

PLANNING STATEMENT

Full Planning Permissions and Listed Building Consent for the change of use of the former Princess Helena College to residential use, comprising the conversion of Grade II* Listed Building & Teaching Block to apartments, the replacement of existing sports hall and science block with 22no. new-build dwellings, the conversion of existing Tank House and Pump House to two further dwellings and the provision of 2no. new dwellings located within the summerhouse plantation and associated partially covered car park for residents and visitors. Associated reinstatement of Grade II* Listed Parks and Gardens and provision of new community Cricket Pitch, together with replacement Cricket Pavilion.

At

**TEMPLE DINSLEY (FORMER
PRINCESS HELENA COLLEGE),
SCHOOL LANE, PRESTON,
HITCHIN, HERTS**



CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	3
2.0	PLANNING HISTORY AND BACKGROUND.....	6
3.0	APPLICATION PROPOSALS.....	8
4.0	NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY	16
5.0	LOCAL PLANNING POLICY.....	20
6.0	MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	25
7.0	CONCLUSIONS AND PLANNING BALANCE	73

Appendices

Appendix 1:	Schedule of Plans and Drawings
Appendix 2:	Temple Dinsley – Proposed Land Use & Access (Drawing No. 41-KS-70-XX-DR-A-11100)
Appendix 3:	‘Survey schedule of hardstanding areas and assessment of heritage value’
Appendix 4:	Site Plan Existing and Proposed Hardstanding (Drawing No. 641-KS-70-XX-DR-A-11200-P01)



1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Planning Statement has been prepared on behalf of the landowner of the site, Mr Russell Prince of The Door PHC Ltd, hereafter referred to as “the Applicant”, in support of a Full Planning Application and an application for Listed Building consent in relation to a residential development at the Former Princess Helena College, known as Temple Dinsley, School Lane, Preston, Hertfordshire. This application is made to North Hertfordshire District Council (hereby referred to as “the LPA”).
- 1.2 The applications that have been made are for both Planning permission and for Listed Building Consent. The two descriptions for what is being proposed are as follows: -

Full Planning permission for the change of use of the Former Princess Helena College and associated land from a former all-girls boarding school to 69no. private residential dwellings (Use Class C3), including the conversion of the main Grade II Listed House to 35no. new apartments, the conversion of the retained Teaching Block to provide 8 new apartments, the demolition of the existing sports hall building and science block and replacement with 20no. new houses and 2no. new apartments, the conversion of the Tank House and the Pump House buildings to provide 2no. detached dwellings and the erection of 2no. new dwellings located within the ‘summerhouse plantation’. The provision of a new car-park together with domestic storage units and covered parking bays to include solar PV Panels, and waste storage units and the provision of new driveways and associated works. In addition, the associated landscaping of the site including provision of new pathways and gates and the reinstatement of Grade II* Listed Parks and Gardens and the provision of a new Cricket Pitch and associated Cricket Pavilion.*

And -

Listed Building Consent for all works associated with the conversion of the Grade II Listed Building from the former all-girls boarding school to 35no. new apartments and the works for the reinstatement of the Grade II* Listed Park and Garden at Temple Dinsley, and all works associated with the conversion of the curtilage listed Tank House and Pump House buildings and the demolition of the existing sports hall.*



The Site

- 1.3 The application site comprises the Temple Dinsley Grade II* Listed House and the associated and surrounding grounds and parkland, which are also Grade II* Listed Parks and Gardens.
- 1.4 The list entry name for the building is “Princess Helena College, Temple Dinsley, with terraces, steps, walls, railings, gates, pergolas, and garden buildings” at address ‘Princess Helena College, Temple Dinsley’ and under List entry number 1307766. The detailed listing description is very lengthy and so is not repeated here but is available at the Historic England website.
- 1.5 The list entry for the parks and gardens is under list entry number 1000919 and again, the description is very lengthy and so is not repeated here but is available on the Historic England website.
- 1.6 The main house is originally of C18 and which was substantially extended by Edwin Lutyens between 1908 and 1913. At the same time Lutyens collaborated with Gertrude Jekyll and together they created and formed the formal landscaped gardens around the house. The house and the more formal gardens are complimented by surrounding parkland, which also dates from the C18.
- 1.7 The site has been used as Princess Helena Boarding School from 1935 until 2021, when it closed. The site has remained largely unused since 2021, over the past three years.
- 1.8 The current site, subject of this application and as shown edged red on the accompanying Site Location Plan, extends to a total of 27.8 hectares. The application site is located on the eastern edge of the village of Preston and is approximately 2.8km from the southern edge of the town of Hitchin and is approximately 5km from the centre of the town. As ‘the crow flies’ the site is approximately 3.5km from the western edge of Stevenage.
- 1.9 The site is served by two main vehicular access points, with the main entrance from School Lane, a road which runs along the sites western border. The ‘Park Wall facing School Lane and 2 pairs of gatepiers and flanking walls at main gate to Princess Helena College’ are Grade II Listed in their own right (list entry number 1102432). The second access is found on St Albans Highway, which flanks the sites eastern border.



- 1.10 As well as the main house, the site includes a number of other buildings which have served the former boarding school and which include a number of further listed buildings. These include the 'The Piggery', located to the south of the main house and which is Grade II listed and also the 'Icehouse' located to the east of the main house, which is also Grade II Listed.
- 1.11 Further buildings include the Tank House and Pump House, which are located within the wider parkland, some 270m south of the main building and which are considered to be curtilage listed, in association with the main house.
- 1.12 Further buildings include a substantial sports hall building immediately to the rear of the main house and a Teaching Block and Science Block which are located within close proximity to the eastern wing of the main house. Lastly, there is a barn building located within the Summerhouse Plantation, to the north-east of the main house. It is understood that these buildings are later additions and were constructed after the main building was listed in 1952. Accordingly, these are not considered to be curtilage listed.
- 1.13 The western portion of the site is located within the Preston Conservation Area, including the main house and Teaching block, the formal gardens, the main access drive and the listed entrance and brick wall at School Lane. The reminder of the informal parkland, including the Summerhouse plantation, the science block and the sports hall are not included.
- 1.14 In terms of land designations, the entirety of the site is located within the Green Belt.

Preston

- 1.15 As noted, the site lies on the eastern edge of the village of Preston. Under the North Herts Local Plan 2011 – 2032, Preston is listed as a 'Category A' village (Policy SP2 'Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Distribution'), where sustainable development is generally supported, owing to the fact that the village benefits from a number of services and facilities. Accordingly, a housing site, ref. PR3 is allocated within the village for 21 houses, and which has gained planning permission.



- 1.16 At the 2011 census, Preston had a population of 420 people with 158 households (although this will have increased owing to recent housing developments since 2011). The village benefits from a community run public house, The Red Lion, which is located in the centre of the village, overlooking the village green. Other facilities include Preston Primary (VC) School, Preston Nursery School, St Martin's Church, a Village Hall, and a recreation ground which also accommodates Preston Cricket Club.
- 1.17 It is also hoped that the village will soon benefit from a community run convenience shop, following the granting of Prior Approval for the 'Change of use of agricultural building to community shop' under planning reference 24/00928/PRN, at Pond Farmhouse, Charlton Road, located at the north-western corner of the village (granted in April 2024).

2.0 PLANNING HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

- 2.1 As outlined, the site has been used since 1935, and therefore for nearly the past 90 years, as a boarding school for girls, known as Princess Helena College. The more historic origins of the listed house and gardens are outlined within the submitted Design, Access and Heritage Statement and to avoid repetition, this will not be outlined here.
- 2.2 The more recent planning history of the school is outlined below (provided in chronological order):
- 01/01175/1 - Detached building to provide science centre. Re-alignment of path of internal driveway (as amplified by plan no 3565.309 rec'd 28.8.01) – Approved October 2001. It is believed this relates to the Science Block building, located to the east of the main house.
 - 09/01977/1 - Change of use of agricultural field to playing field. Conversion and extension of redundant barn to pavilion to serve playing field – Approved February 2010. This relates to the open parkland fields to the south of the main house and the building proposed for conversion is the Tank House. This permission was not implemented.
 - 11/00864/1LB - Internal alterations and extension to allow conversion of redundant barn to pavilion to serve playing field – Conditional Consent approved July 2011.
 - 15/01815/1 - Installation of 208 solar panels to south roofslope of Sports Hall (as amended by drawings received 10/09/2015) – Approved September 2015



- 17/01378/1 - Construction of a performing arts centre attached to the schools existing sports hall with associated landscaping. – Approved September 2017. This permission allowed for the erection of a substantial extension to the side of the existing sports hall, to provide a performing arts centre, of a height similar to the sports hall. However, this was not implemented and the permission has since expired.
- 17/01629/1LB - Internal redecorating of the timber panelling in the entrance hall with a zinc oxide paint – Conditional Consent approved August 2017.

2.3 The more recent planning history of the site relates to its use as a boarding school and the various extensions, additions and new outbuildings to accommodate the school. It is considered that little of the recent planning history is of significant relevance to the proposals now put forward.

Pre-application

- 2.4 Pre-application advice was sought by the applicant, through the architectural team in September 2023 with an initial formal response provided in December 2023, which was very positive and very helpful. Discussions and advice on ever evolving proposals were then pursued under a Planning Performance Agreement, with several presentations and meetings held on site, with valuable feedback provided by Planning Officers and Conservation Officers, helping to shape and inform the proposals now being put forward.
- 2.5 As part of the PPA process, a more recent meeting in late June 2024 has been held on site with members from Historic England and also the Council Conservation Officer in attendance and this focused on final design proposals and detailed heritage matters.
- 2.6 In addition, a final site meeting was also held in early July 2024 with the applicant's Ecology and Arboricultural consultants, together with the Council's 'in-house' ecologist and a Council appointed Tree consultant. This has been to discuss tree removal, the parameters of Biodiversity Net Gain and the impacts of lighting on bats within the Summerhouse Plantation.



- 2.7 During the course of the pre-application work, the applicant has also sought to liaise with and involve the local community, meeting regularly with members of Preston Parish Council, representatives of Preston Cricket Club and with local residents who neighbour and/or overlook the site. Two presentation and pop-in sessions were held in the Parish Hall on 30th May and on 1st June 2024, allowing local residents to come and meet the team and to discuss the proposals and provide their feedback. This is outlined in greater detail in the submitted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

3.0 APPLICATION PROPOSALS

- 3.1 Planning permission and listed building consent are sought for the change of use and conversion of the former Princess Helena College building and surrounding listed gardens and the wider parkland site. The proposals are multi-faceted and include the conversion of the main listed building and additional curtilage listed buildings, the demolition of existing outbuildings and their replacement with new-build dwellings and also the provision of two new-builds within the Summerhouse Plantation.
- 3.2 With the main building being Grade II* Listed, as well as the formal Parks and Gardens being Grade II* Listed in their own right and several other buildings within the site being Grade II Listed (The Piggery, Icehouse and the entrance wall and gatepiers at School Lane), at their core the proposals have been very much heritage led. A consideration of the historic and architectural significance of the heritage assets and the setting of these has been at the forefront in the development of the proposals and has been the primary consideration. Each of the various aspects of the proposals are described below.

Conversion of Main Building

- 3.3 The 'flag-ship' aspect of the proposals is the conversion of the main house and its various wings and extensions. As noted above, the proposals are very much heritage led and therefore when considering how best to divide the building into residential units, the applicant and the architectural team have allowed the building itself to inform this process and so the layout of the building and the historic fabric and the presence of historic features (and their preservation and enhancement) has guided the layout of the building.



- 3.4 The works of conversion will involve the repair of historic fabric, fenestration and key historic features (fireplaces, etc.). It is proposed to remove and replace modern detailing and much of the unfortunate late-C20 additions and interventions
- 3.5 As a result of this process, the proposals are for the conversion of the main building to provide a total of 35 new apartments, comprising 10no. one-bedroom units, 20no. two-bedroom units, 4no. three-bedroom units and 1no. four-bedroom units. Owing to the historic nature and layout of the building, all of the proposed apartments are of unique and individual layouts and are of different sizes. All of the proposed apartments are single-level apartments.
- 3.6 The building will contain three entrances leading to the three existing main stairs and the existing halls and corridors providing access to the 35 new apartments and allowing for the historic fabric to remain unaltered. A new lift is also proposed in the eastern wing, to allow for suitable access to multiple floors.

Teaching Block

- 3.7 The teaching Block, which is located immediately to the rear and to the north-east of the main building, is also proposed to be converted. It is proposed to convert this to provide a total of 8no. new apartments, comprising 2no. one-bedroom units, 5no. two-bedroom units and 1no. three-bedroom unit. Although of some age, the Teaching Block is not considered to be historical and so its conversion is less sensitive in heritage terms.

Sports Hall Housing

- 3.8 The site currently features the former school sports hall building, located to the rear of the teaching block and to the north-east of the main building. This is a substantial building and is of an appearance and design of its time and of its type and also includes a large-array of solar panels on the southern roof slop, facing towards the main building. This building is clearly harmful to the setting of heritage assets and so it is therefore proposed to demolish this building and to also demolish the Science Block building and to replace these with five new buildings, which in total will provide 22no. new-build houses and apartments (known as the 'sports hall housing')



- 3.9 The five new rows/buildings are named ‘Edwin’ (4no. terraced houses), ‘Violet’ (4no. terraced houses), ‘Sadleir’ (6no. terraced houses), ‘Ithel’ (6no. terraced houses) and ‘Templar’ (2no. Split-level apartments) – these names refer to the history of the Temple Dinsley site (for example, ‘Edwin’ Lutyens who extended the main house and introduced the formal parks and gardens in the early C20).
- 3.10 The form and layout of the new housing, as well as their design’ is to reflect a C19 model farm, such as the one historically in place at Temple Dinsley, which was located to the south-east of the main building, in what is now the open parkland (the listed Piggery, tank house and pump house remain).
- 3.11 The buildings will be of a modern design, using modern materials and achieving high sustainability and energy performance standards. Each will be served with an individual Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) and three of the buildings will feature Solar PV units, with PV slates to Ithel (south rood slope) and Violet (west roof slope) and Templar will feature bespoke PV panels. The buildings have also been formed and laid out with the topography and slopes at this part of the site in mind, as well as seeking to minimise loss of higher quality trees.
- 3.12 The total number of dwellings proposed are summarised in **Table 1** below, providing a breakdown of all of the units and their size and type.

Conversion of Pump House and Tank House

- 3.13 These two buildings are set apart from the main buildings and are located within the open parkland, to the south-east of the main house. These are curtilage listed and although structurally sound, they are in a poor state of repair and appear to have not been used by the school for several decades. It is proposed to sensitively convert both of these two buildings into 2no. detached three-bedroom houses.
- 3.14 The Tank House would provide a single storey dwelling and the conversion works would include a modest ‘infill’ extension to the south-western elevation. An open-sided, timber framed cart lodge is proposed to the north of the existing building, to provide two covered parking spaces and an enclosed storage unit.



- 3.15 The Pump house, owing to its significant height, would provide a two-storey dwelling and the works of conversion would include a series of new windows, arranged in a sensitive manner in order to respect and retain its barn-like appearance. The timber cladding and frame would be reinstated and as with the Tank House, an open-sided double cart-ledge is also proposed, to be located to the east of the existing building.
- 3.16 The site features multiple tracks and permissive paths across the parkland and it is proposed to make use of one of these, leading from the separate access on School Lane (the arched brick wall, which is listed and includes two existing vehicular access points), to form an access driveway to serve these two new dwellings and which would be lined with black-painted iron 'estate fencing'. Each house would be provided with a suitable garden and curtilage, with sensitive boundary treatment to delineate the private space from the surrounding parkland.

Summer House and Harwood House

- 3.17 Two new detached houses are proposed within the Summerhouse Plantation, to the north-east of the main house. The first, to be called 'Summer House', will be located in place of an existing barn structure, in the south-wester corner of the plantation. The second, called 'Harwood House', is proposed at the north-western corner of the plantation.
- 3.18 Both dwellings would be two-storey, five-bedroom dwellings, which would be accessed from an existing track which runs north-south through the centre of the plantation and which will be formally laid-out and surfaced. As advised during pre-application discussions, the two new dwellings would be of a unique, contemporary design, with significant 'wrap-around' glazing at ground floor, with minimal structural interventions, to provide a 'floating' appearance and a dark stone cladding at first floor.
- 3.19 Each dwelling would be set within a clearing of the plantation woodland and would be provided with an open amenity space, a driveway leading the access track and each would be served with open-sided cart-lodges with enclosed stores, to provide covered parking spaces and storage.

Table 1 – Proposed dwelling mix and numbers

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed	Total
Main building	10	20	4	1		35
Teaching Block	2	5	1			8
Edwin		2	2			4
Violet				4		4
Sadleir			4	2		6
Ithel			6			6
Templar			2			2
Summer House					1	1
Harwood House					1	1
Tank House			1			1
Pump House			1			1
TOTALS	12	27	21	7	2	69

East Car Park

- 3.20 Parking for the four individual houses (Tank House, Pump House, Summer House and Harwood House) will be provided at those individual plots. However, a significant amount of parking will be required for the 43 conversion apartments and for the 22 'Sports Hall Housing' units. Furthermore, visitors' spaces are required.
- 3.21 A parking strategy requiring 1 parking space per 1 and 2 bedroom apartments and 2 parking spaces for all apartments and houses which are 3+ bedrooms has been adopted and has been agreed by Council officers during pre-application discussions. In addition, a ratio of one visitors parking space is to be provided per 2 new dwellings. This results in a requirement for 127 parking spaces. The parking spaces for the 22 Sport Hall houses are to be provided on the existing car park which runs along both sides of the main internal access road.



- 3.22 To accommodate the remaining parking spaces for the apartments and for visitors, a new car park is proposed to the south-east of the existing car-park, which will be orientated in line with the slopes and topography of this part of the site and which will be enclosed with a wall around its perimeter, to provide screening and to give the appearance of a walled garden. Each of the parking spaces for the new apartments will also feature a storage unit and these parking spaces will be covered, although the sides will remain open. It is proposed that the covering roofs will be Solar PV panels. Additional planting and landscaping will also be provided both within and on the outside of the perimeter wall.
- 3.23 The East Car Park will also include structures at its north-west corner (close to the entrance) to accommodate the communal waste bins (where they would be collected by Refuse Lorries) and also to accommodate plant and machinery, primarily the 'Energy Centre unit', which will be the communal Air Source Heat Pump serving the new apartments within the Main building and the Teaching Block..

Landscape Proposals

- 3.24 The proposals also include for works and developments in the surrounding listed parks and gardens as well as to the wider parkland. It is proposed to fully reinstate the listed gardens, including pergolas and pathways, the removal of the existing school swimming pool and its replacement with the original 'ornamental pond' and the removal of the car-park and hardstanding immediately to the front of the main house and the reinstatement of the Lutyens designed garden courtyard. The applications include the submission of a suite of drawings by George Carter Design Ltd, together with a 'Summary of Restoration Proposals' report, which details the proposed works to the 'Lutyens Formal Gardens'. Furthermore, the proposals are also accompanied by a set of landscape proposals and drawings by 'Livingston Eyre Associates' detailing the proposed landscaping to other key parts of the site, such as around the Sports hall housing and around the proposed 'East Car Park'.
- 3.25 In terms of the wider parkland within the Temple Dinsley site, a significant amount of woodland planting is proposed, around the fringes of the site and also linear rows of tree planting to frame views and to reinstate former historic aspects of the landscape design.



- 3.26 In addition, it is proposed to provide a new Cricket Pitch on the former school athletic field, at the eastern part of the estate, alongside St Albans Highway. It is also proposed to reduce the existing three tennis courts down to just one court, which will be retained to serve the new residents, and in place of the former courts it is proposed to construct a new cricket pavilion. This would be of a low single-storey height and of a modest footprint, with a traditional timber build and it would feature a veranda to the front and a small gable feature above (likely with a clock). The existing pavilion/ storage unit, currently in place, would be relocated to make space for the proposed cricket pitch and would be located alongside the new pavilion, to be used for storage (of plant and machinery).
- 3.27 It is also proposed to refurbish and re-provide a dis-used tennis court which is located in the woodland to the north of the main house, on the track leading to the neighbouring Dower House development (the listed Dower House has been converted into six new dwellings in recent years). This tennis court is to be made available for use by the wider community and so a footpath is also proposed, which would lead from the existing gate on the western boundary of the site (which leads directly from the central village green) and would follow the north-western boundary of the site, through the woodland, leading to the tennis court.
- 3.28 Additional pathways are proposed throughout the site, to provide direct access from the new dwellings to the existing gate on the western boundary of the site, and therefore providing easy, direct access to the village. Further pathways are proposed across the southern section of the site, formalising an existing permissive pathway running east-east from School Lane (west end) to St Albans Highway (eastern end), which will also include spurs to the south (leading to an existing gate further down School Lane) and also to the north, to provide access to the Cricket Pitch.

Submitted Documents and Plans

- 3.29 This application is supported by a full schedule of surveys, reports and documents and which are listed below. These have been prepared in accordance with the NHDC validation requirements and through discussion and agreement with the Council's Planning and Conservation Officers:



3.30 Supplementary and supporting documents:

- Application form and Ownership Certificates (Sworders)
- Cover Letter (Sworders, July 2024)
- Planning Statement (Sworders, July 2024)
- Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms (Sworders, July 2024)
- Statement of Community Involvement (Sworders, July 2024)
- Design, Access and Heritage Statement (SCABAL / KPT Architects, July 2024)
- Schedule of Materials (SCABAL/ KPT)
- Level 3 Historic Recording (John Selby, July 2024)
- 50no, 'Significance Impact Tables' (SCABAL/KPT)
- Initial Landscape Appraisal (ILA) (SCABAL, July 2024)
- Energy Statement (CBG, July 2024)
- Energy Feasibility Report ('M &E Feasibility Report by CBG, July 2024)
- Transport Assessment (EAS, July 2024)
- Construction Traffic Management Plan (EAS, July 2024)
- Travel Plan (EAS, July 2024)
- Ecology Report (Applied Ecology, July 2024)
- Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Report and Metric) (Applied Ecology, July 2024)
- Flood Risk Assessment & SUDs Statement (EAS, July 2024)
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Tree Survey (Sharon Hosegood Associates, July 2024)
- Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (Britannia Archaeology Ltd – June 2024)
- Acoustic Report (Gillieron Scott Acoustic Design, July 2024)
- Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study Reports (J P Chick & Partners Ltd, June 2024)
- Asbestos Surveys (Cambridge Asbestos Removal – August 2023 and Green Sheild Environmental, August 2020)
- Structural Report (AFP Consulting Engineers Ltd, May 2024)
- Method Statement for Demolition of Buildings (AFP Consulting Engineers Ltd, April 2024)



Plans & Drawings

- 3.31 The application is accompanied by over 150 plans and drawings, which are for approval. These are listed in the submitted drawing schedule, provided at Appendix 1 of this Planning Statement. In addition to these, and as noted above at paragraph 3.24 of this statement, two further sets of landscape drawings are provided. Firstly, a set of drawings by ‘George Carter Design Ltd’ are provided, showing the proposed renovation and reinstatement of the Formal ‘Lutyens’ Parks and Gardens. A further set of drawings are provided by ‘Livingston Eyre Associates’, showing landscape proposals to the wider site.
- 3.32 In addition to the main drawings, the application is also accompanied by a series of ‘informative plans’, which are for information only and are not for approval. For example, provided at Appendix 2 of this Planning Statement is a plan illustrating the land uses on site, in terms of what land is private garden, which parts of the site are communal to be shared by all residents of the site and which parts will be for community access. This is informative only and is not sought for approval.

4.0 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

- 4.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2014 requires that all planning applications be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 4.2 National planning policy is contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) adopted 2012 (as amended December 2023).

Sustainable Development & General Planning Principles

- 4.3 The NPPF identifies at paragraph 7 that: *“the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development”* and identifies three overarching objectives, which are economic, social and environmental.



- 4.4 Paragraph 10 goes onto state: *“So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11). For decision-taking this means: c) Approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay”.*
- 4.5 Government seeks to encourage local planning authorities (LPA) to be positive in their decision making, stipulating at paragraph 38 that they: *“... should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.”*
- 4.6 Paragraph 123 of the recently revised/ amended NPPF states that *“Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions”* and paragraph 128 goes onto state that *“Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land...”*.
- 4.7 Section 11 of the NPPF sets out policy and guidance in seeking the effective use of land and Section 12 focuses on the requirements in achieving well-design and beautiful places.
- 4.8 Paragraph 65 of the NPPF (under Section 5 ‘Delivering a sufficient supply of homes’) states that *“Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). To support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount³¹”* (Emphasis added). Footnote 31 further clarifies that *“Equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of the existing buildings. This does not apply to vacant buildings which have been abandoned”*.



Green Belt

- 4.9 The entire application site is located within the Green Belt and so section 12 of the NPPF is of particular relevance. Paragraph 142 of the NPPF states 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”*.
- 4.10 Paragraph 152 goes on to clearly state that *“Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”* and paragraph 153 further elaborates by stating that *“When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”*
- 4.11 Paragraphs 154 and 155 of the NPPF list and outline the types of development which are exceptions within the Green Belt and thus are appropriate forms of the development – further reference is made to these elements of National Planning Policy throughout this planning statement.

Historic Environment

- 4.12 As the site comprises a Grade II* Listed Building, Grade II* Listed parks and Gardens and several other individually listed buildings, as well as part of the site being within the Preston Conservation Area, section 16 of the NPPF is of particular relevance to these applications. Some of the more relevant paragraphs are provided as follows:
- 4.13 Paragraph 196 of the NPPF states that *“Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. This strategy should take into account:*
- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*

- b) the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;*
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and*
- d) opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place. “ (Emphasis added)*

4.14 Paragraph 203 states that *“In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:*

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.” (emphasis added)*

4.15 In terms of the planning balance and the weight afford to the preservation and enhancement of a heritage asset, it is noted that at Paragraph 205, the NPPF states that *“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be)”*. Furthermore, paragraph 209 goes on to state that *“The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.” (emphasis added)*

4.16 Clearly there are more sections of the NPPF which are relevant to the proposals, however, only those considered of most relevance have been referred to in this instance (rather than repeating most of the NPPF here).

4.17 Lastly, it is noted that Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states *“that special regard must be given by the decision maker to the desirability of preserving or enhancing listed buildings and their setting”*.



5.0 LOCAL PLANNING POLICY

5.1 The development plan for the area comprises the North Herts Local Plan 2011 – 2031 ('LP'), which was adopted by the Council in November 2022. The Local Plan now has full weight in the determination of planning applications and the relevant policies contained within the plan are as follows:

- **Policy SP1: 'Sustainable development in North Hertfordshire'** is a strategic policy and which states that *"This Plan supports the principles of sustainable development within North Hertfordshire. We will:*

b) Ensure the long-term vitality of the District's villages by supporting growth which provides opportunities for existing and new residents and sustains key facilities;

c) Grant planning permission for proposals that, individually or cumulatively:

i. deliver an appropriate mix of homes, jobs and facilities that contribute towards the targets and aspirations in this Plan;

iv. protect key elements of North Hertfordshire's environment including biodiversity, important landscapes, heritage assets and green infrastructure (including the water environment);"

- Under **Policy SP2: 'Settlement Hierarchy'**, Preston is listed as a Category A village and it is stated that *"In Category A villages, general development will be allowed within the defined settlement boundaries"*. The supportive text under this policy states, at 4.16 that *"The Category A villages, normally containing primary schools, also have defined boundaries within which development will be allowed and sites have been allocated to meet the District's overall housing requirement. These villages are excluded from the policy designation (either Green Belt or Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt – see Policy SP5) which affects the surrounding countryside"*.

Policy SP5: 'Countryside and Green Belt' reflects national policy within the NPPF and states that *"We support the principles of the Green Belt and recognise the intrinsic value of the countryside. Green Belt and Rural Areas Beyond the Green Belt are shown on the Policies Map. We:* c) *Will only permit development proposals in the Green Belt where they would not result in inappropriate development or where very special circumstances have been demonstrated;"*.



Policy SP13: 'Historic Environment' of the LP states that *"The Council will balance the need for growth with the proper protection and enhancement of the historic environment. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight will be given to the asset's conservation and the management of its setting. We will pursue a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment through: a) Maintaining a strong presumption in favour of the retention, preservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their setting according to their significance;"*.

Policy HE1: Designated Heritage Assets states that *"Planning permission for development proposals affecting Designated Heritage Assets or their setting will be granted where they (as applicable): a) Enable the heritage asset to be used in a manner that secures its conservation and preserves its significance;"*.

Additional Policies within the Local Plan which are of relevance are listed as follows:

Strategic Policies:

- Policy SP6: Sustainable transport
- Policy SP7: Infrastructure requirements and developer contributions
- Policy SP8: Housing
- Policy SP9: Design and Sustainability
- Policy SP10: Healthy Communities
- Policy SP11: Natural resources and sustainability
- Policy SP12: Green infrastructure, landscape and biodiversity

Development Management Policies:

- Policy T1: Assessment of transport matters
- Policy T2: Parking
- Policy HS3: Housing mix
- Policy HS5: Accessible and adaptable housing
- Policy D1: Sustainable design
- Policy D3: Protecting living conditions
- Policy HC1: Community facilities

- Policy NE1: Strategic green infrastructure
- Policy NE2: Landscape
- Policy NE4: Biodiversity and geological sites
- Policy NE6: New and improved open space
- Policy NE7: Reducing flood risk
- Policy NE8: Sustainable drainage systems
- Policy NE10: Water conservation and wastewater infrastructure
- Policy NE11: Contaminated land
- Policy NE12: Renewable and low carbon energy development
- Policy HE4: Archaeology

Preston Neighbourhood Plan

5.2 The Preston Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2031 was 'made' in April 2020, following the required examination in September and October 2019 and the subsequent local referendum in March 2020. Therefore, the policies within the plan carry full weight and must be considered as part of the proposals. The policies of the Neighbourhood plan which are of most relevance to this proposal are summarised as follows:

- **Policy HD1: Residential Development** – *“Development proposals outside the settlement boundary will only be supported where they comply with national and local policies for development in the countryside”.*
- **Policy HD3: Housing Types:** - *“Proposals for new homes should demonstrate the way in which they would address local housing needs. Proposals for or which include, two- and three-bedroom houses suitable for families, local people and first-time buyers will be supported”.*
- **Policy HD5: Sustainability and Energy Efficiency** - *“Proposals for the provision of measures for water conservation and landscape schemes that improve biodiversity will be encouraged. Proposals with a low carbon footprint will be encouraged. The provision of electric car charging points for all new homes will also be supported as will proposals that enable residents to work from home. Prior to occupation, each residential property shall incorporate an Electric Vehicle (EV) ready, domestic charging point”.*



- **Policy HD6: Design** – *“New housing schemes should be designed to incorporate appropriate storage facilities for refuse bins, bicycles and mobility scooters. They should also provide a minimum of 1 secure, covered cycle parking space per new residential unit”.*
- **Policy HD10: New Housing Development** - *“New dwellings will be supported where the proposal maintains and contributes to the local character of Preston. Development schemes should be designed in such a way that the green spaces and green lanes of the village are protected and landscaped appropriately. New access arrangements should be safe and take account of the character of the rural lanes in the parish”.*
- **Policy EH1: Village Boundary, Rural Character and Setting** – *“Development proposals should retain a clear visual separation between Preston and nearby villages and settlements. In addition, they should ensure that the open countryside, woodlands, hedgerows and green corridors are protected and, where practicable, enhanced. Development proposals which would unacceptably impact on these environmental assets will not be supported”*
- **Policy EH2: Conservation Areas and Heritage Assets** – *“All development proposals, including new build, must demonstrate how the particular environment of Preston has been taken into account during conception and evolution of the design. Proposals that do not positively contribute to the local character must explain why and demonstrate the reasons behind the alternative approach. All development within a conservation area and within the setting of other designated and non-designated heritage assets must take account of the historic fabric of these areas and conserve, and where appropriate enhance, their character and appearance. Proposals should provide a statement containing an appropriate level of detail for the importance of the asset...”*
- **Policy EH7: Protecting and Enhancing the Local and Natural Environment** – *“Development proposals should maintain and where practicable enhance the elements of the natural environment as identified in Appendix C2 (pages 68 to 84). Where appropriate development proposals should also incorporate measures to ensure their connectivity to the wider habitats in the neighbourhood area. Where significant harm to biodiversity arising from a proposed development cannot be*

avoided, adequately mitigated or as a last resort compensated for, any such proposals will not be supported”.

- **Policy TC1: Safe and Sustainable Transport** - *“Residential and community development proposals will be supported where amenities in the village can be readily and safely accessed by pedestrians and cyclists. In addition development proposals should conform to the following criteria:*
 - a) development proposals should not generate an unacceptable increase in traffic volume and movements within or through the village and*
 - b) development proposals should not generate unacceptable highway safety risks and*
 - c) development proposals should provide a minimum of 2 off-road parking spaces per new residential unit with 2-3 bedrooms and a minimum of 3 parking spaces for 4+ bedroom residential units”.*

Additional Policy considerations

5.3 As well as the NHC Local Plan and the adopted Preston Neighbourhood Plan, there are several other documents which make up part of the ‘Development Plan’ and which must be afforded due consideration. Further documents to consider are as follows:

- North Herts Draft Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (December 2023)
- NHDC Vehicle Parking at new Development Supplementary Planning Document (September 2011)
- Hertfordshire Minerals Local Plan (2002 - 2016)
- Hertfordshire Waste Development Framework (2011 – 2026)



6.0 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT - GREEN BELT

- 6.1 Whilst the site is located on the edge of the village of Preston, which is outside of and is excluded from the Green Belt, the entire site itself is located within the Green Belt. Accordingly, Green Belt Policy is a fundamental material consideration with regard to the acceptability of the proposed development.
- 6.2 As outlined in section 13 of the NPPF, and reflected under Local Plan Policy, *“Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”*. The starting point is set out paragraph 154 of the NPPF which states that *“A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are...”*. The proposals in this instance are complex and are multi-faceted and so for clarity, this Planning statement will first go through each aspect of the proposals, to differentiate as to which aspects are appropriate forms of the development within the Green Belt and therefore which remaining elements may be considered as inappropriate. An assessment as to the harm to the Green Belt (and its purposes) will then follow and this will be weighed against any ‘Very Special Circumstances’ which can be demonstrated to ‘clearly outweigh’ any harm to the Green Belt and any other identified harm.

Appropriate forms of development in the green belt

- 6.3 As noted above, paragraphs 154 and 155 of the NPPF state as follows:

154. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;

b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;



- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;*
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;*
- e) limited infilling in villages;*
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and*
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, 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.*

And

155. Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:

- a) mineral extraction;*
- b) engineering operations;*
- c) local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;*
- d) the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;*
- e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and*
- f) development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.*

- 6.4 The main ‘flagship’ element of the proposals is the conversion of the Grade II* Listed Temple Dinsley building to provide a total of 44 new apartments (together with the conversion of the retained Teaching Block). This is of course to be heritage led and the number of apartments is a result of what the building can suitably provide, with minimal intervention or internal demolition. There are to be minimal external alterations and no additional built form or volume as part of this element of the proposals. Therefore, this aspect would be an appropriate form of development within the Green Belt, as it would represent the ‘re-use of the permanent building (155d.) and the change of use of land (155e.)
- 6.5 The next element would be the demolition of a number of existing buildings, most notably the substantial sports hall building and the science block and the replacement of these with a range of new build houses in the same location. A summary of the ‘Gross Internal Floor Area’ (GIFA) to be demolished and to be replaced with new building dwellings is provided below, in Table 2.

Table 2 – Summary of converted, demolished and replacement GIFA

Aspect	GIFA in m ²
Total Existing GIFA	8,380m ²
To be Converted – Main building, Teaching Block, Tank House and Pump House	4,794m ² (45 new homes)
To be demolished – Sports Hall, Science Block, Barn 1 in Summerhouse Plantation, Stables (etc)	3,586m ²
New ‘Sports Hall Housing’ (‘Edwin’, ‘Violet’, ‘Sadlier’, ‘Ithel’ and ‘Templar’)	2,746m ² (22 new homes)
Two new houses in Summerhouse Plantation – Summer House and Harwood House	840m ² (2 new homes)
Total new build	3,586m ²
Total to be converted and to be new-build	8,380m ²



- 6.6 The form and pattern of the sports hall is unsympathetic and totally at odds with heritage assets, with a substantial and inappropriate bulk and massing which conflicts with the narrower, linear and more traditional built forms of the main house and its various extensions and wings.
- 6.7 The built form is to be re-provided as a series of terrace blocks, in a form and layout so as to mimic a farm-stead, with 5 no. new blocks of houses, known as 'Edwin', 'Violet', 'Sadlier', 'Ithel' and 'Templar'. These buildings would have a volume, height and floorspace significantly less than that of the sports hall and the other buildings to be demolished and these structures would sit either directly in place of the sports hall and science block (Edwin and Sadlier) or within close proximity to the location of the existing buildings. Therefore, the construction of these buildings, in place of the existing structures would fall under the exceptions for development within the Green Belt as replacement buildings (154d.), as redevelopment of previously developed land (154g.) and the change of use of that land (155e.).
- 6.8 The proposals also include for the conversion of two existing outbuildings, which are considered to be curtilage listed, known as the Pump House and the Tank House. It is proposed to convert these to two separate detached dwellings and so this element, as with the main building, would be an appropriate form of development, as the re-use of existing buildings (155d.) and the change of use of land (155e.). As part of the conversion of these buildings, it is also proposed to provide each with suitable parking outbuildings. It is long since established within planning case law that if an outbuilding is of modest scale and is within close proximity to the main 'parent' building, that it can be considered under the exception of development within the Green Belt under 154 c. "*c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building*" (considered by the High Court in *Warwick District Council v Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing And Communities* [2022] EWHC 2145, that an addition to a building does not need to be physically attached to it to be considered an extension).



- 6.9 Both the Pump House and the Tank House would be provided with modest double-car ports with a side store, which would be lightweight timber-framed structures with open sides and a low roof. In both instances these would be subservient to the main dwelling and would be within a very close proximity of the main building. Accordingly, these should be viewed as appropriate additions to the existing buildings, as part of their conversion and re-use and therefore would represent an appropriate form of development in the Green Belt.
- 6.10 As part of the proposals, the former athletics track and surrounding area is to be handed over to Preston Cricket Club on a longer-term lease and under a 'peppercorn rent', to allow them to lay a new cricket pitch and to erect a new, modest pavilion, to provide changing rooms. The pavilion would sit in place of the two existing tennis courts which are to be demolished and removed (leaving just one tennis court for use by the new residents). The existing storage/pavilion building would be relocated and retained, as it would still be required for storage of plant and machinery – lawn mowers, roller etc). The proposed pavilion would be needed in association with the provision of a new community sporting facility, provided as part of the development. Accordingly, the construction of such a building would fall under exception 154 b. *"the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation,..... as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it"*.
- 6.11 As noted, the proposed cricket pavilion would be a low level, modest structure which would be located in place of two existing tennis courts, which currently include hardstanding and surrounding tall fencing. On balance, it is considered that the pavilion would result in a neutral impact on the openness of the Green Belt and thus would not be inappropriate development.
- 6.12 The proposals also include for the reinstatement of the Grade II * Listed Gardens and proposed landscaping across the wider site, much to the improvement and enhancement of the landscape setting and also to secure at least 10% Biodiversity Net Gain across the site and the proposals (more on this below). However, much, if not all, of the associated works to the gardens and landscaping will not represent operational development and so will not fall under Green Belt policy and will have no impact on the openness of the Green Belt.



- 6.13 This leads to the final aspects of the proposals which are appropriate development within the Green Belt. As noted above (at Table 2), the proposed replacement dwellings in place of the sports hall and science block, would be of a floorspace significantly less than that of the existing buildings. As such, it is proposed to re-use the 'left-over' GIFA elsewhere within the site, in order to provide two new dwellings, to be located with the Summer House Plantation, to the north-east of the main building.
- 6.14 Firstly, the dwelling known as 'Summer House' is proposed on the site of an existing barn structure (also to be demolished and which forms part of the GIFA calculation and floorspace to be reused). As such, this dwelling would re-use existing built floorspace and would be on previously developed land, in place of an existing structure. Therefore, Summer House would represent an appropriate form of development, as it would comply with 154 d. as it is a replacement building, with 154 g. as it would represent the redevelopment of previously developed land and 155 e. as it would represent a material change of use of the land.
- 6.15 The proposed dwelling, being two storeys, would be larger than the barn it will replace, however it would be within a very discrete location and thus would not be overly visible from the surrounding Green Belt and the increase in floorspace would be 'sourced' from the demolition of other buildings to be demolished – see Table 2 above. As such, there would be no increase in built form in this instance, as it would be 'reallocated', in more discrete location and as part of high quality design, set away from heritage assets. As noted above, the existing sports hall is of a substantial scale and is of a form and bulk at odds with the main listed building, causing significant harm to the setting of the heritage assets. The re-allocation of the built form, in more suitable design and set away from the listed building would result in a significant benefit to the setting of heritage assets. Therefore, Summer House would be an appropriate form of development.



Inappropriate development in the Green Belt

6.16 As outlined above, the vast majority of the proposals are considered to fall within the category of appropriate development within the Green Belt. Of the 69 dwellings proposed, 68 are an appropriate form of development. However, it is acknowledged that some aspects of the proposals, including one new dwelling, have to be considered as inappropriate and so this section now focuses on those elements of the proposals which do not necessarily comply with the exceptions for development in the Green Belt, as listed under paragraphs 154 and 155.

'Harwood House'

6.17 Leading on from the previous paragraphs above (6.13 – 6.14 above), it is noted that Summer House is an appropriate form of development, in accordance with the NPPF. However, it is conceded that the second new-build dwelling, also to be located in the plantation and to be called 'Harwood House', would be an inappropriate form of development.

6.18 On one hand, the proposed dwelling does partially comply with the exception of development in the Green Belt under 154 d., as it is replacement GIFA from that 'gained' from the demolition of existing buildings, and so can be considered the 'replacement of a building'. However, it is acknowledged that Harwood House would be some distance from the 'source' GIFA that it is replacing and thus would not strictly comply with this exception, as listed in the NPPF and so it must be considered inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

6.19 A 'sequential test' was carried out in order to identify where and how best to re-use the lost/demolished GIFA and several locations have been proposed and even more have been considered in the background, taking into account the following:

- Impact on the setting of heritage assets
- Impact on the site as a whole and the wider landscape
- Impact on the openness of the Green Belt (visual impact)
- How each location relates to the site and to the proposals as a whole



- 6.20 The assessment of the various options were put to Council officers as part of the PPA and Pre-application process.
- 6.21 Some of the other options which were considered, in re-using and reallocating the lost GIFA and lost built volume, included the sites of the existing tennis courts, a 'Folly' location at the rear of the main building, within the grounds of the listed gardens or in place of the historic 'model Farm' location, to the south-east of the main house. However, these alternative locations were all discounted, as it was found that a new dwelling in any of these locations would either be far too prominent in the landscape setting, resulting in significant harm to the local and wider landscape and causing increased harm to the openness of the green Belt. Some of these alternative locations would also distract from the setting of the main listed building, causing harm to heritage assets.
- 6.22 The proposed location of Harwood House has been chosen within the summerhouse plantation, as it would be set within a very discrete position, screened from most surrounding views and therefore reducing any potential impacts on the more localised as well as the wider landscape impacts. As stated, this is a reallocation of existing built volume and so there would not be any additional built form within the Green Belt as a result of this aspect of the proposals and thus there would be little-to-no harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Given its discrete and well-screened location, this aspect of the proposals would not result in any undue visual harm to the Green Belt.
- 6.23 In relocating/reallocating the built form in a more screened and discrete location, this would clearly reduce the visual impact on the Green Belt, compared to the existing situation, given the scale, bulk and prominence of the existing sports hall and science block in particular.
- 6.24 Whilst it may be viewed as neutral in the planning balance, it is asserted that Harwood House, in the chosen location, would not be contrary or harmful in terms of the five purposes of the Green Belt as outlined under paragraph 143 of the NPPF:
- A dwelling in this location and on the basis of the circumstances as already outlined above would not result in the 'unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas';
 - Likewise it would not result in towns (or villages such as Preston) merging into one another;

- It may be viewed that a dwelling this location would result in 'encroachment'. However, given the particular circumstances as outlined above, in that existing built form is to be reallocated in a more discrete location and yet still within the grounds of the wider brownfield site, any 'encroachment' should be viewed as 'very minimal'.
- The allocation of Harwood House in the proposed location would indeed preserve the setting of Preston and would result in a significant 'net improvement' on the setting of the heritage assets at Temple Dinsley (the main listed building, the listed gardens and the other listed buildings) in moving what is currently built development that is in the form of a very substantial and unattractive sports hall, away from the heritage assets and re-providing it in the form of significantly more attractive and more appropriate dwellings houses, of a high quality design.
- Lastly, the provision of a dwelling in this location would have a neutral impact in terms of the fifth purpose of the Green Belt, in that it would not have any impact in terms of 'encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land'. If anything, the proposal has a positive impact in this regard, as it would assist in the regeneration of what is a previously developed, brownfield site.

6.25 However, fundamentally, the key issue to consider is the 'very special circumstances' which would outweigh any harm to the Green Belt. This will be discussed later in this statement, once all of the inappropriate development has been identified.

Parking Structures

6.26 The proposals also include a new 'east car park' which would serve the new apartments within the converted Temple Dinsley Grade II* Listed Building and within the converted Teaching Block (a total of 43 new apartments). The new dwellings in place of the sports hall and Science Block would be served by the reinstatement of the existing car park.

- 6.27 Clearly, 43 new dwellings require a certain amount of parking. Following a full, in-depth and thorough review of the options, the east car park has been identified as the most appropriate solution in terms of providing an adequate level of parking, to serve the development and the new apartments, as well as providing sufficient visitors spaces. This location has been identified as it would have the least impact on the setting on heritage assets, as well as reducing the prominence and visibility of the parking in terms of the impacts on the immediate and wider landscape.
- 6.28 However, it is acknowledged that the proposed car park, which would include areas of hardstanding and storage units for each apartment together with covered structures (to provide cover over the parking bays as well as the communal refuse/ bins and the communal ASHP plant and machinery), would provide additional built form within the Green Belt and which is not included or 'covered' by the GIFA gained via the demolition of the existing buildings. As this is new development, which does not fall within any of the exceptions of development, then it is conceded that this must be considered as inappropriate development within the Green Belt.
- 6.29 Furthermore, the two new dwellings within the plantation, Summer House and Harwood House, would both be served by double car-ports with attached stores and these would also represent new, additional built form within the Green Belt. Unlike the Pump House and Tank House, in this instance the outbuildings would be associated with new-build dwellings and these would be set away from the houses. Accordingly, it is not reasonable to consider these under the exception as listed at 154 c. of the NPPF – *"c) the extension or alteration of a building"*.
- 6.30 As with Harwood House, a sequential test was carried out whereby a series of options were explored, in order to identify the most suitable parking strategy and also the most suitable location to accommodate the required additional parking, taking account a set of criteria, such as the impact on heritage assets and the impact on the parkland setting and the wider landscape setting.



- 6.31 Alternative locations such as the 'West Field' (actually located to the north-east of the main buildings), the 'Herbaceous Gardens' and a below ground car park under the 'sports hall housing' were considered. However, these were found to either be totally unviable from a financial perspective or they would result in significant harm to the setting of the heritage assets and/ or on the immediate and surrounding landscape setting.
- 6.32 As advised by Council Officers during the pre-application discussions, a review has been carried out on the amount of parking considered necessary and a total 127 spaces are proposed, on the basis that 1 and 2 bed apartments will be served by 1 parking space and any of the new units, be it apartments or new housing are to be served by two parking spaces. For visitor parking spaces, an allowance of one space per 2 dwellings is provided for. Overall, the allocation of parking spaces is below the Council's minimum standards, but it is considered reasonable and justified in this instance, in seeking to reduce the impact this would have on this heritage site as a whole.
- 6.33 Furthermore, as advised by Council Officers, a survey was carried out of existing areas of hardstanding across the site. However, it was found that most of this was either not suitable for parking, was too close to the listed buildings (and thus would overly dominate its setting) or conversely, would be too far away from the buildings to ensure that parking would be usable in a practical sense and close enough to the new homes. The results of the survey are provided at Appendix 3 and shown on the plan at Appendix 4.
- 6.34 As a result of these reviews and this research into the various options, a single larger car-park is proposed to the east of the main buildings and to the south of the existing car park which is to be reused (as mentioned above). Due to the sloping topography of the site, the chosen area means that the new car park would be located within a natural dip in the land. In addition, a significant area of existing tree planting, around a large pond, provides existing natural screening and separation between the main listed building and the location for the new 'East car park'.



- 6.35 Whilst the hardstanding to form the car park is additional ‘operational development’ within the Green Belt, having carried out a review of existing hardstanding and comparing it to the proposals, there will actually be a net reduction in hardstanding across the site as a whole. A ‘Survey Schedule of Hardstanding areas (and assessment of heritage value)’ is provided at Appendix 3 of this statement (and shown on the plan at Appendix 4). As can be seen from this, the proposals as a whole will actually result in a net-loss across the site, of approximately 792m² of hardstanding, which is a reduction of 14%. This is because the former school included a number of large areas of hardstanding which are no longer required and several areas of which can be removed, to the betterment of the setting of the heritage assets.
- 6.36 With regard to the storage structures, these would serve as cycle (and other) storage for each of the proposed apartments. Many of the new apartments would be of ‘bespoke’ layouts and would be unlikely to provide suitable storage for larger items such as bicycles. In addition, in order to respect the setting of the listed buildings and listed gardens, it is preferable to avoid storage structures in-and-around the existing and proposed dwellings and to reduce the amount of residential paraphernalia within the immediate setting of the heritage assets. As such, it is for heritage reasons that the storage structures are proposed together with the parking spaces, to provide the residents with their own outdoor storage space. This would also assist in encouraging bicycle ownership and use, as an alternative and sustainable means of transport.
- 6.37 Parked cars and car parks can often be visually intrusive and the sight of a collection of parked cars would not be in keeping with the parkland character of the site and the setting of the heritage assets. Lightweight covers/ car-ports are proposed to screen and enclose the parking, but only over the parking spaces serving the apartments. Therefore, whilst these structures would be new built form and new volume within the Green Belt, it should be acknowledged that the reality is that these would very much be open-sided, lightweight structures which would serve to improve on the setting of the heritage assets in screening the parking and helping the necessary parking to assimilate into the parkland setting.

Summary

- 6.38 To summarise, the vast majority of the proposals would represent appropriate development in the Green Belt and this includes 68 of the proposed 69 new dwellings. The elements which are acknowledged as representing inappropriate development would be the proposed dwelling 'Harwood House', the proposed main east car park and its associated structures and the two car-ports proposed at Summer House and Harwood House. As outlined above, there are significant mitigating factors regarding these aspects of the proposals and their location, positioning and design has been carefully selected to ensure that the impact on the Green Belt, as well on the localised and wider landscaping impacts and impacts on the heritage assets is minimised, thus significantly reducing any resultant harm.

Very Special Circumstances

- 6.39 Paragraph 152 of the NPPF states that *"Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances"*. Paragraph 153 goes on to states that *"Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"*.
- 6.40 In this instance it is put forward that the proposals would provide for a range of significant benefits, which cumulatively, would represent very special circumstances which clearly outweighs any harm.

Heritage Benefits

- 6.41 The identified inappropriate development, including Harwood House and the various parking structures, should not be looked at in isolation but as part of the wider project as whole. The proposals will bring this important Grade II* Listed heritage asset back into use and it is generally agreed that the most suitable, optimum and viable use for this listed building and the associated listed gardens, in order to secure their future, is a residential conversion and re-development. This has been agreed with the Council officers through pre-app discussions.



- 6.42 Grade II listings make up 92% of all listed buildings across the country and therefore Temple Dinsley is within the 8% most significant listed buildings within the country and given its scale and prominence, together with its Grade II* listing, it is clearly of national significance.
- 6.43 With all due respect to the previous owners and tenants of the listed property (Princess Helena College), the building has not always been treated with the respect it deserves, given its architectural and historic significance. This no doubt has been as a result of a need to comply with various educational legislation and requirements over recent decades and the use as a school has meant that the building now includes a significant number of inappropriate additions and intrusive features which are far from sensitive, and which are not in keeping with the historic character and fabric of the building. In addition, the building and the gardens have now been vacant and unused for over three years, since the school closed in 2021. As a result, the building is now slowly falling into a state of disrepair and therefore significant intervention and investment in the building is required in order to secure its future.
- 6.44 This application is supported by a Design, Access and Heritage Statement (by SCABAL/ KPT), 50no. Significance Impact Tables and a Level 3 Historic Recording Report (by John Selby), all of which outline and explain in detail both the existing building and the proposed works.
- 6.45 In converting the listed building to a series of apartments, the proposals would include the removal of all of the more modern, intrusive and inappropriate additions to the listed building and would provide for a full reinstatement and revealing of its architectural and historical significance.
- 6.46 The proposed scheme of conversion has been entirely heritage led and the building and its layout has informed the provision of each of the apartments, in terms of the number of apartments and their layout and scale. This has included the detailed and painstaking review of all of the walls, floors, ceilings, windows and all other features in identifying what is modern and what therefore can be removed and which elements are of most significance and therefore need to be retained and 'celebrated'.
- 6.47 Examples of the proposed improvement and reinstatement works include: -
- Removal of stair and dividing walls in East Wing first floor north to make 'Norman and Birt' apartment No 2, revealing original room with marble fireplace at its centre,



- Removal of school partition to create principal bedroom for Vivienne Pain, apartment No 3, West Wing, first floor south;
- Reinstatement of front courtyard to match Lutyens' design
- Apartment 2, (The master bedroom suite, West Wing, Level 1) where the secondary stair to the dormer attics and the division of this panelled room is to be removed. This a positive intervention and reinstates this room to its original layout.
- Apartment 11, rationalising the structural intervention inserted by the school.
- Generally, the removal of low quality fittings throughout (doors, joinery, linings etc.), the repair of all the significant windows and doors, as well as removal of unsympathetic decoration are also a huge heritage gain.

As noted, the works of conversion would reestablish the listed building to its deserved and rightful significance and would ensure its longevity in its most viable and sustainable use for the future.

6.48 Furthermore, the listed gardens have also been somewhat neglected and have not been used in a sensitive manner over recent decades. For example, a large swimming pool is within a prominent location next to the rose gardens and forward of the main house. The main entrance to the main house is also covered in hardstanding and has been used as a car park. As such, further significant heritage benefits include the following:

- The proposals include for the removal of the swimming pool and for the reinstatement of the original Jekyll 'ornamental pond'.
- The hardstanding to the front of the main house will be removed and replaced with a lawn and border planting, reinstating the front courtyard to match the Lutyen's design.



- 6.49 Full details regarding the renovation and reinstatement of the Lutyens Gardens are illustrated in the drawings submitted with this application, by George Carter Design Ltd.
- 6.50 As outlined., the proposals will include a significant amount of work in reestablishing the historical and architectural importance of this Grade II* Listed Building and the Grade II* Listed parks and gardens, which are of national significance. Clearly, this element of the proposal carries very substantial weight.
- 6.51 The proposals also include for the demolition and removal of several existing buildings which are currently harmful to the setting of the listed building and the listed gardens, most notably the substantial sports hall building. Given its height, scale and bulk, this building clearly detracts from the setting of the listed building. This is further exacerbated by the presence of a large array of solar panels on the southern roof slope of the sports hall, directly facing towards the rear of the main listed house.
- 6.52 The removal of this building and its replacement with a series of new dwellings in its place, of a high quality and a well considered design and of appropriate materials and appearance, would result in a significant improvement to the setting of the listed building and the setting of the listed parks and gardens. This again attracts very substantial weight in terms of the planning balance and in terms of very special circumstances.

Benefits of the proposals

- 6.53 The elements of the proposals which have been identified as inappropriate development, would provide for additional benefits in themselves.
- 6.54 It has been made clear to Council officers during pre-application discussions that it is essential, from a financial point of view and for the viability of the scheme as a whole, that there is no loss of GIFA (Gross Internal Floor Area), compared to that which is currently in place. The addition of the new build dwellings is required, to help 'enable', support and allow for the wider project in converting the Grade II* listed buildings and bringing them into their optimum viable use, much of which will require significant financial investment.



- 6.55 As has been noted, the provision of Harwood House would make use of and would reallocate existing built form and GIFA. Viewing the Harwood House proposal as part of the wider project also includes considering its impact on the Green Belt in comparison to the existing situation and the impact of the existing built form, in particular, the existing sports hall.
- 6.56 In relocating and reallocating the built form in a more screened and discrete location, this would clearly reduce the visual impact on the Green Belt, compared to the existing situation, given the scale, bulk and prominence of the existing sports hall in particular. This relocation of the built form, away from the immediate setting of the main house would also provide benefits in Heritage terms, providing for improvements in the setting of the grade II* listed building.
- 6.57 As already outlined above, the location for Harwood House and the location for the required parking has been fully considered and thought-out. The locations which have been chosen are those which are the most discrete and which will result in the least harm to the setting of heritage assets, the wider landscape and the openness of the Green Belt (in terms of visual harm/prominence).
- 6.58 Given the number of dwellings proposed as part of the scheme as a whole and noting that it is agreed that a residential, heritage-led proposal is the most viable and suitable use in terms of securing the future of the listed building, it is unavoidable that parking is required. In addition, it is reasonable to require that each of the apartments be provided with some form of external storage.
- 6.59 As has been outlined, the most suitable location for the parking has been identified in lower-lying land to the east of the main building, as an extension to the existing car park and where it would be screened by existing vegetation. The car park has been laid out to accord with the slope of the land and the lines of topography and so it will sit well within the landscape and respect its setting. In addition, and as supported by Historic England, it is proposed to include a wall around the car park, to give the character and appearance of a walled-garden, a feature synonymous with houses and estates such as Temple Dinsley. This would serve to reduce the prominence of the car park.



- 6.60 As noted above, it is suggested that the proposed storage structures are reasonable and justified, to serve the apartments within the main listed building. The proposals also include for covers over these parking spaces. The covered structures would be lightweight and would be open on three sides, reducing their bulk and built form. These would also provide for key additional benefits.
- 6.61 The covered parking structures would provide for screening of the parked cars, improving on the appearance of car park, as this would be more visually pleasing compared to rows of cars. This would provide for significant benefits compared to the alternative option of not having any covered structures (noting that parking is required and has to go somewhere on the site).

Sustainability Credentials

- 6.62 A further significant benefit of the covering structures is that the roofs will include solar PV panels which will provide for a significant amount of renewable energy, serving the new-build housing and ensuring that these would achieve a 'gold standard' in accordance with the NHDC Draft Sustainability SPD. One aspect of the parking structures will also accommodate the communal ASHP, which will provide a renewable source of heating for the 43 new apartments within the main building and the Teaching Block.
- 6.63 All of the new builds, including the 'Sports hall housing' and the two plantation houses will all be of a high specification build, adopting 'Passivhaus principles' and built to be highly insulated, significantly reducing energy demand. All of the units, both conversions and new builds are to be fitted with efficient goods, to reduce the need and demand for electricity and water. Three of the buildings - those being Ithel, Violet and Templar - will include large sections of roof which will be of solar PV Slates or panels, which will further contribute to the provision of renewable energy whilst at the same time these PV Slates will be subtle and discrete, and which would respect the setting of heritage assets.
- 6.64 In addition, all of the new-build houses, as well as the converted Pump House and Tank House, will benefit from individual ASHPs, providing a clean, green and renewable source of heating. More details are provided within the submitted Energy Statement and the 'M & E Feasibility Report ('Mechanical & Energy Feasibility') accompanying this application (both by CBG).



- 6.65 In accordance with the North Herts Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document and the three-tiered approach outlined within, the works of conversion and the 45 new apartments within the main building and the Teaching Block would achieve the 'Silver level', which would represent an improvement over the base-line minimum standards (the 'bronze level' being the minimum standards). All of the new build housing (24no. houses), given the high-specification, 'Passivhaus principles' of the builds, the ASHP and solar PV panels and PV slates, would achieve the Gold level as set out in the NHDC SPD and this would signify exemplary standards significantly exceeding the minimum requirements. In providing these measures, the proposals as a whole would significantly contribute towards tackling and addressing the Council's stance of a 'Climate emergency' and address both local and national renewable energy targets
- 6.66 This element of the proposal provides for further significant benefits and contributes weight towards Very Special Circumstances. Particularly, in providing the solar panels on the roofs of the parking structures and the communal ASHP plant and machinery away from the heritage assets, this provides for key sources of renewable energy in a discrete location, on a site where this is difficult to achieve, given the heritage sensitivities.

Public and community Benefits

- 6.67 The proposals would result in additional public and community benefits, particularly compared to the current situation (the previous use as a private school). The proposals include for the provision of a new cricket pitch together with a new pavilion, on the former school athletics field, towards the eastern part of the site. This would be leased and handed over to Preston Cricket Club (on a 'peppercorn rent'), providing a key community facility as part of the proposals.
- 6.68 In addition, the proposals include for the renovation and reinstatement of a tennis court to the north of the main building, which is to be made available for use by the wider public.



- 6.69 This tennis court would be accessed by a new footpath, to be laid from the existing gated access on the western boundary of the site, opposite the Preston village green and Red Lion Pub. The path would lead north along the western boundary of the site to the tennis court. This path would also lead to the existing houses at The Dower House, providing these dwellings with a sustainable walking route to the village, where there currently is not one available (there is no footpath along Hitchin Road/Preston Road).
- 6.70 This footpath would provide improved access for these dwellings at the Dower House, which are somewhat isolated from the village. A further benefit of the proposals is the wider network of footpaths that are proposed, providing improved linkages across the site and to the wider network of footpaths and public rights of way.
- 6.71 A permissive footpath would be formalised across the southern section of the site, linking the village and School Lane with PROW 002 to the east of the site. The new pathways would allow access across the site, where this was not previously possible when it was a private school.
- 6.72 The applicant has also agreed to allow for a number of 'Garden open days' each year (perhaps tied to the existing Preston village + 'open garden days'), whereby the renovated and reinstated gardens will be open to the community to enjoy. This would allow a greater enjoyment and appreciation of the listed house and the listed gardens by the wider public (compared to when it was a private boarding school and public access was very limited).
- 6.73 The cumulation of public benefits, in terms of the cricket pitch, cricket pavilion, the tennis court and the provision pathways to allow improved public access would again provide significant benefits, contributing to the very special circumstances of the proposals.

Biodiversity Net Gain

- 6.74 As laid out under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and as required by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021, a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of at least 10% must be demonstrated either on site, off-site or via the purchase of credits. This application is accompanied by a BNG calculation and report by Applied Ecology Ltd, which are discussed in greater detail later in this report.



6.75 Whilst the provision of two new houses within the plantation would require the removal of a number of trees, the loss of the trees would be mitigated with a significant amount of tree planting at suitable locations around the site and additional planting of wildflower meadows. The result of this is that the site and the proposals will achieve a BNG uplift of at least +15%, which is over-and above the minimum requirement. Whilst meeting the 10% would be neutral in the planning balance, the additional net gain is a further benefit of the scheme, providing further significant weight in the planning balance and further contributing to the cumulative very special circumstances.

Highway Improvements

6.76 Although this aspect is touched upon in greater detail later in this report, it is worth highlighting at this stage that the proposals would result in a significant reduction in the use of the local highway network. A Transport Assessment by EAS is submitted together with this application, and this identifies that when taking even a cautious approach (in terms of assumptions and modelling), the former school (and fall-back position) would generate nearly 700 vehicle movements per day. The proposals for 69 new dwellings, made-up of a mix of 43 apartments and 26 houses, is estimated to generate 292 vehicle movements per day. This represents a decrease of just over 58% compared to the previous use of the site and is seen as a significant wider benefit of the proposals, again contributing to the cumulative very special circumstances.

Summary of Very Special Circumstances and Planning Balance

6.77 The starting point in this regard is at paragraph 153 of the NPPF, which states that *“When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt.”* As identified above, the proposed parking structures at the main car park and at the two new houses within the woodland plantation, and Harwood House itself would represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt, which in turn is harmful and which attracts ‘substantial weight’.

- 6.78 However, also as outlined in the preceding sections of this planning statement, many measures and design elements have been incorporated in the positioning and location of these aspects of the proposals to ensure that any harm is significantly reduced and mitigated, both in terms of the impact on the openness of the Green Belt but also in terms of the impact on the setting of heritage assets and impacts on the wider landscape. As such, the total extent of harm has been minimised.
- 6.79 It should also be of consideration that the majority of the proposals would represent appropriate development in the Green Belt and those elements that are inappropriate are quite minimal, relative to the proposals as a whole (again, 68 of the 69 proposed dwellings are an appropriate form of development).
- 6.80 It is identified that a heritage-led conversion of the Grade II* Listed Building, to provide a series of apartments, together with the construction of a series of new-build houses in place of existing buildings, is the most viable and most suitable option in terms of the securing the future of this nationally important heritage asset. The conversion and provision of dwellings come with certain reasonable requirements, such as parking and domestic storage and so these elements are justified and are needed as part of the scheme as a whole. Fundamentally, the proposals would result in very substantial benefits in terms of the preservation and enhancement of the heritage assets. This, combined with the other significant benefits as outlined above, such as the additional BNG benefits, the sustainable design/ build of the housing together with provision of renewable sources of energy and the public and community benefits to be provided as part of the scheme, cumulatively would provide for Very Special Circumstances which would clearly outweigh the harm that has been identified.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT - SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

- 6.81 The NPPF identifies at paragraph 7 that: *“the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development”* and identifies three overarching objectives, which are economic, social and environmental.
- 6.82 As set out at paragraph 8 of the NPPF, the planning system has three overarching objectives in achieving sustainable development, those being economic, social and environmental objectives, which both need to be independent and also be mutually supportive.



- 6.83 The village of Preston is listed under Policy SP2 of the North Herts Local Plan as a Category A village, which are considered sustainable locations for new housing, given the services and facilities that they already contain. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is outside the 'defined boundary' of the village, the application site is a brownfield site immediately on the edge of the village, with immediate walking and cycling distance of the village and its various service and facilities.
- 6.84 The site already includes a gate on the western boundary, which leads directly to the central village green, which includes bus stops and The Red Lion pub, which is community run. A range of footpaths within the application site will lead to the 'western gate', providing the new residents with easy and immediate access to the village centre. The site will be within a short and easy walking distance of the other village services, such as the primary school, the children's day nursery and the recreation ground.
- 6.85 Through discussions with the Parish Council and local residents (see Statement of Community Involvement), the applicant is also aware that significant efforts and plans are taking place to provide the village with a community run shop. Land on the application site has been offered for the shop, however it has been decided that this would not be plausible or practical. However, it is noted that prior approval has been granted under the Council reference 24/00928/PNR for the conversion of a disused agricultural building on Charlton Road, at the western edge of the village, to a community shop. Having such a service within walking and cycling distance, would further increase the 'sustainability credentials' of the site and the village as a whole.



- 6.86 Planning history at The Dower House is also of relevance in this regard. Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in May 2021 for the conversion of this listed building to form 6 no. new dwellings (under Council references 17/02800/1 and 17/02801/LB). This building was a former dormitory for the school and was previously associated with the school and the application site. Although, The Dower House does not have available walking routes to the village (as noted in the officer's delegated report in May 2018), the proposals were still considered a sustainable form of development, given it would put that listed building into a viable use, much as is the case with this current application. The application site now under consideration, as is noted above, is immediately adjacent to the village boundary and has walking and cycling access to the village and its services and facilities. The proposals also include for a new footpath from the west gate to the tennis court and to the houses at The Dower House, providing access for this previous development and making it more sustainable.
- 6.87 Referring back to the NPPF, a further assessment will now be provided on the three aspects of sustainable development.
- 6.88 In terms of the **economic objective** the development would provide homes that would support economic growth and productivity. The construction of the development and on-going maintenance of it would result in construction jobs and employment in the service sector. The development would result in increased expenditure for local goods and services within Preston, noting that the village will soon hopefully benefit from a new community shop, boosting the local economy and helping to sustain the vitality and viability of the local shop and other village services. Increased Council tax revenue would help to maintain public services.
- 6.89 In terms of the **social objective**, a number of community benefits would accrue from this development. First and foremost, it would provide valuable housing, in a district where there has been historic undersupply. The proposals would also convert the heritage assets to their most viable and optimum use, securing them for the future, whilst at the same time providing significant heritage benefits, in reinstating and restoring the architecture and historic significance of the building.



- 6.90 The proposal is well supported by the local community (see submitted Statement of Community Involvement) in providing a viable, long-term use for the listed buildings and the proposals would also provide new community facilities, including a new Cricket Pitch and a new Tennis Court. In addition, the site will become more accessible than before, with the opening-up and provision of several new footpaths across the site and it is also hoped and intended to open this heritage site on a number of days annually, to provide 'open garden days' so that the history and heritage of the site can be enjoyed more broadly by the community.
- 6.91 With regard to **environmental benefits**, although the scheme is very much heritage lead, the proposals would result in a number of environmental benefits. The vast majority of the trees and vegetation which forms the wider parkland site would be retained and enhanced, with only a relatively small number of trees to be removed to make way for some aspects of the new-build housing. Where the proposals would result in the loss of trees and vegetation, there is to be significant replacement planting, to mitigate any loss and there would be a substantial net-gain in trees on the site.
- 6.92 In addition, the accompanying Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) calculation and report demonstrate that the development will provide for an uplift in biodiversity of at least +15%, in excess of the statutory minimum requirement of 10%.
- 6.93 As noted the site at Temple Dinsley is located adjacent to the existing village and is an easy walking distance to the services available. As such, the site is set within a highly sustainable location.
- 6.94 The change of use of the site from a boarding school to private residential would also result in a significant reduction in traffic movements on the local and wider highway networks, providing additional environmental benefits. There would also be a shift to more sustainable modes of transport, with likely increases in walking and cycling and use of the local bus service.



- 6.95 As outlined in the submitted Energy Statement (by CBG, together with the M&E Feasibility Report), the new build dwellings are to implement 'Passivhaus' principles and will be highly insulated and will make best use of renewable energy sources, such as solar PV panels over the covered parking spaces, PV slates to some of the new-build housing and also communal and individual air source heat pumps. It is proposed that, in accordance with the NHDC Draft Sustainability SPD, that the new build houses will achieve the 'gold standard' which would represent exemplary standards significantly exceeding the current minimum requirements and the conversion of the listed building (and the Teaching Block) will achieve a 'silver' standard.
- 6.96 In light of the above, the proposals are a sustainable form of development and would satisfy the three pillars as outlined in the NPPF.

IMPACT ON THE LOSS OF EXISTING SPORTS FIELD/ FACILITIES

- 6.97 Paragraph 103 of the NPPF supports the protection of community sports pitches and facilities and states as follows: *"Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:*
- a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or*
 - b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable*
 - c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use."*
- 6.98 Policy SP10 of the NHDC Local Plan states that *"We will provide and maintain healthy, inclusive communities for our residents. We will a) Support the retention of existing community, cultural, leisure or recreation facilities; b) Require appropriate levels of new community, cultural, leisure and built sport & recreation facilities to be provided in new development;"*
- 6.99 The proposals would include for the removal and loss of the existing school sports hall, the swimming pool and two of four existing tennis courts.



- 6.100 Firstly, it is of note that these facilities were only in private use by the school and were not considered 'community facilities', that were regularly available to the wider community. Having made enquiries with the local community, it has been reported that the sports hall was only used on very rare occasion for community events (Charity and school balls and craft fairs etc). It is apparent that the sports hall, swimming pool and tennis courts have not been in regular use by the community.
- 6.101 As such, there would not be any loss of any community or public sports facilities as such. The proposals include for a new cricket pitch and a tennis court, both for community use. Therefore the sporting facilities available to the community would actually increase as a result of the proposals.
- 6.102 The sports hall is also in a very poor state of repair and would require a significant amount of investment and refurbishment to bring it back into use.
- 6.103 Lastly, it is considered that the removal of the sports hall and the swimming pool are required, in order to secure significant heritage benefits which carry very significant weight in the overall planning balance and which would outweigh any potential adverse impact as a result of the loss of sports facilities.
- 6.104 In light of the above, the proposals comply with Paragraph 103 of the NPPF.

HERITAGE IMPACTS & BENEFITS

- 6.105 This planning application is accompanied by a Design, Access & Heritage statement by the architectural team, KPT and SCABAL and 50 'Significance Impact Tables' and also a Level 3 Historic Recording Report by John Selby. These documents provide a full and comprehensive assessment of the significance of all of the heritage assets and the impact the proposals will have on these. As such, in order to avoid duplication, this Planning Statement will not repeat what is outlined in these support documents.



6.106 As has been outlined previously in this statement, whilst the proposals may result in some smaller aspects of harm to the setting of heritage assets – for example the requirement for a new car park – this would be significantly outweighed by the heritage benefits of the scheme, in putting the main listed building into its most viable and optimum use and which would secure it for the future. In addition, as previously documented, over the 90 years that the site was in use as a boarding school, this has involved the implementation of some unfortunate additions and harmful and intrusive alterations to the listed building. The proposals include for a sensitive and full reinstatement of the historic fabric and character of the Grade II* listed building and parks and gardens. Therefore, in summary, the proposals would result in significant heritage benefits.

Archaeology

- 6.107 An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment has been produced by Granta Heritage (June 2024) to support this application. The Assessment found that the potential for archaeological remains dating from the Prehistoric, Roman and Saxon periods is considered low, however the potential for remains from the medieval and post-medieval periods is considered high.
- 6.108 The report concludes that should the Archaeological Advisor from Hertfordshire County Council deem further archaeological investigation is required, such investigations should include archaeological trenching to determine the character and state of preservation of any archaeological remains. This work could be conducted after any above-ground demolition works but prior to any grubbing out of existing foundations.
- 6.109 Finally, the report recommends archaeological monitoring to be used where appropriate to ensure any archaeological deposits are fully recorded. The conclusions and recommendations of the report can be secured by planning conditions where appropriate.



DESIGN, LAYOUT AND AMENITY IMPACT

- 6.110 The applications for planning permission and for listed building consent are accompanied by a 'Design, Access and Heritage Statement', prepared by the applicants architectural team. As such, the merits of the design, the layout and the design rational of each aspect of the proposals is outlined in that supporting document and so in order to avoid duplication, this will not be repeated here, as part of this Planning Statement.
- 6.111 Needless to say, all aspects of the proposals have been heritage lead. For example, the proposed 'Sports Hall Housing' has been designed and has a layout to reflect a model farm, a feature often seen at large estate houses such as Temple Dinsley (and one was historically in place within the Temple Dinsley parkland). The detailed design of these houses also uses materials sympathetic to the heritage setting but in a contemporary design, implementing modern sustainable materials and products, to ensure a high standard of insulation. For example, slate PV panels are to be used on Ithel and Violet (and bespoke PV panels on Templar), which will provide a modern solution in providing a renewable source of electricity but which would also be subtle and in keeping with the setting of heritage assets.
- 6.112 The two proposed houses in the summerhouse plantation, given their distance from heritage assets and their discrete location within the woodland, are to be of a very unique, contemporary design, with 'wrap-around glazing' to the ground floor, with minimal structural intrusion, to provide a 'floating appearance' for the first floor, which would be of a contrasting dark stone cladding.
- 6.113 A final example (again, not wanting to labour on this aspect of the proposals, as this is covered in the submitted Design, Access and Heritage Statement), is with regard to the proposed parking strategy. Significant work has taken place in identifying the most suitable parking strategy and in seeking to keep parked cars away from the immediate setting of the main Grade II* Listed Building, in order to enhance and respect its setting. The 'East car park' is proposed, in a discrete location, which would be set away from and screened from the main house by existing trees. This car park has been carefully designed so as to lay it out in line with the topography of the land, to provide a walled enclosure, providing further screening and giving the appearance of a walled garden and to also provide covers to some of the parking spaces, to include solar PV panels, to maximise the sustainability credentials of the proposals.



6.114 Each of the proposed new-build dwellings are laid-out to ensure that each would benefit from suitable privacy and levels of light (both ambient day-light and direct sun-light), without overlooking of each other and each would benefit from a private amenity area. Although private gardens would be relatively small, this would be in keeping with the Grade II* Listed parks and gardens and the residents of all of the new housing would be able to use and enjoy the wider communal parks and gardens.

6.115 In summary, each aspect of the proposals has been given great care in being heritage led in the first instance and all elements of new build development would be of a high-quality design, using high-quality materials and each unit will benefit from a suitable standard of amenity.

OPEN SPACE PROVISION & SITE MANAGEMENT

6.116 In terms of open space provision for new housing development, NHDC have adopted and apply the 'Fields in Trust' Standards (FiT), under the *'Guidance for Outdoor Sport and Play – Beyond six acre Standard'*

6.117 Table 3 below sets out the minimum requirements for a proposal of this scale, for 69 new homes, under the FiT standards and provides what is being provided on site (or in some instances it is proposed to provide for off-site contributions as part of a Section 106 legal agreement).

Table 3: Open space and sports provision compared to FiT Standards

Open Space Typology	Minimum required under FiT standards	Actual Provision at Temple Dinsley
All outdoor sport (includes playing pitches + extra)	0.27ha	- Proposed Cricket pitch – 1.58ha - x2 Tennis Courts – 0.13ha Total = 1.71ha
Play Parks (for proposals of 1 – 200 dwellings)	- x1 LEAP and x1 LAP - Contribute to a MUGA	S106 off-site contributions towards play park and new MUGA at Preston recreation Ground and toward splay park at Millennium Park
Parks and Gardens	0.13ha.	3.6ha
Amenity Green space	0.01ha	1.8ha
Natural and Semi-natural Green space	0.3ha	6.3ha



6.118 As can be seen from Table 3, given the nature of the application site, which includes extensive gardens and parkland, the proposals significantly exceed all of the minimum standards. Given the sensitive heritage setting of the site, it has been agreed with Council officers (as part of pre-application discussions) that it would not be appropriate to provide play parks on site (a LAP or a LEAP). The site is within a reasonable distance of a number of existing play parks in Preston (within the maximum distances set out in the FiT standards) and so it would be more suitable to provide contributions towards the improvement of these existing facilities, as part of a section 106 legal agreement (the total amounts and the precise projects to be identified during the course of the planning application).

6.119 The majority of the site will be available for the new residents as communal spaces, for example the formal gardens immediately around the main house and the wider parkland. Each of the new-build houses will have a private garden, although these will be relatively small for the 'Sports Hall Housing', to ensure that these would be appropriate in terms of the relationship with the listed gardens (see appendix 2 site plan). Some aspects of the site would be made available to the wider community and these would include the tennis court to the north of the main house, the various permissive pathways and the new cricket pitch. The allocation of land and which parts of the site are available to who (what is private, what is communal and what is available for community use), is demonstrated in the plan provided at Appendix 2 of this planning statement.



- 6.120 Once construction of the proposals has been completed and the dwellings are occupied, it is intended that a Management Company will be put in place, financed by the residents, and it will be the responsibility of the management company to maintain the site as a whole. This will include maintenance of the parks and gardens. However, the proposals include for a BNG uplift of at least +15% and in order to secure this and ensure that it is retained for a minimum of 30 years, a Biodiversity Management Plan is to be agreed (likely required by a condition or a s106 obligation). In addition, the Summerhouse Plantation will also require maintenance and so it is further understood that a 'Woodland Management Plan' may also be required (if this is not already covered by the BNG Plan). The management company to be put in place will also be responsible for ensuring that the requirements of the BNG plan are implemented in full and are maintained – the responsibilities would also include the upkeep and monitoring of all trees due to be retained as part of the proposals (and retained as part of the BNG calculation), including those within the residential curtilages of Summer House and Harwood House.
- 6.121 Although not strictly material planning considerations, any new properties and the residents of these properties would also be bound by a series of 'restrictive covenants'. For example, while it is expected that permitted development rights would be restricted on the new build houses (via a suitable condition), residents would also be required to gain permission from the management company before they could make any alterations, extensions or erect outbuildings (although their permission would more often than not be forthcoming). Additional covenants will be issued on Summer House and Harwood House, restricting any tree removal.

PROVISION OF HOUSING

- 6.122 As outlined at Table 1, whilst the proposals have been very much heritage led - i.e. the historic layout and fabric of the main house has informed the number and size of the proposed apartments., the proposals include a good range and mix of dwelling type and size in accordance with Policy HS3 ('Housing mix') of the NHDC Local Plan.
- 6.123 The proposals include for 12no. one-bedroom units, 27no. two-bedroom units, 21no. three-bedroom units, 7no. four-bedroom units and 2no. five-bedroom units. This would be split across a total of 43 apartments and 26 new houses.



6.124 Policy HS5 of the Local Plan requires that *“Planning permission for major residential development will be granted provided that:*

a) applicants demonstrate that at least 50% of homes can be built to the M4(2) Accessible and Adaptable standard; and

b) on schemes where 10 or more affordable units will be delivered, 10% of these can additionally be built to the M4(3) wheelchair user standard.”

6.125 All of the new-build dwellings, to be in place of the sports hall (Edwin, Templar etc) will meet the M4(2) standards and the two new-builds in the Summerhouse Plantation (Summer House and Harwood House) will meet M4(3) standards. This well exceeds the requirements of Policy HS5. Achieving these standards within the listed building is very challenging, given the narrow halls and corridors and the multiple steps and split levels. As such, even with the installation of a lift, it is unlikely that any of the conversion units will meet the accessibility standards.

Affordable Housing & Vacant Buildings Credit

6.126 In order to help incentivise development of brownfield site, the government first introduced the ‘Vacant Building Credit’ (VBC) policy in 2014. Where a building is to be converted and reused or where it is to be demolished and replaced, the applicant should be offered a credit against any Local Plan affordable housing requirement, consistent with the floorspace of those existing buildings (in the case that the existing buildings be converted, replaced or a combination of the two, as is the case with the proposals subject of this planning application.

6.127 Paragraph 65 of the NPPF states that *“Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). To support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount”* (emphasis added).

6.128 Under the governments online NPPG (Planning Guidance), it is further explained that: -

What is the vacant building credit?



“National policy provides an incentive for brownfield development on sites containing vacant buildings. Where a vacant building is brought back into any lawful use, or is demolished to be replaced by a new building, the developer should be offered a financial credit equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of relevant vacant buildings when the local planning authority calculates any affordable housing contribution which will be sought. Affordable housing contributions may be required for any increase in floorspace”

And

What is the process for determining the vacant building credit?

“Where there is an overall increase in floorspace in the proposed development, the local planning authority should calculate the amount of affordable housing contributions required from the development as set out in their Local plan. A ‘credit’ should then be applied which is the equivalent of the gross floorspace of any relevant vacant buildings being brought back into use or demolished as part of the scheme and deducted from the overall affordable housing contribution calculation. This will apply in calculating either the number of affordable housing units to be provided within the development or where an equivalent financial contribution is being provided.” (emphasis added)

- 6.129 This is a brownfield site within the Green Belt and as the proposals include the demolition and removal of a number of significant buildings (primarily the sports hall and the science block), the proposed dwellings do not include any net gain of built floor space. The proposals include for the change of use and conversion of the existing main building and where new buildings are proposed, the cumulative floorspace of these will be no more than the cumulative floor space (GIFA) of the buildings to be demolished – see Table 2 above providing a summary of existing and proposed GIFA.
- 6.130 As such, in accordance with the Vacant Building Credit Policy, the proposals are not required to provide any affordable housing nor provide any commuted sums towards off-site provision.



ACCESS, HIGHWAYS AND PARKING

- 6.131 A Transport Assessment has been submitted with this application, produced by EAS (July 2024). The assessment has been produced following two pre-application discussions with Hertfordshire County Council as highways authority.
- 6.132 The access strategy for the site proposes to retain the existing main entrance from School Lane, with vehicle entry to the main site being taken solely from this access. A one-way system will be instigated, and vehicles will exit from the site onto St Albans Highway. These access/exit points provide safe and suitable means of entry and egress, with appropriate visibility splays and road aligned being achieved in both locations.
- 6.133 The only exception to the above access arrangements will be for the Pump House and Tank House, which will utilise a separate existing access to and from School Lane. Again, visibility splays appropriate to the road layout and speeds are achievable in this location, therefore a safe and suitable access will be provided to the dwellings.
- 6.134 The existing pedestrian access onto School Lane (to the west of the main buildings) will be formalised and improved, providing future residents a separate and vehicle free access to the village from the site. In addition, a new internal footpath is proposed, linking the Dower House in the north of the site to the new pedestrian access mentioned above onto School Lane.
- 6.135 The access strategy has been underpinned by analysis of trip generation, both from the previous use as a school and the proposed future use. It is estimated that previously the school produced 317 vehicle movements in the morning and evening, with a total of 700 vehicle movements during the course of the day.
- 6.136 TRICS data has been used to estimate the likely number of vehicle movements to be generated by the proposed use. This analysis suggested the proposed residential units on the site could generate 26 AM and 48 PM Peak Period movements, with a total of 292 movements during the course of the day. This results in a significant decrease in vehicle movements from the fall-back position generated by the previous school use, with a net decrease of 291 AM and 269 PM vehicle movements and a net decrease of 408 movements during the day.



- 6.137 A refuse and waste disposal strategy has been outlined within the Transport Assessment. To support this, significant tracking and swept path analysis has been carried out to ensure refuse vehicles can access and exit the site in forward gear. The swept path analysis shows how refuse vehicles can safely and suitably access the site from a variety of directions from School Lane.
- 6.138 In addition, tracking has also been carried out to ensure fire rescue vehicles can get within sufficient distance of all dwellings in the event of a fire emergency. This swept path analysis, along with those for the refuse vehicles, is included within the Transport Assessment as appendices.
- 6.139 With regards to parking, it is proposed to provide 127 car parking spaces, equating to an allocation of one space for each one and two-bedroom apartment, two spaces for each 3-bedroom apartment and house; and 33 unallocated visitor spaces. It is also proposed that all allocated parking spaces and a policy compliant number of unallocated parking spaces will be provided with EV charging capabilities. In addition, 158 cycle parking spaces will be provided, formed of 130 long stay spaces for residents and at least 18 short stay spaces for visitors. These numbers are based on discussions during the pre-application process.
- 6.140 In terms of off-site highways improvements, as has been discussed with both the highways authority during the pre-application process and subsequent discussions with the Parish Council, it is not possible to provide extensive additional pedestrian paths due to land ownership constraints. As explained in greater depth in the Transport Assessment, the majority of the carriageway verges are classified as 'Village Green' common land, owned by Preston Parish Council. Due to this historic designation and accompanying legislation, the applicant is not able to make alterations to this land.



- 6.141 Subsequent discussions have been carried out with the Parish Council to establish the extent of off-site highways improvement Parish Council members and village residents would be willing to accept. Several options were put forward however only one was accepted, which was to the proposed pedestrian route meeting School Lane opposite Church Lane. A plan outlining this route is included within the Transport Assessment. Notwithstanding this, public access to the site will be significantly improved from the current position and compared to the site's previous use as a school when access was closed to the public, with the new path leading from School Lane to The Dower House and to the new community tennis court to the north of the site and also the formalisation of the permissive path at the southern section of the site, linking School Lane and St Albans Highway and which will include several 'spurs' to the north and to the south.
- 6.142 Finally, it is noted that the use of the site for private dwellings likely lead to a 'change in habits' when compared to private boarding school, for example, residents will be more likely to make use of public transport and local services. Therefore, the applicant would be willing to discuss reasonable s106 contributions towards improvements to local bus services and nearby bus stops. These provisions are to be discussed and agreed with Local Highway Authority during the course of the application.
- 6.143 Turning next to the Travel Plan submitted with this application, also produced by EAS (July 2024). The Plan has been developed in accordance with Department for Communities and Local Government Guidance on Travel Plans, Transport Assessment and Statement in Decision Taking (2014), Hertfordshire County Council Travel Plan Guidance (2020), alongside the policies and guidance of North Hertfordshire District Council and Hertfordshire County Council.
- 6.144 The Travel Plan outlines the various existing means of access to the site from a range of sustainable transportation methods. It then analyses expected travel patterns, using census data and outlines how travel surveys will be carried out in the future once the development is established. The results of these surveys will feed into the sustainable travel strategy and objectives for the site.
- 6.145 The Plan outlines numerous initiatives which will be utilised to encourage uptake and use of sustainable means of transport and for ensuring the implementation of the Plan is successful.
- 6.146 The Plan concludes with an Action Plan timetable, which clearly sets out how the Plan will evolve and the key timeframes which will be adhered to during the application process and beyond.



6.147 Finally, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has also been submitted with this application. As the scheme moves forward in the planning and development process, this report will be enhanced with further details by the working team and will remain a live document through the development process, until the site is occupied.

6.148 This level of information is not typically required at this early phase of the development, however the applicant felt it would be useful to provide an outline CTMP for consideration at this stage, to demonstrate that the practical implications concerning the construction of the development have been factored into the scheme.

ECOLOGY, BIODIVERSITY AND TREES

Trees

6.149 An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) has been prepared by Sharon Hosegood Associates (July 2024). The report confirms there are no Tree Preservation Orders and part of the site is within a Conservation Area (although not Summerhouse Plantation). It is a Registered Parks and Garden and has a high landscape value.

6.150 The report includes detailed tree survey sheets, plans and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment. All information is in accordance with the British Standard (BS 5837: 2012 "*Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. Recommendations*") (referred to as BS). The assessment concludes that the proposals have been carefully designed to minimize impact to trees and follows close design team collaboration.

6.151 The vast majority of trees will be retained, although two discrete areas of the mid last century Summerhouse Plantation will be removed. The tables below summarise the trees surveyed and those to be retained and removed.

Categorisation of tree features - trees/groups/hedges/woodland	Total	Trees/groups to be retained	Trees/groups to be removed
Category A	28	28	0
Category B	391	380	11
Category C	511	413	98
Category U	123	74	49
Total	1053	895	109+49 U

Trees/groups to be retained	Trees/groups to be removed	Trees to be planted	Net gain
895	109 (excluding U)	335	226 plus woodland planting



- 6.152 The majority of the trees to be removed are either Category U (and therefore require removal anyway) or Category C (considered to be of low quality). The removal of trees will also benefit the health of the plantation as a whole, which is currently overcrowded, creating too much competition between trees, it is therefore in need of management (which has been factored into the BNG provisions). The trees to be retained within the residential curtilages of the new properties in Summerhouse Plantation will be protected by the BNG management plan. This will ensure that they are not subsequently removed by the occupants of the properties.
- 6.153 Tree planting will exceed the NHDC Tree Strategy Policy of requiring two trees for every one tree removed, including new woodland planting of a greater species diversity than the relatively poor-quality self-sown sycamore dominated parts of the plantation, which is required for removal for development. The existing landscape screens all of the proposals and will be enhanced by planting which is appropriate for the biodiversity and landscape setting.

ECOLOGY

- 6.154 Accompanying this application is an Ecology Report (July 2024) produced by Applied Ecology. This assessed the likely ecological constraints on the site and provided comment on the potential impact the development could have on any protected habitat and species.

Bats

- 6.155 With regards to the built form on the site, the appraisal identified several potential bat roosts, however these were considered to be of low conservation value and the report concluded that their loss or damage could be easily managed through mitigation measures.
- 6.156 In relation to the trees on site, 20 trees were surveyed at ground level and 11 of these were subject to follow up climbing surveys to establish whether they possess features to support a potential bat roost or any active bat roosting evidence. Of these 11 trees, three trees showed no evidence of bat roosting nor did they present suitable features to support bat roosts. The remaining eight trees will be re-surveyed on two occasions in July and August, as they each contained features suitable for bat roosting, although only one of these trees showed evidence of a potential bat roost during the first survey.



- 6.157 The report also identified use of the airspace around the site by several bat breeds, including a rare barbastelle bat (although this breed of bat was not found to be roosting).
- 6.158 The additional surveys referenced above in July and August will be carried out during the course of the application and the results provided accordingly, as agreed with the LPA's ecologist.
- 6.159 A number of the proposed works were identified as having potential impact on roosting bats, and measures have been suggested to mitigate this under the auspices of a Natural England bat licence. These recommendations will be followed throughout the construction phase of the site and can be controlled by an appropriately worded condition. Further, all bats and their places of shelter are legally protected and these regulations will be adhered to regardless.
- 6.160 Several recommendations were put forwards with regards to lighting, primarily in relation to the two proposed houses in the Summerhouse Plantation. The applicant has engaged with a lighting engineer (CBG) who have provided initial early stage input on how the impacts of lighting from the two new dwellings in the Summerhouse Plantation can be managed. CBG have confirmed that they can produce a lighting design to ensure there is minimal light spill from internal dwellings via glazing to external areas (0.2 lux on the horizontal plane and below 0.4 lux on the vertical plane), including to reduce the upwards output lighting and skyglow effect for the external lighting. Further details on the lighting scheme will be provided at the detailed design stage and can be secured via condition, this will include the recommendations of the Ecology Report, which will be factored into CBG's scheme. An Isoline Plan will also be provided to show achievable levels of light spread.

Other Species

- 6.161 Two buildings were identified to be potentially hosting a nesting barn owl. The report stipulates that works to these building must be carried out outside the nesting season and replacement boxes will be provided for the barn owls.
- 6.162 With regards to newts, five ponds were surveyed for the report and these were all found to have either poor suitability or be completely unsuitable for habitat for great crested newts.



- 6.163 In relation to nesting birds, the report stipulates that the removal of scrub, trees, and other areas of dense vegetation to facilitate development should be undertaken outside of the bird breeding period between September – February, or immediately following an inspection of these areas by an experienced ecologist that confirms nesting bird absence.
- 6.164 The report recommends a watching brief for badgers and hedgehog throughout the development construction process.
- 6.165 In summary, the report concluded that a number of protected species and habitats are located on the site, however with careful management the impact on the species and habitat can be easily mitigated. Further surveys are still ongoing to fully establish the potential for bat roosting in the trees within the Summerhouse Plantation, as agreed with the LPAs ecology advisor. The results of these surveys will be provided during the course of the application.

BNG

- 6.166 The BNG assessment carried out for this proposal indicates that a gain of at least +15% can be achieved. On this basis, the mandatory target of 10% net gain set within the Environment Act 2021 should easily be met.
- 6.167 The site has a baseline habitat value of 119 units across 27.8 ha at present. As a result of the proposed scheme, around 5.2 ha of the site will be impacted by the proposals (including both areas of new development and locations of new habitat creation). The majority of this is through the loss of semi-natural woodland in Summerhouse Plantation and the loss of grassland due to woodland planting (although there is an overall net benefit to the woodland planting on the grassland).
- 6.168 In order to achieve the net gain referenced above, a management programme to enhance the condition of Summerhouse Plantation and the two smaller areas of woodland (one in the south of the site and one around the pond to the south of the Main House) will be put in place. Currently these areas are in poor condition and require management to prevent over competition between trees. In addition, 2.1 ha of existing grassland will be enhanced through wildflower over-sowing and annual hay cutting/light grazing and new habitats will be created through the planting of an extensive block of broadleaved woodland and new small native trees across the site. These measures combined will result in a gain of at least +15%.



WIDER LANDSCAPE IMPACTS

- 6.169 An Initial Landscape Appraisal (ILA) has been submitted with this application. As agreed with the LPA during pre-application discussions, it was determined that a full LVIA was not required. Also of relevance to landscape is the Design and Access Statement and Heritage Statement, which should be read in conjunction.
- 6.170 The ILA assesses how the primary important views, both in relation to landscape and historic features, across the site have been factored into the design and layout of the proposed development.
- 6.171 Various options have been explored for the siting of new buildings and car parking within the site, taking into account the existing historical and landscape features and ensuring the impact on these is minimised and mitigated.
- 6.172 The location and orientation of new buildings within the development have been selected with the important landscape features in mind, ensuring that their presence appears discreet and does not detract from important views and setting. For example, the two new dwellings within the Summerhouse Plantation will be almost completely obscured from view by the existing woodland, meaning their impact on the surrounding area will be negligible.
- 6.173 In addition, landscaping enhancements have also been provided. For example, new woodland planting has been proposed across the site in order to screen certain aspects of the development. When selecting the location of this woodland, this has been carefully considered in order to ensure the openness of the historic parkland is not interrupted, recognising that this is an important feature of parkland settings.
- 6.174 In addition, detailed landscaping plans are submitted as part of the proposals, provided by Livingston Eyre Associates, which show the landscaping details for the new proposals. For example, the landscaping and boundary treatments around the proposed Sports Hall Housing and around the East Car Park is shown in detail and these landscaping plans demonstrate how suitable and sensitive planting will be used to help assimilate the proposals into the heritage and landscape setting.



FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE STRATEGY

- 6.175 Regarding flood risk, a Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Strategy Assessment (FRA) has been supplied with this application, this has been produced by EAS (July 2024).
- 6.176 The site is located in Flood Zone 1. Flood Zone 1 is defined by the Environment Agency (EA) as having less than 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. The risk of fluvial flooding at the site is considered low.
- 6.177 The EA long term risk maps also display the risk from reservoirs. The site is shown to not be in a reservoir flood risk area on the EA long term risk maps, therefore the risk of reservoir flooding is low.
- 6.178 Based on Hertfordshire's interactive mapping, the site is not susceptible to groundwater flooding. The Hertfordshire Level 1 SFRA also indicates a low risk. Therefore, the risk of groundwater flooding is considered low.
- 6.179 The northwest of the site is shown on the EA long term risk maps to be at low, medium and high risk of surface water flooding. The surface water flooding forms a flow path originating from the centre and west of the site, flowing in a northerly direction until it leaves the site boundary and continues northwards.
- 6.180 In order to assess the surface water flood risk in more detail, DEFRA surface water flood data for the 0.1% flood risk event was obtained and overlayed onto the proposed site layout. This confirms surface water flood depths of up to 900mm within the vicinity of the proposed and existing buildings with a flow path travelling from south to north through part of the site.
- 6.181 Further mitigation measures such as raising the finished floor level of the proposed buildings and utilising flood resilient construction methods may also be required. As the existing buildings to remain are Grade II* listed, altering floor levels and utilising flood resilient construction methods may not be viable.



- 6.182 To inform the SuDS Report, infiltration testing was undertaken at the site to BRE 365 Standards. The testing confirmed infiltration rates of greater than 1×10^{-6} m/s therefore infiltration is not considered viable at the site. As such, an attenuation-based strategy with a restricted outfall to an existing ditch located to the north of the site is proposed.
- 6.183 A site visit was undertaken in order to review the existing drainage system at the site. The visit found the existing main building and teaching block drained via a series of manholes and surface water sewers. These sewers direct surface water flows from the existing buildings at the centre of the site to an existing ditch located towards the north of the site. It is assumed that the existing surface water runoff discharges to the ditch at an unrestricted rate.
- 6.184 As the proposals are for the exterior of the existing main building to remain unchanged, it is proposed for the existing drainage network serving the main building to also remain unchanged and continue discharging to the existing ditch. The teaching block and proposed buildings north of the existing main building are to be drained via a proposed new system with a restricted outfall to the same ditch. The outfall for the proposed system will be restricted to 2.9 l/s offering a significant reduction on existing runoff rates from the site.
- 6.185 The proposed attenuation based strategy for the teaching block and proposed buildings to the north will utilise a combination of SuDS devices including Raingarden Planters, Lined Permeable Paving and below ground Cellular Storage Tanks in order to meet each of the four pillars of SuDS – Water Quantity, Water Quality, Biodiversity & Amenity.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Acoustics

- 6.186 An Acoustic Design Feasibility Report (July 2024) has been submitted with this application, produced by Gillieron Scott Acoustic Design. The report sets out the acoustic criteria required in order to achieve Approved Document E (Resistance to the Passage of Sound, 2003 edition) for all party walls, floors, internal partitions and also reverberation time in common parts. The report relates to the buildings on site to be converted into residential dwellings (rather than the new build dwellings).



6.187 Acoustic testing has been carried out to establish the existing performance of walls and floors. The testing determined that although some walls and floors do already meet Part E requirements, the majority will need upgrading.

6.188 The report sets out three options that could be adopted in the design in order that Approved Document E can be achieved, depending on the method of construction of the existing walls and floors, which is not known to a full and comprehensive extent at this stage. Once this is known, the various different methods will be applied accordingly in order to achieve at least Approved Document E standards. This can be secured via the inclusion of an appropriately worded condition in the planning consent to allow these details to be provided at a later stage.

Ground Contamination

6.189 For the purposes of assessing contamination on the site, the area has been divided into six zones (A to E), as shown on drawing number 641-KS-XX-XX-SK-A-00017. For each area, a desk-based Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Study has been carried out.

6.190 Within Areas A and D it was found that the potential risk of harm to human health from on-site contamination sources was low, and therefore a watching brief approach has been recommended for these areas during construction. Recommendations are also made in relation to testing for asbestos in the buildings on site in Area B. The testing for asbestos is covered in the subsequent section of this report.

6.191 Within Areas B and E it was found that the potential risk of harm to human health from onsite contamination sources was low, therefore a watching brief approach has also been recommended for this area too. In addition, it has been recommended that samples from made ground on the site is collected from shallow soils following demolition to test for a range of contaminants. Recommendations are also made in relation to the infilling of the swimming pool in Area B and the testing for asbestos in the buildings on site in Area B. The testing for asbestos is covered in the subsequent section of this report.



- 6.192 Within Area C, it was identified that there is a potentially moderate risk to human health from on-site contamination sources and the potential risk from ground gas is low to moderate. It has been recommended that a Phase 2 Ground Investigation is undertaken across the western section of Area C to establish the extent of the potential contamination and any required remedial measures.
- 6.193 Within Area F it was identified that there is a potentially moderate risk to human health from on-site contamination sources. It has been recommended that a Phase 2 Ground Investigation is undertaken in the areas proposed for soft landscaping and garden space associated with the proposed new dwellings. Across the rest of Area F a watching brief methodology has been recommended.
- 6.194 Adherence to the recommendations of the various Phase 1 Reports can be controlled by an appropriately worded condition.

Asbestos

- 6.195 Several asbestos surveys have been undertaken across relevant buildings subject to this application. The majority of these have been carried out by Cambridge Asbestos Removal (August 2023) with the exception of the Main House and Teaching Block, which were also surveyed by Green Shield Environmental (August 2020).
- 6.196 The Icehouse, the Piggery, the Pumping Station, the Science Block and the Storage Sheds were found to contain no asbestos materials during the surveys.
- 6.197 The Main Building, Sports Hall and Summerhouse Building were found to contain asbestos materials. These areas should be environmentally cleaned prior to any works or use, and recommendations are included within the reports as to how this should be carried out, depending on the type and extent of asbestos found.
- 6.198 In the Teaching Block a sample was taken but no asbestos was found to be present in the sample. It is still assumed asbestos materials could be present due to the Green Shield August 2020 report identifying asbestos residue in the pipework for this building. As a precaution, the report recommends that the pipes, walls and ceilings should be environmentally cleaned prior to any works being carried out to the building.



ENERGY PERFORMANCE & SUSTAINABILITY

- 6.199 A Mechanical and Electrical Feasibility Report and an Energy Statement have been submitted with this application, both produced by CBG Consultants. This undertook an analysis of the Temple Dinsley Estate and identified several technologies that are suitable for minimising carbon emissions.
- 6.200 The report concluded that dedicated ASHPs are the likely solution for the new-build dwellings and stand-alone conversions. A district heat network served from a number of commercial-sized ASHPs is the preferred approach to provide heating and hot water to the apartments. Each apartment would use a Heat Interface Unit (HIU) to supply and meter the final hydronic circuits.
- 6.201 A combination of PV panels on the car park roofs and PV slate/ panels on some of the new dwellings (Ithel, Violet and Templar) will meet the NHDC's Gold Standard (as set out within the Draft Sustainability SPD) for renewable energy generation with the deployment of individual ASHPs for the new-build dwellings. For the buildings to be converted, NHDC's Silver Standard will be met.
- 6.202 With regards to incoming electrical supply, there is an existing substation located on the main road. A Load Assessment has been carried out, with an estimated usage of 1.6MVA, therefore requiring an upgraded UKPN supply. The new substation will be located at the site boundary (near to the pedestrian access gate on the Western boundary) feeding 43 flats, 26 houses and two existing structures, which are being converted into accommodation, all via local Ryefield boards in a purpose-built structure. Separate supplies for the communal energy centre and EV chargers are proposed.
- 6.203 The existing condition of services in the listed buildings show signs of aging and wear. The proposed plan for each property is to have a dedicated UKPN supply with a consumer unit feeding all final circuits. Small power provision will be developed to suit furniture arrangement and appliances.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND PLANNING BALANCE

- 7.1 This application is submitted for both Planning Permission and Listed Building consent for the change of use and redevelopment of the Temple Dinsley site, from the Former Princess Helena College boarding school to a residential development of 69 dwellings and all associated works.
- 7.2 The site is located immediately on the edge of the village of Preston, a Category A village under the North Herts Council Local Plan and the proposals allow for direct pedestrian and cycle access to the village and its various services and facilities, including a Primary School. The proposed development is therefore a sustainable form of development.
- 7.3 The site is also located within the Green Belt. Whilst the majority of the proposals will be an appropriate form of development within the Green Belt (68 of the 69 proposed dwellings), it is acknowledged that one proposed dwelling (Harwood House) and the parking and storage structures will represent inappropriate forms of development.
- 7.4 However, the proposals would result in a number of significant benefits which cumulatively, are afforded very substantial weight in the overall planning balance and therefore provide very special circumstances which clearly outweigh any harm to the Green Belt.
- 7.5 First and foremost, and fundamental to the proposals, is that this is a heritage led scheme and the proposed change of use of the main Grade II* Listed Building and the Grade II* Listed Parks and Gardens would put these heritage assets to their most optimum and viable residential use, which would secure the future of these heritage assets, which are of both historical national significance and also architectural significance.
- 7.6 The proposals would include significant works of renovation and the reinstatement of both the listed house and the surrounding listed gardens, removing a significant amount of inappropriate additions and interventions, which have been added over the decades while the property has been used as a school. Historical features of the building are to be revealed and reinstated to the betterment of the heritage asset. The proposals submitted are the result of complex, detailed and in-depth discussions spanning 18 months with NHDC Planning Officers, NHDC Conservation Officers, and Historic England.



7.7 The proposals also include for the demolition and removal of the existing substantial and unsightly sports hall building, and its replacement with a range of sensitively design homes, far more in keeping with this location and to the significant improvement of the setting of the heritage assets.

7.8 As well as the significant heritage benefits, there are a number of other benefits which would result from the proposals and these are summarised as follows:

- All new-build dwellings (24no.) will be of a high-quality sustainable build, including 'Passivhaus principles' in terms of insulation and energy efficiency.
- The development will be provided with renewable sources of energy and heating, via the large array of Solar PV Panels at the East car park (positioned in a discrete location), PV slates to Ithel and Violet and Templar (bespoke PV panels), a communal ASHP network for the converted apartments and individual ASHPs for the new-build houses and for the Pump House and Tank House.
- The new-build proposals will therefore achieve the 'Gold standard' as per the Council's Draft Sustainability SPD, which would signify exemplary standards significantly exceeding the minimum requirements.
- The new dwellings provided as part of the conversion of the listed build (and curtilage listed buildings) will achieve the 'Silver Standard' under the NHDC Sustainability SPD.
- The proposals across the entire site will achieve a BNG of at least +15%, significantly over the statutory requirement of 10%.
- The proposals would include for the reinstatement of the wider parklands of the Temple Dinsley site, including the improvement of the Summerhouse Plantation (currently of poor quality and poor health), substantial additional woodland planting around the site and the planting of a significant amount of wildflower meadows, all contributing towards the BNG uplift.
- Significant community benefits, including the provision of land for a new cricket pitch and cricket pavilion and a new community tennis court.



- Provision of new permissive pathways, including to the currently isolated Dower House dwellings and the new community tennis court and across the southern section of the site linking School Lane, St Albans Highway and to surrounding public footpaths, all avoiding dangerous roads.
- Provision for specific 'open garden days' throughout the year, allowing the local community to experience a broader enjoyment and appreciation of the renovated and reinstated listed parks and gardens.
- The proposals would also result in highway and sustainability benefits, as it would result in a significant reduction in traffic and vehicle movements compared to the previous/ fall-back use of the site as a private boarding school.

7.9 It is acknowledged that the proposals would result in the loss of the sports hall and the swimming pool. However, it is understood that these were almost entirely used by the school and there was very little community use or access (for example, the swimming pool was only ever in use for a short period over the summer period). Fundamentally however, the heritage benefits of removing the substantial and unsightly sports hall building and the replacement of the swimming pool with an 'ornamental pond, as was historically in place, would provide for significant heritage benefits – preferable in the eyes of Historic England - which outweigh any minor adverse impacts in terms of the loss of these facilities.

7.10 It is also acknowledged that the proposals would not provide for any affordable housing. However, the proposals benefit from the 'Vacant Buildings Credit' policy within the NPPF, which is there to encourage the re-use of existing buildings and the redevelopment of brown-field sites. This policy is also in place as incorporating affordable housing in heritage-led projects, such as this, is often very difficult in both practical terms (for example, the management of affordable units by a Registered Provider, when the building is also shared with private-market units) and also in terms of viability, given the significant financial investment required in the renovation and conversion of the listed buildings.



- 7.11 However, the proposals would provide for an excellent range of unit types and sizes, with a significant number of smaller one and two bedroom units, as well as a number of larger units. The smaller units, by virtue of their size, will therefore be more affordable in relative terms and will appeal across the spectrum of first-time buyers, families and older generations looking to downsize. The proposals would also represent a 'windfall' development of 69 new dwellings, set against a back-drop of a historical undersupply of housing within the district. Therefore, the proposals would provide a significant contribution towards the districts housing supply.
- 7.12 The proposals are in accordance with both local and national planning policy, including the Preston Neighbourhood Plan, NHDC Local Plan and the NPPF and would provide for significant heritage, planning and public benefits. Accordingly, in light of the material considerations set out within this planning statement and as supported by the additional supporting documents submitted as part of the applications, the Local Planning Authority is therefore respectfully requested to grant this application for Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent.



Appendix 1

Schedule of Plans and Drawings



Project No:	641
Project Name:	Temple Dinsley
Work Stage:	Planning
Drawing Package:	[01] Demolitions (22)
Revision / Date:	P01 / 10.07.2024

Document No.	Document Name	Scale	Size
641-KS-01-XX-DR-A-10001	Demolitions Key Plan	1:1000	A0
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02010	Demolitions: Main Building: West Spur	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02020	Demolitions: Main Building: Level 0: West Wing & Old House	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02021	Demolitions: Main Building: Level 1: West Wing & Old House	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02022	Demolitions: Main Building: Level 2: West Wing & Old House	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02023	Demolitions: Main Building: Level -1: Old House	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02030	Demolitions: Main Building: Level 0: East Wing	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02031	Demolitions: Main Building: Level 1: East Wing	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02032	Demolitions: Main Building: Level 2: East Wing	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02033	Demolitions: Main Building: Level -1: East Wing	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02040	Demolitions: Main Building: Level 0: East Annexe	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02041	Demolitions: Main Building: Level 1: East Annexe	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02042	Demolitions: Main Building: Level -1: East Annexe	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-MB-DR-A-02050	Demolitions: Main Building: Stables Block	1:100	A2
641-KS-04-MB-DR-02001	Demolitions Elevations: Main Building ~ 1,3	1:100	A1
641-KS-04-MB-DR-02002	Demolitions Elevations: Main Building ~ 2,4,5,6	1:100	A1
641-KS-01-TB-DR-A-02010	Demolitions: Teaching Block: Level B1	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-TB-DR-A-02011	Demolitions: Teaching Block: Level O0	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-TB-DR-A-02012	Demolitions: Teaching Block: Level B2	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-TB-DR-A-02001	Demolitions Elevations: Teaching Block	1:100	A1
641-KS-01-TH-DR-A-02010	Demolitions: Tank House	1:100	A2
641-KS-01-PH-DR-A-02010	Demolitions : Pump House	1:100	A2

KS Planning Documents Schedule

Project No:	641
Project Name:	Temple Dinsley
Work Stage:	Planning
Drawing Package:	[03] GA Plans (67)
Revision / Date:	P01 / 10.07.2024

[illegible]



Project No:	641
Project Name:	Temple Dinsley
Work Stage:	Planning
Drawing Package:	[04] GA Elevations & Sections (14)
Revision / Date:	P01 / 10.07.2024

[illegible]

Project No:	641
Project Name:	Temple Dinsley
Work Stage:	Planning
Drawing Package:	[06] Apartment & Room Layouts (65)
Revision / Date:	P01 / 10.07.2024

[illegible]

Project No:	641
Project Name:	Temple Dinsley
Work Stage:	Planning
Drawing Package:	[30] Phasing (21)
Revision / Date:	P01 / 10.07.2024

[illegible]



Project No:	641
Project Name:	Temple Dinsley
Work Stage:	Planning
Drawing Package:	[70] External Works (9)
Revision / Date:	P01 / 10.07.2024

Document No.	Document Name	Scale	Size																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
--------------	---------------	-------	------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



KS Planning Documents Schedule

Project No: **641**
Project Name: **Temple Dinsley**
Work Stage: **Planning**
Drawing Package: **[XX] Documents (10)**
Revision / Date: **P01 / 10.07.2024**

[illegible]



Appendix 2

Proposed Lane Use Plan (Drawing Number 41-KS-70-XX-DR-A-11100)



Background illustrated indicatively, please refer to the latest Proposed Site Plan drawing:
641-KS-03-XX-DR-A-10002

DO NOT SCALE OFF THIS DRAWING
DO NOT SUBSTITUTE ANY OF THE PRODUCTS
OR MATERIALS.

1. This is a planning drawing and is intended for this use only; it must not be used for construction.
2. All dimensions are in MM and should be checked on site prior to commencement of work; do not scale off this drawing.
3. This drawing is to be read in conjunction with all other relevant information.
3.Discrepancies between drawings and information to be referred to Architect without delay.

- Public Access
- Private Gardens
- Formal Gardens ~ shared by residents
- Parkland ~ shared by residents
- Woodland ~ shared by residents
- Pedestriana ~ shared by residents
- Carparking
- TBC
- Permissive path

P01	Issued for planning	12.07.24
Revision	Description	Date



KAY PILSBURY THOMAS ARCHITECTS
SULLIVAN **C**ABAN **A**BBOTT **L**AW
HONEYLANDS RADWINTER SAFFRON WALDEN ESSEX
CB10 2TJ 01799 599208 | info@kpt.co.uk | kpt.co.uk

Client
The Door UK Ltd

Project
Temple Dinsley
Preston, Hitchin, Hertfordshire,
SG4 7RT

Drawing title
Site Plan:
Proposed Land Use

Purpose of issue
Planning

Job no. Status Scale @ A0
641 S0 1:1000

Checked by
ST

Date Revision
10.07.24 P01

Drawing number
641-KS-70-XX-DR-A-11100



Appendix 3

Survey schedule of hardstanding areas and assessment of heritage value'

Survey schedule of hardstanding areas* and assessment of heritage value

*Hardstanding areas measured as existing and potential parking space and tennis courts across the Temple Dinsley parkland exclude driveways and paths

No	Location	Name	M² Exist	Heritage impact of removal	M² Proposed	Heritage impact of proposed	Car capacity proposed	Proposal
1	Immediately south of the Main House	Forecourt	874	Positive contribution	437	Positive contribution	6	Visitor / Drop Off
2	At Level -1 doorway to East Annexe	Drop Off	38	No harm	38	No harm	3	Visitor / Drop Off
3	East of big Oak tree	Existing Car Park	1,061	No harm	586	Less than substantial harm	38	Houses + 6 Visitor
4	Between East Annexe and Teaching Block	Courtyard	425	No harm	206	Positive contribution	-	Pedestrian pathway
5	North of Science Block	Science Block	31	No harm	-	No harm	-	-
6	North of the Sports Hall	Stable Yard	327	No harm	-	No harm	-	Ithel & gardens
7	North boundary	North Tennis Courts	665	No harm	665	-	-	Community use
8	East avenue	East Tennis Courts	1,735	No harm	665	No harm	-	-
9	East avenue	Sports Pavilion parking	460	No harm	460	No harm	x	Events only
10	West of driveway	n/a	-		-	-	31	-
11	East of Main Building	East Park	-		1,074	Less than substantial harm^	42	Apartments + 10 Visitor
12	NE existing parking	Avenue	-		-	-	7	Visitors
13	Southern part of Park	Tankhouse (Barn 2)	-		253	Less than substantial harm		
14	Southern part of Park	Pumping House	-		160	Less than substantial harm		
15	Summerhouse Plantation	Summer House	-		140	Less than substantial harm		
16	Summerhouse Plantation	Harwood House	-		140	Less than substantial harm		
TOTAL AREA			5,616		4,824		127	
				Difference	-792	-14%	Reduction in hardstanding across Temple Dinsley parkland	
^ East Park secluded by natural topography of the site unseen from the Main Drive.								



Appendix 4

Site Plan Existing and Proposed Hardstanding - 641-KS-70-XX-DR-A-11200-P01



Background illustrated indicatively, please refer to the latest Proposed Site Plan drawing:
641-KS-03-XX-DR-A-10002

DO NOT SCALE OFF THIS DRAWING
DO NOT SUBSTITUTE ANY OF THE PRODUCTS
OR MATERIALS.

1. This is a planning drawing and is intended for this use only; it must not be used for construction.
2. All dimensions are in MM and should be checked on site prior to commencement of work; do not scale off this drawing.
3. This drawing is to be read in conjunction with all other relevant information.
3. Discrepancies between drawings and information to be referred to Architect without delay.

Existing Hardstanding Areas

Proposed Hardstanding Areas

P01	Issued for planning	12.07.24
Revision	Description	Date



AY PILSBURY THOMAS ARCHITECTS

K **S** **C** **A** **B** **A** **L**

HONEYLANDS RADWINTER SAFFRON WALDEN ESSEX
CB10 2TJ 01799 599208 | info@kpt.co.uk | kpt.co.uk

Client
The Door UK Ltd

Project
Temple Dinsley
Preston, Hitchin, Hertfordshire,
SG4 7RT

Drawing title
**Site Plan:
Existing and Proposed
Hardstanding**

Purpose of issue
Planning

Job no. Status Scale @ A0
641 S0 1:1000

Checked by
ST

Date Revision
10.07.24 P01

Drawing number
641-KS-70-XX-DR-A-11200