



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/M2840/W/25/3368090

2 Loddington Road, Cransley NN14 1PY

- 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 & Mrs Dimmer against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
- The application Ref is NK/2025/0077.
- The development proposed is new dwelling and associated access.

Appeal B Ref: APP/M2840/Y/25/3368349

2 Loddington Road, Cransley NN14 1PY

- 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 & Mrs Dimmer against the decision of North Northamptonshire Council.
- The application Ref is NK/2025/0078.
- The works proposed are the same as Appeal A

Decisions

1. The appeals are both dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the special interest and setting of the Grade II listed building known as White Hill Farmhouse¹ and the character and appearance of Cransley Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. White Hill Farmhouse (2 Loddington Road) is a Grade II listed building dating from the late 18th century with mid-19th century rear wings. It is a long two storey ironstone property with a thatched main roof and brick chimneys. The front elevation faces onto Loddington Road behind a small front garden and low level brick wall, with several timber casement windows, a central entrance door, and a recently erected porch. An ironstone wall topped with clay ridge and pantiles runs diagonally northwards from the rear corner of the property to separate two parts of the garden. The wall is fixed to, and thus forms part of, the listed building. While its original purpose and demarcation is unclear, it appears comparable in age and materials to the main property and thus forms a positive part of the listed building.
4. The special interest and significance of the listed building is informed by its architectural and historic qualities as a large rural farmhouse but is also influenced by its setting. The property occupies a prominent position at the junction between Loddington Road and Church Lane and is clearly visible in approaches along both roads on the edge of the historic part of the village. A large gap to the bungalow to the north at 4 Loddington Road and the side road to the south known as Bridle

¹ List entry number 1213580

Way reinforces the prominence and standalone qualities of the property. Planning permission has been granted for a two storey dwelling on land between the property and No 4 but has not yet been implemented and would still maintain a reasonable gap on this side of the property. Thus, the setting of the listed building makes a positive contribution to its special interest and significance.

5. Cransley Conservation Area encompasses the historic part of the village from Loddington Road along Church Lane and into the countryside. The character and appearance of the conservation area is partly informed by the focal point of the above junction with the listed building and the Three Cranes Inn, and then sporadic historic buildings along Church Lane including Cransley Hall and St Andrew's Church. There is an overall sense of space and rurality within the conservation area that makes a positive contribution to its character and appearance as well as its significance.
6. The appeal site is within the grounds of the listed building and comprises the northernmost part of the property's garden with outbuildings and other ancillary structures. The front boundary of the site adjacent to Loddington Road is enclosed by a brick wall that does not appear to be particularly old. However, the site contains most of the ironstone wall that runs diagonally from the listed building. It also forms the remaining part of the gap to the north of the listed building, assuming the dwelling with planning permission gets built. Therefore, the site in its current form makes a positive contribution to the listed building and the conservation area.
7. The proposed detached dwelling would be of a similar height and design to the listed building and would be set further back from the road. However, it would erode a significant part of the remaining gap and would be sited only a few metres to the side of the listed building. Even without the permitted dwelling, the spacious setting that the listed building currently enjoys to this side would no longer exist. The openness of the street scene in this part of the conservation area would be diminished. The new dwelling would also result in the removal, at least in part, of the diagonal ironstone wall and a consequential loss of historic fabric from the listed building. Conversely, the removal of part of the front boundary brick wall for vehicular access would not lose any historic fabric or have a significant impact on the overall street scene.
8. Taken as a whole, the proposal would not preserve the special interest and setting of the listed building or the character and appearance of the conservation area, contrary to Sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It would also result in harm to the significance of the listed building and the conservation area. The harm would be less than substantial but still of moderate magnitude given the loss of gap and fabric.
9. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires great weight to be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset irrespective of the harm or loss. NPPF paragraph 213 requires clear and convincing justification for any harm or loss, while NPPF paragraph 215 requires less than substantial harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
10. The proposal would provide an additional dwelling to the local housing stock and some investment in local services and businesses. However, these public benefits are minor given that only one house would be created and so they carry little

weight. Thus, there are insufficient public benefits to outweigh the harm identified and no clear and convincing justification exists for the proposal.

11. In conclusion, the proposal in both appeals would have an adverse effect on the listed building and the conservation area with insufficient public benefits. Therefore, it would not accord with Policies 2, 8 and 11 (part 2b) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU1 and RS1(a) and (d) of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. Amongst other things, these policies seek to conserve heritage assets, respond to local character, and ensure that small scale infill development does not harm the character of the area and the surrounding settlement. The proposal would also not accord with NPPF paragraphs 212, 213 and 215.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge

INSPECTOR