

CONSERVATION TEAM CONSULTATION APPLICATION RESPONSE

APPLICATION REF:	25/01871/FP
CASE OFFICER:	Melissa Tyler
APPLICATION SITE:	Glebe Road Industrial Estate Glebe Road Letchworth Garden City Hertfordshire SG6 1BT
DESCRIPTION OF WORKS:	Erection of nine dwellings including relocation of access following demolition of existing warehouse building.
RECOMMENDATION: There is an OBJECTION. The scheme will not 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: N/A	
SHORT SUMMARY: Impact on listed building's special character – N/A Impact on character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal is within the Letchworth Conservation area and as such should be mindful of the importance of building scale, styles and materiality. A link to the appraisal statement is copied below. Adopted Character Statement Letchworth The Letchworth Conservation Area as stated in the above document stated the importance in town planning setting a new environmental and architectural stated for twentieth century housing design and layout. Letchworth was the creation of a town dominated by open space, varied species of trees, and houses sited to obtain the maximum benefits of daylight was a significant achievement. Letchworth created widespread interest in Town Planning and led to the development of pioneer planning legislation and the founding of the Royal Town Planning Institute in 1914. Historically, this area was developed early in the history of the Garden City. In Green Lane some houses date from 1905. Common View was largely developed in 1907 and Glebe Road slightly later between 1913 and 1915. The land was originally known as Glebe Fields from which one of the roads takes its name. The area lies parallel to the industrial area and was zoned in the master plan for residential use. The housing was built by various housing societies and contains simple workers cottages.	

Form and Scale. The housing forms terraced blocks that are small in scale and rectangular in form. The blocks are one and a half to two storeys high, and the roofs are largely gabled, hipped or half hipped, although there are also some gabled roofs. The roof pitches are steep and the depth of the buildings relatively shallow. The blocks are unified through their size, form and design, varying only slightly in their simple but effective detailing.

Any development should seek to reflect the above characteristics.

The principle of the proposed development is accepted, however the submission seeks new dwellings reflecting a townhouse approach in terms of height. As stated in the character statement above the building types are one and a half to two storeys which is more in keeping with the overall character of this part of the garden city.

As submitted the over approach does not reflect the character of this part of garden city and a reduction in height of the proposed development would be sought before support would be forthcoming.

Impact on setting of heritage assets and how this affects significance – As submitted and as per the reason stated above the scheme is considered to not to enhance the character of conservation area.

Does the proposal occasion harm or preserve or enhance – As submitted the scheme is considered to cause less than substantial harm at the medium to lower end of that spectrum.

Site Context:

See summary section above.

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): n/a

CONCLUSION:

If the proposed revisions were made ie to height of the new dwellings and subject to materials the scheme would be supportable.

OFFICER: Tricia Craggs

DATE: 9.10.2025