



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 21 January 2025

by **H Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/W2845/W/24/3351428

Warwick House, The Woodlands, Staverton, West Northamptonshire NN11 6JN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Plaskett against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/1332/FULL.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey extension to rear together with alterations.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W2845/Y/24/3350957

Warwick House, The Woodlands, Staverton, West Northamptonshire NN11 6JN

- 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 and Mrs Plaskett against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/1801/LBC.
 - The works proposed are for a single storey extension to rear together with alterations.
-

Decisions

1. **Appeal A** is dismissed.
2. **Appeal B** is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the proposal relates to a listed building which is within a conservation area, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).
4. The two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.
5. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was published in December 2024 after the Council made its decisions. I have had regard to the revised Framework in reaching my decisions.
6. The appeals seek planning permission and listed building consent for a single storey rear extension, serving a dining room and shower room. At my site visit I saw that a single storey extension to the rear of the appeal property had been constructed on site. However, as I cannot be certain that what has been built is fully in accordance with the plans before me, I have assessed the development and works as shown on the submitted plans.
7. A previous scheme was approved in 2020 (Refs: DA/2020/0494 and DA/2020/0495) for a single storey rear extension measuring approximately 7.5m in length and 3.5m in width with a single rooflight. However, the main parties agree

that what has been built on site has not been built in accordance with the approved plans. Based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to disagree.

Main Issue

8. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

9. The appeal site comprises a Grade II listed¹ building known as Warwick House, dating from the 18th Century. It is a detached two-storey dwelling with 3 bays, constructed from coursed ironstone and limestone rubble and set under a thatched roof with brick stacks. The main entrance is in the central bay and has a 20th Century gable stone porch with a wooden panel part-glazed front door. The front elevation has three 2-light casement windows with wood lintels at ground floor level, and three 2-light casement windows set under thatched eaves at first floor level. To the right of the main building is a single storey side extension built of ironstone with a slate gable roof.
10. The rear of the building is also constructed from coursed ironstone and limestone rubble and has a symmetrical arrangement of three 2-light casement windows set under thatched eaves at first floor level. The dwelling has extensive grounds to the front and an enclosed garden to the rear.
11. Based on the listing description and what I observed during my site visit together with the evidence put forward, I find that the special interest and significance of this heritage asset largely derives from its historic and architectural interests. These are drawn from its illustration of 18th Century domestic rural architecture along with its simplicity of its historic form, which remains evident despite the later addition of the side extension. The local building materials and building style are reflected in, amongst other characteristics, the thatched roof, and with regard to external walls, the high proportion of stone in relation to window openings.

Proposal and effects

12. The proposal would be a flat-roofed single-storey rear extension extending over two thirds of the appeal building's rear elevation. Such scale and massing would dominate the rear elevation, obscuring historic fabric and upsetting the balance and rhythm of the building's design. Its presence would overwhelm the listed building and detract from its traditional character and historic form.
13. Furthermore, the proposal's large glazing panels would be a distinctly modern design element that would contrast sharply with the traditional materials of the listed building. Its reflective surfaces would visually compete with the traditional fabric of the building, disrupting its visual coherence and eroding its architectural integrity.
14. Consequently, the proposal would introduce a discordant feature that would draw attention away from the historic features of the building's rear elevation to the

¹ List Entry Number: 1077014 – Warwick House, Grade II

detriment of the designated heritage asset. It would therefore unacceptably harm the listed building.

15. The proposal's two rooflights would be of modest scale and proportions and would be set flat within the extension's roofscape. As such, they would not appear as dominant features. The materials used for the proposal, such as ironstone, would be similar to the materials currently present on the listed building. Nevertheless, these acceptable aspects of the proposal would not justify the harm identified above.
16. The proposal would not be visible in views from the front of the property and the road serving The Woodlands. However, views of the proposal would still be possible from within the site itself. Furthermore, considering that listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest, irrespective of whether or not public views of the proposal would be available, the limiting of public views would not negate the identified harm.
17. The previous planning permission and listed building consent (Refs: DA/2020/0494 and DA/2020/0495) would include a flat roof extension with glazing panels. However, the footprint of the previously approved extension would be smaller than that of the proposed design and would incorporate fewer glazing elements. In contrast, the larger scale of the proposed extension, with its extensive span of glazing panels, would create a visually dominant feature that fails to integrate harmoniously with the historic building.
18. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would not preserve the Grade II listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In doing so, it would harm the significance of this designated heritage asset.

Public benefits and balance

19. With reference to paragraphs 214 and 215 of the Framework, in finding harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given the extent and fairly localised nature of the proposal, I find that the harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset assessed above would be 'less than substantial' but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use.
20. In this case, economic benefits would be delivered through the manufacturing and construction phase and the general investment into the property, and support to local services. However, these outcomes would be moderated by the extent of the scheme, but still weigh in favour of the appeals.
21. I also acknowledge that the unsightly flat roofed lavatory outshut that was positioned to the rear of the property has been removed from the site. However, any benefit arising from this would be lost by its replacement with the proposed extension.
22. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the property would not be usable or viable as a dwelling or that its future would be at risk if the appeals were to fail and the development and works as proposed were not implemented. Additionally,

given the previous approved scheme (Refs: DA/2020/0494 and DA/2020/0495), it has been demonstrated that the same benefits could be secured by an alternative, more modest scheme. In these respects, the identified harm to the significance of the listed building has not been clearly and convincingly justified as required by paragraph 213 of the Framework.

23. On balance, in giving considerable importance and weight to the harm to the significance of the listed building, I find that this would not be outweighed by the limited public benefits arising from the proposal.
24. I conclude that the proposal would not preserve the Grade II listed building, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. It would therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment.
25. It would also conflict with Policy BN5 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) (adopted 2014), and Policies ENV7 and ENV10 of the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Part 2) for Daventry District 2011-2029 (adopted 2020). Collectively, these policies amongst other things, seek to ensure developments conserve and enhance heritage assets, including their settings, and is of high quality design which reinforces local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

26. The appeal site is located within the Staverton Conservation Area (CA). Mindful of the statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Act, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance. The Staverton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (adopted 2019), states that the special interest of Staverton includes its interesting settlement form with its nucleated and irregular street pattern to the west and more dispersed form to the east, its strong local vernacular architecture, and the contrasting character of the conservation area around The Woodlands and Well Lane, where there is a sparsity of buildings and the land is predominantly wooded areas and pasture enclosed with hedges. The special interest and significance of the CA mainly stems from the varying ages and architectural styles of its buildings that reflect the evolution of the village.
27. The appeal listed building largely retains its overall external historic character and detailing and therefore makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and thereby to its significance as a designated heritage asset.
28. Given the limited scale of the proposal and its siting to the rear of the property, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and would not harm its significance as a designated heritage asset.
29. The appeal site sits alongside two other Grade II listed properties, known as Avon Cottage and Well Cottage. These properties are of a similar size and character to the appeal property. However, given the location and extent of the proposal, the settings of these listed buildings would be preserved, and the proposal would not detract from them. This would meet the requirements of section 66(1) of the Act; the provisions of the Framework regarding the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment; and the policies referred to above. I note the Council raised no concerns in this respect either.

30. The proposal would not result in unacceptable adverse impacts on the living conditions of any neighbouring occupiers. I note the letter of support from Staverton Parish Council, and I also acknowledge that there were no objections to the proposal from Historic England. Nevertheless, these would be neutral considerations and do not weigh in favour of the proposal.
31. The appellant has raised concern that the Council's Conservation Officer may not have inspected the site in person. However, this is a matter between the main parties and is not relevant to my determination of these appeals, which is based upon the evidence before me and my own site observations.
32. My attention has been drawn to existing rear extensions on other dwellings at the Woodlands, as well as other modern garden features and structures. However, I have not been presented with the full details of these other extensions and structures. Therefore, the circumstances which led to these other developments being constructed are not before me. I have determined these appeals on their own merits based on the evidence before me and my observations on site.

Conclusions

33. **Appeal A:** The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.
34. **Appeal B:** For the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

H Smith

INSPECTOR