

CONSERVATION TEAM CONSULTATION APPLICATION RESPONSE

APPLICATION REF:	25/00571/fp
CASE OFFICER:	Alex Howard
APPLICATION SITE:	Land North Of Milksey Lane Graveley Hertfordshire
DESCRIPTION OF WORKS:	Erection of 24 dwellings including creation of vehicular access off High Street, associated parking, drainage, amenity space and landscaping.

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:

A landscaping plan should accompany the proposal to detail boundary treatment of the entire site and in particular the part of the conservation area that the proposed site will occupy.

SHORT SUMMARY:

The proposed development has been subject to a pre application process which was broadly supportive.

Impact on listed buildings or non designated heritage assets

There will be no tangible impact on listed buildings given the distance from the site. Graveley House a non designated heritage asset is considered not to be affected by the proposal given its distance.

Impact on character and appearance on Graveley Conservation Area

The site will occupy a small portion of Graveley Conservation area (northern tip) and no built form is proposed.

Site Context:

A link to Graveley Conservation Area Appraisal is copied below which sets out the special character and significance of the area.

[Graveley CA Character Statement 0.pdf](#)

DETAILED ANALYSIS AND CONSIDERATIONS:

The setting of the conservation area is predominantly rural despite the proximity of the A1 to the west of the settlement and the much-enlarged Stevenage to the south. All of its boundaries open to agricultural land, with the exception of the part which borders development along Ashwell Common.

The southernmost part of the site is located within northern tip of the conservation area, but no built form is proposed in this area. and support for the scheme would only be forthcoming if this were to remain the case.

Please see map within submitted HIA [28EBDD7EF96D40658A3ED98C23A3E561.pdf](#) at 2.17 which shows area of the conservation area

The map below shows proposal map for Local plan 2011-2031 and GR1 is allocated for residential development. The dotted orange line shows Graveley Conservation Area boundary with northmost tip overlapping the GR1 allocation.



Given that the development proposes no built form for this area then support for the scheme would be forthcoming.

The level of harm is considered to be less than substantial at the middle to lower end of that spectrum for the reasons stated above.

HERITAGE POLICY ASSESSMENT:

Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990:

North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031:

NPPF (December 2024):

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:

The proposals would preserve the character and/or appearance of the conservation area and therefore complies/does not comply with section 72 (1) of the Act.

