

February 2023

London Luton Airport Expansion

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR020001

Volume 7 Other Documents

7.01 Planning Statement

Appendix D - Heritage Assessment

Application Document Ref: TR020001/APP/7.01

APFP Regulation: 5(2)(c)



The Planning Act 2008

**The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure)
Regulations 2009**

**London Luton Airport Expansion Development Consent
Order 202x**

**7.01 PLANNING STATEMENT APPENDIX D: HERITAGE
ASSESSMENT**

Regulation number:	Regulation 5(2)(q)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR020001
Document Reference:	TR020001/APP/7.01
Author:	Luton Rising

Version	Date	Status of Version
Issue 1	February 2023	Application issue

Contents

	Page
D1 Introduction	1
D2 Legislation, policy and guidance context	2
D2.2 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	2
D2.3 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)	3
D2.4 Historic England Guidance	3
D3 Heritage Significance	4
D3.2 Luton Hoo Grade II* RPG	4
D3.3 Heritage significance of Luton Hoo RPG	4
D4 Assessment of impact and harm	6
Glossary and Abbreviations	8
References	9

D1 Introduction

- D1.1.1 This Statement sets out the heritage significance of the assets, to enable an understanding of how the predicted impact may be experienced. There follows a discussion of the impact of the Proposed Development on the identified significance, or on the ability to perceive that significance, and the resultant level of harm.
- D1.1.2 Potential effects arising from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development have been assessed in **Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage of the Environment Statement (ES) [TR020001/APP/5.01]**. Effects can be experienced as a direct physical impact on historic fabric, or an effect as a result of changes to an asset's setting. Effects can also be experienced during the construction of the Proposed Development as short-term, or long-term impacts, or as a result of the operation of the Proposed Development.
- D1.1.3 For the majority of assets, the effects presented in the ES have been assessed as being not significant (negligible to minor adverse effects). As such, it is concluded that the harm caused to these assets falls within the less than substantial category and at the lower level of the spectrum and, in accordance with planning guidance and Historic England advice, a proportionate approach has been taken and these assets are not discussed further.
- D1.1.4 While there is no direct correlation between the significance of effect in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms and the degree of harm referenced in National Planning Policy, it is acknowledged that those assets which are identified as experiencing a significant adverse effect are more likely to experience substantial harm. This statement, therefore, provides further assessment of heritage assets where significant effects have been identified in order to understand where on the harm spectrum this impact falls. The emphasis is placed on the level of impact for the purposes of this Heritage Statement. This is consistent with the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS, Ref 1.1) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, Ref. 1.2). 'Effect' is a purely EIA term which balances the impact of a development on the heritage significance of an asset. Harm is associated with the impact on the asset and is not influenced by an asset's heritage value. In addition, this Statement only discusses harm in relation to designated assets. No non-designated assets have been identified as being of 'schedulable quality' or of potentially national importance and as such are not included in this Statement.

D2 Legislation, policy and guidance context

D2.1.1 Legislation, planning policy and guidance, relevant for the cultural heritage impact assessment, is set out in **Table 10.1** in **Chapter 10** of the **ES [TR020001/APP/5.01]**. A summary of the relevant sections of national policy and guidance is reproduced for this statement.

D2.2 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

D2.2.1 The NPPF provides detail regarding the assessment of harm to heritage assets and is supported by Planning Practice Guidance (PPG, Ref 2.1).

D2.2.2 The NPPF sets out the importance of being able to assess the significance of heritage assets that may be affected by a development. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, Local Planning Authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. Similarly, there is a requirement on Local Planning Authorities, having assessed the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal, to take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset (paragraph 195). Significance is defined in Annex 2 as being the *'value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic'*. Significance is not only derived from an asset's physical presence, but also from its setting. The setting of a heritage asset is defined in Annex 2 as, *'the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve'*.

D2.2.3 Paragraphs 199 to 203 of the NPPF introduce the concept that heritage assets can be harmed or lost through alteration, destruction or development within their setting. This harm ranges from less than substantial through to substantial. In instances where development would cause substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated asset consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that it is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss (paragraph 201). In instances where development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated asset the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal to provide a balanced judgement (paragraph 202).

D2.2.4 Paragraph 5 of the NPPF states that it does not contain specific policies for NSIPs and that applications for development consent are determined in accordance with the decision-making framework set out by the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and relevant NPSs, as well as any other matters that are relevant and important, which may include the NPPF. This assessment is taken forward on the basis of the relevant policy set out in the NPPF.

D2.3 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

- D2.3.1 The PPG expands on terms such as ‘significance’ and its importance in decision making. Paragraph 018 states *‘What matters in assessing whether a proposal might cause harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting. Proposed development affecting a heritage asset may have no impact on its significance or may enhance its significance and therefore cause no harm to the heritage asset. Where potential harm to designated heritage assets is identified, it needs to be categorised as either less than substantial harm or substantial harm (which includes total loss) in order to identify which policies in the NPPF (paragraphs 200-202) apply. Within each category of harm (which category applies should be explicitly identified), the extent of the harm may vary and should be clearly articulated’.*
- D2.3.2 Paragraph 018 emphasises that substantial harm is a high test, and it is important to consider whether an adverse impact ‘seriously affects a key element’ of an asset’s significance. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed (paragraph 018).
- D2.3.3 The PPG states that in relation to setting, a thorough assessment of the impact on setting needs to take in to account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it (paragraph 013).
- D2.3.4 The NPPF indicates that the degree of harm should be considered alongside any public benefits that can be delivered by development. The PPG states that these benefits should flow from the Proposed Development and should be of a nature and scale to be of benefit to the public and not just a private benefit (paragraph 020).

D2.4 Historic England Guidance

- D2.4.1 Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Good Practice Advice Note 2 (GPA2, 2015; Ref. 2.2) contains Historic England’s guidance on implementing historic environment policy contained within the NPPF and PPG. With regard to harm, GPA2 clarifies that change to heritage assets is inevitable, but that the change is only harmful when significance is damaged and that *‘the nature and importance of the significance that is affected will dictate the proportionate response to assessing that change’* (paragraph 29). The document reiterates that substantial harm is a high test (paragraph 27).

D3 Heritage Significance

D3.1.1 Heritage assets which have been identified as experiencing an adverse effect in the ES comprise:

- a. Wandon End House and Wandon End Farmhouse, Grade II Listed Buildings. Construction activities would introduce change within their rural settings which would affect the ability to appreciate their rural context and their relationship with the surrounding countryside, which forms the assets' functional setting. However, this impact is temporary only and would result in no harm to the heritage significance of the assets. As such, these assets are not considered further in this statement.
- b. Luton Hoo Grade II* Registered Park and Garden (RPG) (NHLE 1000578). A moderate adverse effect has been predicted in **Chapter 10** of the ES **[TR020001/APP/5.01]** due to an increase in aviation noise levels during the operation of the Proposed Development. It was assessed that this would detract further from the park's rural character and would represent a slight change to the setting of the park. This impact would occur during the operational phase of the Proposed Development and is therefore assessed as a permanent change.

D3.2 Luton Hoo Grade II* RPG

D3.2.1 In compliance with pre-application advice received from Historic England, dated 23 April 2020, Luton Hoo RPG, although only falling partially within the study area, has been assessed in the ES in its entirety. Furthermore, a holistic approach has been adopted for the assessment, as in, all of the component parts of the RPG, including the designed assets within the park, are assessed collectively, even where they fall outside of the study area.

D3.2.2 Luton Hoo is a Grade II* listed landscaped park that was first enclosed in 1623 and enlarged and remodelled by Lancelot Brown in 1764-74.

D3.3 Heritage significance of Luton Hoo RPG

D3.3.1 A comprehensive description of the heritage significance of Luton Hoo RPG, including the contribution its setting makes to its heritage significance is presented in the desk-based assessment which is presented in **Appendix 10.1** of the **ES [TR020001/APP/5.02]**.

D3.3.2 Luton Hoo derives its value (its heritage significance) from its historic interest, and the architectural interest of its internal features, including Grade I listed Luton Hoo house (National Heritage List for England, NHLE 1321301) and garden houses and retaining walls (NHLE 1158944); the Grade II* listed stables (NHLE 1114713); and the Grade II listed lodges (NHLE 1114715; NHLE 1114716), bridge (NHLE 1114717) and boathouse (NHLE 1159067) at the east entrance. Historic interest derives from the insight the park offers into the social and economic life of 18th and 19th century society, as well as the association with notable architects such as Robert Adam and Robert Smirke, and designers

such as Lancelot Brown. Architectural and artistic interest derives from the aesthetics of the park; the appreciation of the park's design, the careful location of its features, including the relationship between buildings, and planted trees and gardens. Architectural and aesthetic interest also derives from the careful positioning of the house on an elevated platform, with designed views to the east to look beyond the River Lea and towards the copses of George Wood and Hardingdell Wood which frame views in this direction.

- D3.3.3 The views within the park are designed to be inward looking, with internal views dominated and framed by banks of trees and planted boundaries restricting long-range views out of the park in most directions. The views out of and within the park provide a rural character to the asset's setting, despite the presence of Luton Town to the north. The roof tops of airport buildings can be seen breaking the skyline from the upper floors of Luton Hoo house and the presence of these buildings in views from the park detract from the enjoyment of its rural aspect.
- D3.3.4 The park's aesthetics form part of its setting and contributes to its heritage significance. The aesthetics are not, however, experienced within a quiet noise environment. The experience of the park's noise environment changes as you move through it. From the western edges of the park, road noise from the M1 is very noticeable and only reaches barely discernible levels at the golf course in the north of the park, approximately 1 km from the M1. Road noise from the A1081 forms part of the noise environment across the northern sections of the park, from the golf course and eastwards to the River Lea. The parkland to the east of Luton Hoo house can be experienced without noticeable intrusion from road noise but its noise environment is punctuated by the sound of passing trains on the Midland Main Line to the east. The dominant feature of the park's noise environment is the aviation noise from planes landing at and taking off from Luton Airport. The aviation noise is not constant, but is a prominent component of the experience of the park. The park's existing noise environment does not have an impact on the park's historic or architectural interests, but it does detract from an appreciation of the park's aesthetics and the enjoyment of its designed views.
- D3.3.5 The park provides the aesthetic and functional setting for the listed buildings contained within, and the historical context and group value of these assets contributes to the value of the park, which is assessed in the ES as high.

D4 Assessment of impact and harm

- D4.1.1 Four noise receptor locations were marked across Luton Hoo RPG; in the north, south, east and western edges of the park to ensure the entirety of the park was included in the assessment. The resulting noise change contours for assessment Phase 1 operation (**Figure 10.6 [TR020001/APP/5.03]**) predict an increase from the future baseline of less or equal to 1dB, above 51dB_{L_{Aeq,16h}} and below 63dB_{L_{Aeq,16h}} for the majority of the park, which would not be perceptible within the park's existing noise environment resulting in no effect.
- D4.1.2 The noise change contours for assessment Phase 2a operation (**Figure 10.8 [TR020001/APP/5.03]**) show a predicted increase from future baseline of between 1dB and 1.9dB above 51dB_{L_{Aeq,16h}} and below 63dB_{L_{Aeq,16h}} for the majority of the park. The noise increase would have a perceptible impact on the aesthetic appreciation of the park and the ability to appreciate its rural setting and designed views. This would represent a very low magnitude of change, resulting in a minor adverse effect.
- D4.1.3 The noise change contours for assessment Phase 2b operation (**Figure 10.10 [TR020001/APP/5.03]**) show a predicted increase from future baseline of between 2dB to 2.9dB. Whilst the eastern and southern edges of the park are below 51dB_{L_{Aeq,16h}} and the middle portion of the park is between 51dB_{L_{Aeq,16h}} and 63dB_{L_{Aeq,16h}}, the very northern end of the park is above 63dB_{L_{Aeq,16h}}. The predicted increase of 2 to 2.9dB for the northern end of the park above 63dB_{L_{Aeq,16h}} would therefore result in an adverse, likely significant, effect in noise terms..
- D4.1.4 The noise increase during assessment Phase 2b arises from the increased frequency of flights. The noise environment within the park is not a quiet experience and does not rely solely on quietness for an appreciation of its heritage interests. However, the increased frequency of aviation noise would slightly affect the aesthetic appreciation of the park and the ability to appreciate its rural setting and designed views. This was assessed to represent a low magnitude of change, resulting in a moderate adverse effect which is significant in EIA terms.
- D4.1.5 The physical layout of the park would not be impacted by the Proposed Development. Its designed planting, views and the relationship of its component parts would not be affected and would not therefore harm the significance of the park.
- D4.1.6 The setting of the park would experience change as a result of an increase in aviation noise. Aviation noise is already a contributing factor of the park's noise environment and therefore the presence of the aviation noise would not be incongruous to its current experience. However, the predicted level of change in aviation noise derives from the increased frequency of flights and therefore the frequency at which the enjoyment of the park's aesthetics would be interrupted. This would further erode the enjoyment of the park's aesthetics, which contributes to its architectural and artistic interests, however the character of the park as a whole and the ability to understand and appreciate its design

evolution would not be affected. It is assessed that the increase in aviation noise would result in harm to the significance of the asset, due to the impact on its architectural and artistic interest, but the change does not constitute substantial harm to the significance of the asset. It is assessed therefore that the Proposed Development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of this asset.

- D4.1.7 Within the RPG there are a number of designated assets and structures, including Luton Hoo Conservation Area and Grade I listed Luton Hoo house (NHLE 1321301). While the setting of these assets, namely the park, will experience change as a result of the operational phase of the Proposed Development, there will be no harm to the significance of the assets themselves.

GLOSSARY AND ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Definition
ANPS	Airports National Policy Statement
dB	Decibel
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environment Statement
GPA	Good Practice Advice Note
NHLE	National Heritage List for England
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
RPG	Registered Park and Garden

REFERENCES

Ref 1.1 Department for Transport. (2018) The Airports National Policy Statement. London: the Stationery Office.

Ref 1.2 MHCLG (2021) National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

Ref 2.1 MHCLG (2021) Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Department for Communities and Local Government.

Ref 2.2 Historic England. 2015. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2. Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment. English Heritage, Swindon