



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2024

by K Stephens BSc (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M2840/Y/24/3342652

2 Ketton Road, Collyweston PE9 3PS

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr McKinney against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is NE/23/00520/LBC.
 - The works proposed are single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I see from the submitted evidence that a planning application was also determined by the Council, but an appeal was not lodged in time. For the avoidance of doubt, my considerations and conclusions relate solely to the application for listed building consent.
3. During the course of the appeal a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2023. However, as any policies in the Framework that are material to this decision have not fundamentally changed, I am satisfied that neither party would be prejudiced by my consideration of the revised Framework in reaching my decision.
4. Following determination of the application, the East Northamptonshire Local Plan Part 2 (the 'Local Plan') was adopted in December 2023. The parties have had the opportunity to comment. It has been confirmed that new Local Plan Policy EN12 is relevant, and that Policy 2 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031¹ (the Core Strategy) has not been superseded and is still relevant.
5. 2 Ketton Road (No.2) is one of a number of outbuildings that are historically associated with Manor Farmhouse, which is a Grade II listed building. Having regard to this association, as well as the appeal property's location and age, by virtue of section 1(5)(b) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), it should "be treated as part of the listed building" of Manor Farmhouse. I have determined the appeal on this basis, having regard to the statutory duty set out in section 16(2) of the Act.
6. The appeal property is also located within the Collyweston Conservation Area (the CCA). The effects on the character and appearance of the CCA are not part

¹ Adopted July 2016

of the Council's reason for refusal. However, as decision maker in exercising the statutory duty set out under section 72(1) of the Act, I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The parties were given an opportunity to comment on this matter and I have taken any comments received into account in my determination of the appeal. I am satisfied that their interests are not prejudiced by this approach.

Main Issues

7. In light of the above, the main issues in this appeal are whether the proposed works would:
- preserve the Grade II listed building, Manor Farmhouse; and
 - preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CCA.

Reasons

Special interest and significance of the heritage assets

8. Manor Farmhouse is a Grade II listed building that fronts Back Lane. According to the official listing² Manor Farmhouse dates from the mid/late 17th century with 19th century additions. It is two storeys and built of square coursed limestone, part rendered and with a Collyweston stone slate roof.
9. No.2 is a simple, linear two-storey stone barn with stone slate roof. It is also of traditional construction and materials. It is physically attached to an adjacent range of stone barns, which are in part on higher ground to the rear of Manor Farmhouse. The linear arrangement of the other adjacent buildings, together with an outbuilding and tall stone boundary wall to the south, create an enclosed and secluded garden area for No.2. Whilst the building has been converted into residential use, the simple lines, strong linear form, simple wooden door and windows which are limited giving a high solid to void ratio, and retention of historic features ensure that its former agricultural use is still largely legible, despite the creation of a garden and presence of domestic paraphernalia.
10. From the evidence and my own observations I find the special interest and significance of Manor Farmhouse is largely derived from a combination of its historic and architectural interests, with the building's age, surviving historic fabric, use of traditional construction and materials being important contributors to its significance. It also has group value with the other outbuildings, including No.2, as an example of a village farmstead with an associated range of former stone farm buildings. No.2 therefore contributes to the overall historic significance of Manor Farmhouse.
11. Manor Farmhouse and No.2 are also located within the CCA, which covers the older part of the village centred around St Andrews Church, High Street, New Road and Back Lane (which becomes Ketton Road). From my site visit observations, the character and appearance and thus special interest and significance of the CCA, insofar as it relates to this appeal, is derived principally from the preservation and legibility of the village's historic street pattern and open spaces, and the architectural richness and variety of its historic buildings.

² National Heritage List for England: list entry number 1191691

The use of local traditional materials and methods of construction, and buildings of different designs, uses and sizes contribute to it and reflect the growth of Collyweston and its agrarian surroundings. Manor Farmhouse, the former barns and No.2 all positively contribute to the character and appearance of the CCA as a whole, and thereby to its significance as a designated heritage asset.

Appeal proposal and effects

12. The proposed works would involve the erection of a contemporary style single storey, flat roofed extension. It would project off the side, south elevation leading off the living room close to the corner with the horizontal range building. The existing French doors from the living room into the garden would remain to give access into the extension, which would be built around them.
13. The extension would have large panels of full-height double-glazing on all sides, set in aluminium framed units shown coloured grey on the plans. The flat roof would have a raised central glazed lantern. Glazing can often be used to create light-weight structures and indicate junctions between older and new building fabric. The contemporary design used in this proposal is relatively simple in its form and detailing and would be legible as a modern phase of intervention. The fully glazed sides would allow the historic stone wall of the converted barn to still be seen.
14. However, the proposed extension would introduce large vertical expanses of full-height glazing that would disrupt the solid-to-void ratio of the building and appear visually at odds with the limited number of small windows. The extension would be visually disruptive to the existing blank west elevation of the adjoining barn it would extend in front of. Whilst there is a flower bed and vegetation against part of the west elevation, the simplicity of the blank elevation would be lost. The introduction of aluminium window frames would introduce modern materials and create a more industrial intervention that would fail to reflect the simple existing wooden openings of a former agricultural building. This would reduce the building's authenticity and hence the mix of traditional and contemporary design and materials would not sit comfortably against the building and its surroundings.
15. In addition to matters of detail, there is the size and form of the extension. It would project out from the building into the garden by about 3.8 metres and would have a width of about 5 metres. This would appear as a sizeable glass block that would visually disrupt the simple linear form of the building and its surroundings. Furthermore, furniture and likely window dressings that would be placed inside the extension would domesticate the appearance of the former agricultural building.
16. The appellant contends that the extension would be reversible. Theoretically that might be the case, but I consider it highly unlikely. In any event, the extension would cause harm whilst it is in situ for the reasons already set out. Whilst the extension would occupy what is currently an outside patio with seating area and timber gazebo, these are temporary, can easily be removed and are not attached to the building.
17. According to the appellant the extension would cause limited harm to any original fabric. However, no details or sections have been provided to show

how the extension would be physically attached and secured to the side of the building and how it would be reversible. I have considered whether I could impose conditions controlling these details, and other construction and joinery details, as suggested by the appellant. However, in my view the omitted information goes to the heart of understanding the proposed works, the impact on the historic fabric and any effects they may have on the special interest and significance of the listed building. Therefore, it would not be acceptable to leave such matters to condition.

18. I have no reason to doubt the extension would be built to a high quality. However, the size, siting and form of the proposed extension together with use of non-traditional materials would represent an unsuitable addition to No.2 and diminish its contribution to the special interest and significance in terms of its group value. As such the extension would fail to preserve the listed building, Manor Farmhouse.
19. I accept that the extension would not be visible from the public highway, street scene or neighbouring dwellings. Nevertheless, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not close public views of the building can be gained.
20. The listed building, incorporating the former outbuildings, is one of a number of listed buildings within the CCA, and as such is an integral and important element of its character and appearance. It follows that the harmful effects I have identified to the heritage interests of the listed building would diminish the contribution it makes to the CCA, even if not visible from beyond the site. As a result the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CCA as a whole and would result in some residual harm to its significance.
21. My attention has been drawn to a number of contemporary extensions that have been allowed on other listed buildings. They demonstrate that alterations and changes can be managed to heritage assets when appropriately designed and detailed, and indeed No.2 has been converted to a dwelling. However, the examples are of buildings with different forms and contexts and hence no direct comparison can be made with the appeal proposal before me. In any event, I must consider the appeal on its own merits.

Public benefits and heritage balance

22. Paragraph 205 of the Framework states that 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.
23. With reference to paragraphs 207 and 208, in finding harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given the nature and extent of the proposed extension I find the harm to both the significance of the listed building and CCA would be 'less than substantial'. Nonetheless these harms carry considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, paragraph 208 of the Framework requires the harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use.
24. There would be some economic benefits to the wider local economy from jobs during the construction phase, but this would be modest considering the scale

of the extension. Public benefits can also include works to a designated heritage asset to help secure its future. However, there is no substantive evidence before me that demonstrates that the proposed extension is necessary to secure the continued use of No.2 as a dwelling and the contribution it makes to the heritage merit of Manor Farmhouse.

25. There would be some improvement to the living accommodation for the benefit of the appellant and their family, and the size of the extension has been guided by their wishes for a viable and usable space, which a smaller extension would not deliver. However, this does not amount to a public benefit.
26. Overall, the weight I ascribe to the limited public benefits is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight I attach to the harm that would be caused to the significance of the listed building and the CCA from the proposed extension. Accordingly the proposal would fail to preserve the Grade II listed building, Manor Farmhouse, and would not preserve or enhance the character of the CCA. The proposal thus fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the provisions of the Framework.
27. Listed building appeals are not subject to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Therefore development plan policies do not carry the same weight as when considering planning applications. Nevertheless, the Council refers to them and so the proposed works would not comply with Core Strategy Policy 2(a) and (b) and new Local Plan Policy EN12. Collectively these seek, amongst other things, to protect, preserve and where possible enhance the distinctive North Northamptonshire historic environment and the significance of heritage assets and ensure that proposals complement their surrounding historic environment through form, scale, design and materials.

Other Matters

28. I am aware that the appellants have sought to revise the proposal over time with the submission of previous applications. However, I must deal with the appeal on the basis of the scheme before me.
29. I acknowledge the appellant's concerns with the Council's handling of the application and previous ones, but in reaching my decision I have been concerned only with the merits of the case.
30. The lack of representations from local residents, the Parish Council or Historic England does not diminish the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

31. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

K Stephens
INSPECTOR