



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 13 May 2021

by JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th June 2021

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y2810/Y/21/3269057

1 High Street, Clipston LE16 9RU

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Andy Blake against the decision of Daventry District Council.
 - The application Ref DA/2020/0528, dated 30 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2020.
 - The works proposed are the construction of glazed link between dwelling and outbuilding including internal alterations to outbuilding.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y2810/W/21/3269058

1 High Street, Clipston LE16 9RU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Andy Blake against the decision of Daventry District Council.
 - The application Ref DA/2020/0527, dated 30 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of glazed link between dwelling and outbuilding including internal alterations to outbuilding.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issues

3. The main issues in relation to these 2 appeals are the effect of the works on the special architectural and historic interest of this Grade II listed building, whether they would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Clispton Conservation Area, and whether they would harm the significance of either of these designated heritage assets.

Reasons

4. These appeals concern a detached dwelling that appears to date from the mid-18th Century, and was once part of a much larger building. Its historic

detailing, its materials, its simple footprint and its external appearance, all assist in understanding its history, as does the evidence of the extensive alteration and change it has undergone over the years that is clearly apparent in its elevations. These factors therefore contribute to its significance as a designated heritage asset and play an important role in its special architectural and historic interest.

5. The proposed glass link would be 5-5.5m long and connect a relatively modern extension on the rear of the dwelling to a sizeable detached brick outbuilding to the side. This outbuilding has already been converted to ancillary accommodation and the proposal would allow it to be accessed from the house without going outside.
6. Although a doorway would be formed from the dwelling to access the link, that would be in the side wall of the recent rear extension and so there would be no harm to the historic fabric of the building.
7. The link itself would appear frameless and so when seen from the outside it would be entirely of glazing. I accept that the precise specification of the glass and construction method could be agreed to ensure it was as transparent as possible. Similarly, a condition could prevent the installation of any attachments to the glazing (such as window catches, door handles or hinges) and lighting within the link could also be avoided.
8. Despite these measures, the structure would still be apparent to some degree when looking from the front and the rear, and it would appear as a distinctly modern addition. Whilst that means it would be clearly differentiated from the older parts of the property, I nonetheless consider that it would sit uncomfortably with this historic building because of its materials and its angular form. Furthermore, despite its highly transparent nature, it would erode the sense of separation that is currently found between the outbuilding and the dwelling itself, so adversely affecting the composition on site. For these reasons I therefore find the proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the building, and would cause harm, albeit less than substantial, to its significance.
9. In reaching this view I have noted the support for the case from the Ancient Monuments Society (mistakenly attributed to the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings in the Officer Report). However, for the reasons given above I do not share its position.
10. Turning to the Clipston Conservation Area, this has been designated since the applications subject of these appeals were dismissed. However, under the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) and section 72 of the Act I am still required to assess the effect of the scheme on its significance and whether it would preserve or enhance its character or appearance.
11. The conservation area contains an attractive and pleasing range of older buildings of a variety of ages and styles, with few modern or discordant elements. When these are considered with the road layout and the intervening spaces, the character and appearance of the conservation area reflect the informal evolution of this historic rural settlement that is such an important part of its significance. Being prominently located at a key junction, the appeal property, with its historic character and detailing, adds positively to this.

12. Despite the hedge and walling, and again noting the measures designed to make it as transparent as possible, the proposal would nonetheless be visible to some degree to the side of the dwelling at certain times of the year when looking from the front. Again, I consider its materials and its angular form would result in it being an unduly apparent and incongruous element that would be at odds with the built form around and sit uncomfortably in this historic setting. As such, the scheme would not preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area, causing less than substantial harm to its significance.
13. The Framework says that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, with any harm to its significance requiring clear and convincing justification. It adds that if less than substantial harm is identified, it should be weighed against the scheme's public benefits.
14. In this instance the only public benefit cited has been with regard to increasing the size of the dwelling. I acknowledge that the floorspace available in the dwelling itself is, at present, limited. However, I also have no reason to consider the property cannot continue to function adequately as a house, and am aware that the outbuilding already provides some accommodation, albeit with no internal connection to the main building. On balance, I am therefore not satisfied that creating a link to the outbuilding is a public benefit sufficient to outweigh the harm it would cause to the significance of the listed building or the conservation area.
15. Accordingly I conclude that the works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of this Grade II listed building, and would also not preserve the character or appearance of the Clipston Conservation Area, causing less than substantial harm to the significance of both of these designated heritage assets. In the absence of any public benefits to outweigh this harm, the works would therefore conflict with Policy BN5 of the *West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan* and Policies ENV7 and ENV10 of the *Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2) for Daventry District* which together seek development of a high quality that will safeguard and sustain local distinctiveness and the significance of the historic environment, as well as guidance in the Framework.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given I therefore conclude both appeals should be dismissed.

JP Sargent

INSPECTOR