

Heritage & Conservation

Application consultation response

Application reference:	25/00310/FPH
Site:	Maran Cottage 145 - 149 High Street Codicote Hitchin Hertfordshire SG4 8UB
Proposal	First floor rear extension over existing rear extension to include gabled roof. Insertion of rooflights to existing rear roofslope. Front canopy, alterations to fenestration, external cladding and replace front boundary wall.
Action required prior to determination:	No (see below)

Summary

There are still concerns to the materials used for the rear extensions and details of the new windows need to be stated although this could be conditioned.

Heritage Assets/Non designated

Non designated heritage Asset

Discussion

This proposal has been revised based on previous comments copied below.

The scale of the two-storey rear extension would be excessive scale, both in height and depth, in a prominent location within the street scene and would have an overbearing impact on No. 145 and also the adjacent listed properties. This prominence would be increased by the use of black timber which would increase the degree of harm. There are no objections to the replacement of the existing rear windows which are of modern materials and poor quality. The front timber windows appear to be of a historic type and their loss could impact the historic interest and character of the host dwelling and replacement with UPVC windows with applied glazing bars even where the design is 'heritage style' not be supported. The existing front boundary wall is not of historic interest and its replacement with an appropriate low wall of matching brick is acceptable in heritage terms. The proposed rear rooflight and rear sliding doors appear large but would not be visible in the street scene and based on the more modern appearance of the rear elevation currently, there is no objection to these features. The existing flat door canopy is in keeping with the existing dwellinghouse and is appropriate to the dwellinghouse. The larger projecting canopy as proposed, would not be in keeping with the character of the property due to its scale and design and the existing should be retained or replaced like for like. The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the adjacent listed buildings, contrary to Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. With regards to the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 the level of harm is 'less than substantial' as per paragraph 215. 'Great weight' should be given to the heritage asset's conservation as per paragraph 212. In accordance with paragraph 216, a balanced judgement will be required as to the effect on No. 145 as a non-designated heritage asset.

This revised submission has now addressed the issue of excessive scale by reducing the height of the proposed two storey rear extension by some 800mm but there is still an issue with the use of black

cladding. The extension should be in brick as the use of timber cladding is not in keeping with the character of the host dwelling and would exaggerate the scale of the proposed two storey rear extension,

The other revisions have done gone some way to address previous concerns such as aluminium style heritage windows but there is not detail on what type of glazing bars will be used. The fenestration to the proposed new rear elevation is now improved and considered supportable.

The front door canopy should remain flat in in style rather than the proposed pitched style.

In summary the application is still not supportable for the reasons stated above.

Heritage Policy Assessment

The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 26H of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 or Sections 16 (1) & 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and as supported by the aims of the NPPF.

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

That the application does not comply with the relevant heritage policy and therefore unless there are sufficient planning reasons, it should be refused for this reason.

From	Tricia Craggs
Date	15.4.2025