

CONSERVATION TEAM CONSULTATION APPLICATION RESPONSE

APPLICATION REF:	26/00964/FPH
CASE OFFICER:	Will Thompson
APPLICATION SITE:	27 Stockens Green Knebworth Hertfordshire SG3 6DQ
DESCRIPTION OF WORKS:	Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory

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:

N/A

SHORT SUMMARY:

Impact on listed building's special character – N/A

Impact on character and appearance of the conservation area –

The character of the conservation area can be summarised as follows.

An early 20th century co-operative housing development focused around Stockens Green, based on 'garden suburb' principles.

A co-partnership tenants' society was proposed as part of the Knebworth Garden Village to be built on land owned by the Earl of Lytton. The planning was entrusted to Mr Thomas Adams in consultation with Mr Edwin Lutyens (later to be knighted).

Further early 20th century houses associated with the growth of the new town of Knebworth. Buildings are two storeys arranged in pairs and short terraces, with details in the vernacular and Arts & Crafts manner.

The palette of building materials is red brick, with plain clay tile roofs; some of the elevations are rendered and painted white.

Houses are set in large gardens, with high beech hedges providing the boundary treatment to front gardens.

Open, green character created by Stockens Green and the green at the junction of Gun Lane.

Wide grass verges link these two spaces.

Visual links to open countryside to the west of the settlement

Impact on setting of heritage assets and how this affects significance – The proposal seeks to replace an existing conservation with a single storey rear extension on the same footprint but with more sympathetic materials to reflect the palette detailed above.

The location and setting of the proposal are not considered to cause harm to character of the conservation area as it is located to the rear of the property and will be built on the same footprint of the to be demolished conservatory.

Although the roof pitch will increase to accommodate plain tiles this is considered to be acceptable as will introduce materials that is more appropriate for this conservation area.

Although an Article 4 (2) is recommended the conservation appraisal as far as I am aware this did not materialise and therefore this application may not be required, However, conservation has been consulted and I have assessed the proposal based on the appraisal document.

Site Context:

Stockens Green lies on the western edge of Knebworth Village, separated from Old Knebworth by the A1 (M) to the west. Knebworth lies 3km south-west of the centre of Stevenage and 15km northwest of the county town of Hertford. London is only 40 km away. The conservation area has a rural setting to the west, of open fields bounded by native hedgerows and an urban setting of the town to the east. The London to Cambridge/Peterborough railway line runs parallel to the conservation area's eastern boundary, and an underpass connects Stockens Green to Knebworth Village which lies on the other side of the track. Within the conservation area the land rises gently from Gun Lane westwards to the green of Stockens Green.

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: 27.5.2026