

CONSERVATION TEAM CONSULTATION APPLICATION RESPONSE

APPLICATION REF:	25/03083/lbc
CASE OFFICER:	Vicki Wood
APPLICATION SITE:	32 Church Street Baldock Hertfordshire SG7 5AF
DESCRIPTION OF WORKS:	Replace existing front elevation window with a door, replace existing side elevation door with a window, replace existing side/rear store room casement window with a door, replace existing rear utility room door with a window, insertion of rooflight to existing rear elevation utility room and insertion of solar panels to existing rear courtyard roofslope. Internal alterations.

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:

Full joinery details of the proposed new timber doors/windows to a metric scale and 1:1 scale drawings of the proposed glazing bars hereby granted consent, shall be submitted to and agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority before any works are commenced/prior to manufacturing of the doors.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the listed building to which this consent relates and to comply with Policies SP13 and HE1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011 to 2031.

Details and/or samples of materials to be used for the works, hereby granted consent, shall be submitted to and agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority before any works are commenced.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the listed building to which this consent relates and to comply with Policies SP13 and HE1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011 to 2031.

SHORT SUMMARY:

Impact on listed building's special character –

The list entry is copied below.

[32 AND 34, CHURCH STREET, Non Civil Parish - 1347614 | Historic England](#)

The proposal seeks to remove later non historic fabric and therefore there is no level of harm.

The proposed installation of solar panels is supportable given they are on a less prominent roof slope to the rear.

The installation of the door canopy is supportable as this is not out of character and there are other examples along Church Street.

The internal works affect later fabric with minimal historic significance and therefore cause no harm.

Impact on character and appearance of the conservation area –

Baldock possesses an amalgam of building work of many centuries, each plot having its own history. There are a high number of buildings of good architectural quality and historic interest and the vast majority within the Conservation Area are listed.

The overall character is largely that of 18th Century buildings. There are large Georgian Town Houses as well many other older buildings also having been re-fronted in brick in the style of the time.

All buildings forms front the street, and this reinforces the strong building line and linear character of the streets. The majority of majority of larger three storey building date form the Georgian period.

Historically, streets had mixed uses with houses, shops, inns and maltings all intermixed within the layout.

Impact on setting of heritage assets and how this affects significance – Given the variety of buildings and frontages as described above the proposal is considered not to have a detrimental impact on the character of the conservation area and therefore cause no harm.

Site Context:

[32 AND 34, CHURCH STREET, Non Civil Parish - 1347614 | Historic England](#)

DETAILED ANALYSIS AND CONSIDERATIONS:

Please see summary section above.

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."

Relevant National Guidance i.e. Historic England:

Other relevant documents (Please specify):

CONCLUSION:

There are no objections to the proposal for the reason stated in the summary section of this report.

OFFICER:

DATE: