

CONSERVATION TEAM CONSULTATION APPLICATION RESPONSE

APPLICATION REF:	25/00851/FPH & 25/00852/LBC
CASE OFFICER:	Andrew Hunter
APPLICATION SITE:	Garden House 7 Alpine Close Hitchin SG4 9DZ
DESCRIPTION OF WORKS:	Insertion of rooflights to existing roof and insertion of second floor window to existing gable to facilitate conversion of loft space into habitable accommodation, installation of photovoltaic panels to existing roof and replace existing cement render with silicone render
RECOMMENDATION: There is NO OBJECTION. The scheme will satisfy the provisions of Sections 16(2) (LBC) and /or 66(1) (FP/FPH) and/or 72(1) (both) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the aims of Section 16 of the NPPF and Policy HE1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031. SUGGESTED CONDITIONS: Details of new windows	
SHORT SUMMARY:. Impact on listed building's special character – The impact on the listed building is considered to minimal given that the proposal will affect later fabric and there is no loss of historic fabric of significance. In terms impact on character and appearance of the conservation area. n/a Impact on setting of heritage assets and how this affects significance – this considers to be minimal as the proposed pv panels will not be mounted on historic roofs. The proposal in terms of the pv panels is considered to cause less than substantial harm and the lowest end of that spectrum. Other works proposed such as the re render is considered to cause no harm.	
Site Context: Please see Design and Access Statement	
DETAILED ANALYSIS AND CONSIDERATIONS: The property has been subject to additions from early C20 to late 1980s. Much of the original building has been subsumed by these additions and how this is read from the public domain.	

As a result, much of character of the original building is diminished.

HERITAGE POLICY ASSESSMENT:

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990:

North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031:

NPPF (December 2024):

The Local Plan and NPPF

North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031 and the policies contained within it i.e., Policy HE1. The plan was adopted November 2022.

The relevant paragraph numbers at Section 16 of the July 2021 version of the NPPF have been changed as follows:

197. 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.*

199. 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). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

200. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.....

202. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

206. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

The Setting of Heritage Assets: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition) – December 2017

At para 14 under the sub-heading 'Landscape Assessment and Amenity' it states that "Analysis of setting is different from landscape assessment. While landscapes include everything within them, the entirety of very extensive settings may not contribute equally to the significance of a heritage asset, if at all. **Careful analysis is therefore required to assess whether one heritage asset at a considerable distance from another, though intervisible with it – a church spire, for instance – is a major component of the setting, rather than just an incidental element within the wider landscape.**"

At para 17 it states (my emphasis in bold): *“All heritage assets have significance, some of which have particular significance and are designated. The contribution made by their setting to their significance also varies. **Although many settings may be enhanced by development, not all settings have the same capacity to accommodate change without harm to the significance of the heritage asset or the ability to appreciate it.** This capacity may vary between designated assets of the same grade or of the same type or according to the nature of the change. It can also depend on the location of the asset: an elevated or overlooked location; a riverbank, coastal or island location; or a location within an extensive tract of flat land may increase the sensitivity of the setting (i.e. the capacity of the setting to accommodate change without harm to the heritage asset’s significance) or of views of the asset. This requires the implications of development affecting the setting of heritage assets to be considered on a case-by-case basis.”*

CONCLUSION:

There are no objections for the reason stated in the summary and analysis paragraphs above. The proposal is considered to cause less than substantial harm at the lowest end of that spectrum.

OFFICER: Tricia Craggs

DATE: 2 July 2025