

CONSERVATION TEAM CONSULTATION APPLICATION RESPONSE

APPLICATION REF:	26/00028/LBC
CASE OFFICER:	Tabitha Kaye
APPLICATION SITE:	The Bury Bury Lane Codicote Hertfordshire SG4 8GG
DESCRIPTION OF WORKS:	Replacement of existing extension flat roof and partially raising of existing parapets. Replacement of the existing timber windows and roof covering.

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 materials for the proposed roof works (roof tiles) to the main building 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.

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.

SHORT SUMMARY:

The Bury is us located off Bury Lane and the existing site is a Sanctuary Housing Association for the over 50's.

The Bury is a Grade II listed building which dates back to C17 and a later large three storey residential flat roof extension dating from the 1970s.

The site is not within a conservation area.

Impact on listed building's special character –

The existing timber sliding sash/casement windows to the Bury were installed in 1980's and the first listed is June 1952. The list description makes only reference to windows and that is

“Aluminium sash windows, 3 on each elevation”.

Therefore, the existing windows are not considered to be historic fabric of significance.

Impact on setting of heritage assets and how this affects significance –

The proposed replacement double glazed windows in timber to match the existing is supported as they would be in traditional material, openings and glazing bars. There would be no loss of historic fabric of significance.

Other works to the main building include replacement of existing timbers and roof tiles. The existing roof dates from 1980s. The proposed works is supported subject to a materials condition for the new roof tiles. It is agreed that this work is necessary to prolong the integrity of the building.

Works to the flat roof extension that include stripping off existing roof covering/insulation and raising parapets to accommodate the new roof is supported as this sees no loss of historic fabric of significance and will prolong the longevity of this building.

Does the proposal occasion harm or preserve or enhance –

The only level of harm would be the work proposed to the hipped roof to the Bury. It is considered to be at the lowest end of less than substantial but as previously this would be considered to be necessary to maintain the integrity of the main building.

The other proposed works are considered to be neutral

Site Context:

[The Bury, Codicote - 1347253 | 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:

Please see summary section above.

OFFICER: Tricia Craggs

DATE: 3.3.2026