refuse and recycling provision on the site are provided as part of any approval. In addition, they have requested additional information with regards to the proposed bin storage on site. It is considered that if this</p>

	<p>application were approved that these monies could be secured through the proposed obligation and that the additional information required could be secured by condition.</p>
<p><b>Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage</b></p>	<p>The NPPF deals with issues of climate change and flooding and by means of the sequential test seeks to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. The flood zones are the starting point for this approach. The EA identifies Flood Zones 2 &amp; 3 and all land outside those zones is in flood Zone 1. This site is located within Flood zone 1 i.e. a low probability of flooding.</p> <p>The technical guidance also advises that the overall aim of developers and local authorities should be to seek opportunities to reduce the overall level of flood risk in an area through the layout and form of the development, and the appropriate application of sustainable drainage systems. Such systems are designed to control surface water run off close to where it falls and mimic natural drainage as closely as possible.</p> <p>A Drainage Strategy, as well as subsequent additional information, has been submitted by the applicant as part of this application. The Lead Local Flood Authority and Environment Agency have been consulted as part of this application and they have raised no objection, in principle, to the Drainage Strategy submitted by the applicant. Although in principle the Lead Flood Authority have no objection to the proposal they have asked that conditions be imposed on any approval which would require that the proposed development accords with the details submitted within the submitted Drainage Strategy and also that further drainage assessments and data be submitted, and approved, prior to the occupation of the dwellings on site.</p> <p>Accordingly, subject to the recommended conditions being imposed on any approval, the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy R7 of the District Plan, Policy SADM14 of the Emerging Local Plan and the NPPF.</p>
<p><b>Life Time Homes</b></p>	<p>Policy H10 of the District Plan requires residential development of this scale to involve a proportion of dwellings to be built to lifetime home standards. It is noted that the applicant has stated within their planning statement that they intend to provide a number of dwellings which meet this standard. Although the applicant has stated that they would provide life time homes within the development it is considered that it would be reasonable to impose a condition which would require that the specific details of these units are submitted and approved by the Council to make sure that the home standards are in accordance with Policy H10 of the District Plan and SP7 of the Emerging Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Split of houses</b></p>	<p>Policy SP 7 of the emerging LP states that proposals for 11 or more new dwellings should demonstrate how the mix of tenure, type and size of housing proposed on sites will reflect the Council's latest evidence of housing need and market demand and contribute towards meeting the varied needs of different households. The most up to date evidence is found in the Technical OAN paper (June 2019) which has been produced in connection with the Local Plan examination. This states that the implied size of housing required (2013 – 2032) is as follows:</p>

	<table border="1" data-bbox="491 237 1216 309"> <tr> <th>1 bed</th> <th>2 bed</th> <th>3 bed</th> <th>4+ bed</th> </tr> <tr> <td>14%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>41%</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="448 344 1382 412">This paper also sets out that the implied type of housing required (2013 – 2032) is 77% houses and 23% flats.</p> <p data-bbox="448 448 1370 512">The application proposes the following dwelling mix, fifteen units being flats and sixteen units being dwellinghouses.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="491 546 1216 618"> <tr> <th>1 bed</th> <th>2 bed</th> <th>3 bed</th> <th>4+ bed</th> </tr> <tr> <td>12%</td> <td>19%</td> <td>42%</td> <td>29%</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="448 654 1391 920">As a consequence of the above, while it is noted that the proposed development would provide more flats than would be preferred it is considered the unit sizes proposed would be broadly in accordance with the requirements of SP7. As a result of the constrained nature of the development site it is not considered that this proposed mix in terms of size and type would be unacceptable in this case. With regards to tenure this is discussed later in report under affordable housing provision.</p>	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed	14%	23%	41%	22%	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed	12%	19%	42%	29%
1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed														
14%	23%	41%	22%														
1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed														
12%	19%	42%	29%														
<p data-bbox="181 958 392 1055"><b>Environmental Impact Assessment</b></p>	<p data-bbox="448 958 1382 1323">Whilst the applicant has not submitted an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening request, the Local Planning Authority has undertaken one. The development is not contained within Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the Regulations). The development does not fall either within Schedule 2 of the Regulations. Whilst the proposal is considered an Urban Development Project, as listed at 10(b) of Schedule 2, the overall area of development would be less than 5 hectares, would not include more than 150 dwellings and would not include more than 1 hectare of urban development which is not dwellinghouse development. An EIA is therefore not required.</p>																
<p data-bbox="181 1361 349 1426"><b>Planning Obligations</b></p>	<p data-bbox="448 1361 1358 1563">The NPPF sets out that Local Planning Authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended):</p> <ul data-bbox="491 1597 1315 1765" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms</li> <li>• Directly related to the development; and</li> <li>• Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="448 1798 1378 1966">The Council has not adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy and therefore where a planning obligation is proposed for a development, The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, which came into effect from 6 April 2010, has introduced regulation 122 which provides limitations on the use of planning obligations.</p> <p data-bbox="448 2000 1370 2024">Regulation 123 introduces further limitation and these relate to the use</p>																



of planning obligations for the purposes of infrastructure. Where a local authority has a published list for infrastructure projects, the authority may not seek contributions through a legal agreement through S106 of the 1990 Act. In this case, the authority does not have a published list and therefore it is appropriate to seek contributions through a S106 legal agreement. This would be in accordance with policies M4 and IM2 of the District Plan.

#### *Affordable housing*

The proposed development seeks permission for 31 residential units and in accordance with the adopted District Plan, the Council would expect this number of houses to include the provision of affordable housing. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF states that LPA's require a minimum of 10% affordable all major housing developments, which means proposals for 10, or more dwellings. In addition, Policy SP 7 of the emerging Local Plan requires that for a proposal of 11 or more new dwellings, a proportion of these houses should be affordable, with the exact percentage being dependant of the application site's location within the borough. In this case the proportion of the dwellings which should be affordable would be 35%. Given the advanced stage of this plan, whilst not adopted this is a material consideration that holds significant weight. Accordingly, it is considered reasonable that 35% affordable housing is sought to meet the needs of local people who cannot afford to occupy dwellings generally available on the open market.

As this development seeks permission for an additional six houses and the viability appraisal of this development indicates that this would be well in excess of what is the minimum necessary to restore the heritage assets on the site it is considered that it would be reasonable to seek affordable housing provision on this uplift in units given the scheme has shown to be viable.

The applicant has not proposed any affordable housing, with the result that the proposal would fail to comply with the Council's Emerging Policy S7 on affordable housing and paragraph 64 of the NPPF.

#### *Hertfordshire County Council Contributions*

Confirmation has been received from Hertfordshire County Council that financial contributions are required to fund various Hertfordshire County Council projects in order to mitigate the impacts of the development including:-

- Primary Education (Woodside Primary School and Goffs Oak) - £67,308
- Secondary Education (Chancellors School) - £72,507
- Library Services (Cuffley Library) - £5,593
- Youth Services (Hatfield Young People's Centre) - £1,419

It should be noted that as part of the previous permission Hertfordshire

County Council sought the following contributions:

- Primary Education (Woodside Primary School) - £54,823
- Secondary Education (Chancellors School) - £59,887
- Library Services (Cuffley Library) - £4,482
- Youth Services (Hatfield Young People's Centre) - £1,160
- Fire Hydrants

As part of permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ signed a S106 agreement which confirmed that they would pay these monies. These monies have since been paid to Hertfordshire County Council. As a result, it is considered that if this application were recommended for approval that the applicant would only need to provide the additional value above what they have already paid.

#### *Welwyn Hatfield Contributions*

WHBC Client Services have found the proposal to be acceptable, subject to S106 contributions being provided to cover the costs of bin provision for the 31 units. This refuse contribution would not be subject to the pooling system, as this is specific to the proposed development.

In accordance with the Council's Planning Obligations SPD, a monitoring fee of up to a maximum of £5000 will also be required and payment will be required to be made prior to commencement of the development.

These requested contributions are considered to be reasonable and to pass the necessary Community Infrastructure Levy 122 tests as the works are considered necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

#### *Heritage*

Officers consider given the importance of maintaining the wider site in its current form, that if this application were recommended for approval, it would be appropriate and reasonable to request that the management and access to this land is managed through a planning obligation. This because it is considered given the extensive restoration works required as part of this proposal and there fundamental importance to the proposal that this would be the most appropriate tool to make sure such works are appropriately undertaken.

#### *Conclusion*

The applicant has not submitted a S106 agreement and it is considered that it is not possible to secure the legal agreement by way of condition. Given the requested contributions are entirely relevant and proportionate to the impact of the proposed development, it is considered that the Council would be acting unreasonably and failing its

	<p>sustainability objectives were it to not obtain the contributions.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Saved Policy IM2 and M4 the District Plan, the Planning Obligations SPD, Policy SP 7 of the emerging Local Plan, the NPPF and CIL Regulations 2010, as amended.</p>
<p><b>Very Special Circumstances</b></p>	<p>It is necessary to undertake a balancing exercise to establish whether there are very special circumstances that outweigh the harm to the Green Belt that would be caused by the proposed development, which for the reasons set out above, constitute inappropriate development. The NPPF indicates that substantial weight must be attached to inappropriate development by reason of its inappropriateness.</p> <p>As set out above, the proposed development amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which by definition is harmful to the Green Belt. Substantial weight attaches to any harm to the Green Belt. Moreover, as set out above the proposed development would result in a significant loss of openness to the Green Belt and would result in built form encroaching into the countryside, which would result in further substantial harm to the Green Belt.</p> <p>Paragraph 144 of the NPPF outlines that as with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 144 outlines that <i>'Very Special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations'</i>.</p> <p>It is accepted in case law that there is no prescribed list of what might constitute very special circumstances. It may be that a single aspect of a proposal may itself be a very special circumstance (VSC) sufficient to justify development or it may be that a number of circumstances may cumulatively amount to very special circumstances. As Lord Justice Pill said in <i>South Bucks District Council v Secretary of State for Transport, Local Government and the Regions</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 687, [2003] All ER (D) 250 (May): <i>'It is of the essence of very special circumstances that the applicant establishing them is in a very special category.'</i> However, by their nature the existence of very special circumstances must relate to a particular site.</p> <p>The applicant has put forward a number of matters that the appellant considers to amount to very special circumstances that overcome the harm that has been identified within this report. These are discussed below under headings for easy of reference. It is important to note that given the similarity of some points these have been discussed broader heading than chosen by the applicant.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Heritage benefits</i></p> <p>The benefits and harm that the proposed development would cause to the heritage asset have already been discussed above with the result that these discussions will not be repeated here. It is important to note that this analysis identifies that the proposed development would harm</p>

the heritage assets on the site and the level of harm attached to this harm is considered as less than substantial. Although the proposal would cause harm it is judged that the proposed restoration of the heritage assets on the site is a clear benefit to the proposal which must be weighed against this harm.

As it has been found that the scale of development proposed would not represent the minimum to offset the conservation deficit and would not constitute enabling development it is considered that the proposed development would result in unnecessary harm to the heritage assets. In addition, given the extensive increase in built form proposed as part of this application and substantial harm that these works would cause the Green Belt and the character of the surrounding area it is judged that even if it could be argued that the proposed development was the minimum necessary that the harms resulting from the proposed development would not be outweighed by the heritage benefits of the scheme.

As a result of the above, it is not considered that on balance the heritage benefit for this application can be given weight in favour of the proposal because a scheme which would cause less harm to the heritage assets on site could be delivered which would achieve the same benefits

#### *Landscape benefits*

Although it is noted that the applicant believes that landscape grounds would be maintained in perpetuity from the funding generated by the development, as no obligation has been submitted to demonstrate how this would be achieved it is unclear how such a benefit would be achieved. As a consequence of this only limited weight can be attached to the landscaping improvement which may be achieved by the development.

#### *Housing Supply*

The applicant has stated that the Council's failure to have a 5-year supply of housing amount to a very special circumstance in the case of this application.

In addition, it is noted that the Government published the housing delivery test results on 19 January 2021 and that these confirmed that Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council had built 1,450 homes in the period 2017/18-2019/20 against a target of 2,284 which equates to 63% of the target delivery. It is noted that because supply has fallen below 75%, the Council should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development when determining planning applications in accordance with the requirements of Paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

While it is noted that Paragraph 11 of the NPPF makes clear that there is normally a presumption in favour of sustainable development in such cases, it is important to note Paragraph 11d)i) of the NPPF and footnote 6 identify land designated as Green Belt as a protected area. As a consequence, although it is judged that this failure of delivery is a material factor within the determination of any planning application for

housing, it is considered that as the proposed development is within the Green Belt and its proposal would cause substantial harm to the Green Belt, as well as the other harms identified, it is not considered that this material consideration outweighs the clear reasons for refusing this application. As a consequence, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply in this instance because the application of policies in the NPPF provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed.

#### *Economic benefit to the area*

Although the proposed development would provide some economic benefit during the construction phase of the development, this benefit would be limited to the time of the construction period. It is noted that the applicant has stated that there would be long term benefits from the new residents who occupy the dwellings because they would use local services. It is not disputed that these new residents would need to use local services but it is judged that the level of increased demand on these services would be marginal. As a consequence, it is considered that only limited weight can be attached to the economic benefits of the proposal.

#### *Environmental and Ecological Benefits*

As part of this application Hertfordshire Ecology have been consulted. It is important to note they state that the proposed development has the potential to provide biodiversity gains within the site subject to appropriate conditions and to the appropriate management of the site post development to make sure that these gains are not lost. Furthermore while the response from Herts Ecology is positive in principle their response does not indicate that the ecological gains which would result from this development would be exceptional or significantly above what major developments of this nature should seek to achieve.

As a result of the above it is considered although there may be a potential for the scheme to provide ecological benefits, as these are not exceptional or significantly above what would be expected of a development of this nature, it is judged that weight which can be attached to it is only moderate.

#### *Highway Impact*

It is stated that the proposed development would reduce the number of vehicle movements around the site from the current permitted use. It is important to note that as the applicant has already commenced their 2019 permission for the site that the existing use is no longer its former office use but instead the use permitted by this permission. As a consequence, while it is argued by the applicant that the proposed use would result in a reduction from the site's current use it is not considered that this is the case because the proposed development would actually result in a likely increase in vehicular movements because this application proposes an increased number of dwellings to that approved as part of permission 6/2019/0217/MAJ. While it is not considered that this proposed change would be harmful, it is not judged

	<p>that this likely increase could be found to represent a benefit to the proposal. As a result it is judged that no weight can be attached to this point.</p> <p>With regards to the highway improvements, the Highway's Authority have been consulted as part of this application and have stated that the proposed improvement would be acceptable subject to them being appropriately secured by condition. Although it is not disputed that these proposed works would improve the existing access points to the site, it is judged that such improvements are not unusual for a development of this nature. In addition, as the Highways Authority have requested that these improvement be secure by condition it would be reasonable to assume that if these improvement were not proposed as part of this application the Highway Authority would have required them by condition on any approval. As a result only limited weight can be attached to this benefit.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The site is previously developed and the proposed development would have a limited impact on the Green Belt</i></p> <p>With regard to the site being previously developed land, as referred to above, a large proportion of the scheme would be sited on land which is currently open and undeveloped, it is not consider that the proposal could be judged as falling within this definition. As already discussed within this report, in addition to the development being inappropriate by definition, it is also considered that the proposed would result in further substantial harm to the Green Belt because of its impact on its openness and its purposes. It is therefore considered that this argument provides no weight in favour of this proposal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Conclusion</i></p> <p>By their nature the existence of very special circumstances must relate to a particular site. It is considered that the considerations put forward by the applicant do not individually or collectively clearly outweigh the harm identified as a result of the proposed development such as to justify the development on the basis of very special circumstances. Additionally it is not apparent that there are any other considerations.</p> <p>Accordingly the proposed development, which is inappropriate development and causes harm to the openness, purposes and visual amenities of the Green Belt, where there are no apparent very special circumstances, conflicts with the NPPF and policies RA10 and D2 of the District Plan and Policy SADM 34 of the emerging plan.</p>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<p>Policy SD1 of the District Plan and Policy SP1 of the Emerging Local Plan require that proposals will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the principles of sustainable development are satisfied and they accord with the objectives and policies of the Development Plan. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The NPPF outlines, in its introduction, three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles. Of particular relevance to this application is an economic role, among others, to ensure land is</p>

available in the right places to support growth; a social role to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; as well as an environmental role which includes protecting and enhancing the environment.

The NPPF does not require development to jointly and simultaneously achieve planning gain in each of the three considerations. It is sufficient for all three to be considered and for a balance between benefit and adverse effects to be achieved across those three areas.

In favour of the scheme is a social benefit through the provision of 31 additional windfall residential units. The Council are unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and are currently failing to meet the Government housing delivery test. The proposed development would therefore contribute towards this identified shortfall in housing supply, which is a benefit to which significant weight is attached to this benefit. However it is important to note that the proposed development would fail to provide any affordable housing which constitutes a harm.

In relation to the economy, the proposed development would make a small contribution through the provision of employment and the sale of materials associated with the construction of the dwellings. However, this benefit would be short term and is therefore afforded only limited weight. Whilst future occupiers of the development would support shops and services in the long term, this benefit would be spread over a wide area given the location of the site and would therefore be limited in effect.

It is considered that the proposed landscaping and ecological proposals around the site would constitute environmental benefits to the scheme and would weigh in its favour. It is considered that it would be reasonable to attach moderate weight to these benefits.

While it is noted that the proposed development would result in some heritage benefits, it would also result in less than substantial harm to the heritage assets on the site. Furthermore, it is considered that as the additional dwellings do not represent the minimum level of development necessary to constitute enabling development. As a result it is considered that these benefits would not amount to a public benefit sufficient to overcome the harm caused by the proposed development. This is because the viability appraisal for this application has demonstrated that these additional dwellings are unnecessary to deliver the same heritage benefit as that permitted within 6/2019/0217/MAJ.

As set out above, the proposed development amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which by definition is harmful to the Green Belt. Substantial weight attaches to any harm to the Green Belt. Moreover, as set out above the proposed development would lead to some loss of openness and would be an encroachment into the countryside, which adds to the harm to the Green Belt, albeit to a limited extent. In addition, it is considered that there are no very special circumstances which individually or collectively outweigh these substantial harms to the environment.

	<p>Although it is considered that there would be social, economic and environmental benefits to the proposed development, it is judged that these benefits would not outweigh the environmental harms that have been identified within this report.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	
<p>In conclusion, the proposed development would result in conflict with the District Plan, the Emerging Local Plan and the NPPF. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight or importance that clearly outweigh the substantial harm identified to the Green Belt and the other harms identified so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal. For the reasons given above it is recommended that planning permission is refused.</p>	

**Reasons for Refusal:**

1. The proposed development, which is located on land designated as Metropolitan Green Belt, would constitute inappropriate development, causing harm to the openness and purposes of including land in the Green Belt, which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. Additionally further harm is caused to the visual amenities of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances appear to exist which outweigh the potential harm of the development to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and the other harm identified. Accordingly, the proposal fails to comply with Policies RA10 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, Policy SADM 34 of the Emerging Local Plan 2016, the Council's Supplementary Design Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.
  
2. The proposed development would materially harm the setting of heritage assets on the site. Whilst this is less than substantial harm and there would be a benefit to restoring the heritage assets on the site, it is not considered that this benefit would outweigh the harm identified to the setting and significance of the designated heritage assets on site. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy SADM15 of the Emerging Local Plan 2016, National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
  
3. The applicant has failed to satisfy the sustainability aims of the plan and to secure the proper planning of the area by failing to ensure that the development proposed would provide a sustainable form of development in mitigating the impact on local infrastructure and services which directly relate to the proposal and which is necessary for the grant of planning permission. The applicant has failed to provide a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The Local Planning Authority considers that it would be inappropriate to secure the required financial and non-financial contributions by any method other than a legal agreement and the proposal is therefore contrary to Policies H2, IM2, M4 and H7 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, Policies SADM1, SP7 and SP13 of the Emerging Local Plan 2016.



## REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

4.

<b>Plan Number</b>	<b>Revision Number</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Received Date</b>
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_PL0 4		Basement Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL0 5		Ground Floor Plan	11 January 2021
16254_PL0 6		First Floor Plan	11 January 2021
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		Stable Block Sections	11 January 2021

9

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
16254PL01		Site Location Plan	20 January 2021
16254PL02		Site Block Plan	20 January 2021
1046CCEX XXXDRC00 1	P1	Drainage Plan	1 April 2021
1046CCEX XXXDRC00 2	P1	Proposed Drainage General Arrangement Plan	1 April 2021
1046CCEX XXXDRC00 3	P1	Proposed Drainage General Arrangement Plan	1 April 2021
1046CCEX XXXDRC00 4	C2	Proposed Drainage Details	1 April 2021
1046CCEX XXXDRC00 5	C2	Proposed Pond Sections	1 April 2021
		Standard Gratings Plan	11 January 2021

02	Landscape Masterplan Part 1	11 January 2021
03	Landscape Masterplan Part 2	11 January 2021
	Headwall Lifting Diagram	18 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