
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 9 September 2025

by **Samuel Watson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/J3720/W/25/3369462

Lock Cottage, Folly Lane, Napton, Warwickshire CV47 8NZ

- 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 Nigel Wood against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00046/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the enclosure of existing porch and canopy to domestic dwelling.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/J3720/Y/25/3369461

Lock Cottage, Folly Lane, Napton, Warwickshire CV47 8NZ

- 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 Nigel Wood against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00032/LBC.
 - The works proposed are the enclosure of existing porch and canopy.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed and listed building consent is refused for the enclosure of existing porch and canopy.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the appeal relates to a listed building, I have taken account of Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the architectural and historic interest of a Grade II listed building¹.

Reasons

5. The host building is a detached, two-storey dwelling formed of three bays originating from the late 1700s or early 1800s. It is sat close, but perpendicular, to the canal and its associated lock. On the other side of the building, and on lower land, is what I understand to have been the former stable that has been converted for domestic use. Facing the bridge that provides access to the site and nearby Folly public house,

¹ Napton Bottom Lock Cottage and Stable (List Entry Number 1185502)

the dwelling has a small brick extension with a lean-to roof and, a larger open porch made of sizeable timbers and raised up by a rendered brick platform. On the opposite side of the dwelling is a small storm porch, in timber, and a brick projection with a catslide roof that links into the former stable. Although the building is sizeable and prominent, its decoration is limited and so it presents in form and appearance as a simple dwelling. The significance of this building stems, in part, from its age, the legibility of the building's historic form and appearance, and that it is still well related to the operational canal.

6. The large porch on the front elevation of the dwelling, although made of somewhat bulkier materials, is lightweight in relation to the building as a whole. As it does not have any walls, the porch allows views of the host building, its materials and historic form. Therefore, while its construction method is anachronistic for the age of the property, it nevertheless has a neutral contribution to the listed building.

7. However, infilling the walls would result in a significantly bulkier, and therefore more prominent, feature readily visible from public vantages. Enclosing this space would also block views of the building's form which would be further confused by the use of brickwork as part of the infilling material. Collectively this would erode the simple appearance and form of the listed building to the detriment of its historic interest and significance. It has been submitted that the proposed windows would match the existing windows on the host building. As very little information has been provided, I cannot be certain that these windows would be appropriate. In particular, should the windows directly reflect the existing ones it may confuse any reading of the building by suggesting that the porch is contemporary to the host building.

8. Overall, the proposal would adversely affect the appearance of the building and its understanding from prominent and important views. However, it would not harm the building's relationship with the canal or muddy any understanding of its historic use as a lock keeper's cottage. Nevertheless, the proposal would still result in harm to the significance and interest of the listed building.

9. The submissions before me show that there was previously an extension on this elevation. However, the details are limited, and the extension was removed at some point, and has not been present for some significant time. This removal also contributes to building's story and so this former extension does not, in itself justify the proposal before me.

10. Nevertheless, against this background I find that a modest level of less than substantial harm to the significance of Grade II listed lock keeper's cottage would occur. Although less than substantial the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is clear that great weight should be given to any asset's conservation. Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

11. Through the hiring of contractors and the purchasing of materials, the proposal would result in a small and time-limited economic benefit during the construction phase. It would also improve the quality of accommodation at the dwelling which, in turn, would modestly benefit the local housing stock. These improvements would be public benefits, however, given the scale of the development they would, at most be modest.

12. However, it is not clear that there would be any environmental benefits stemming from the enclosure of the porch. In part as it has not been demonstrated how the proposal would improve the thermal efficiency of the dwelling, nor that alternative

methods could not be carried out to this end. I am also mindful that the proposal would create a new area that would require heating. I do not, therefore, find this to be a public benefit supportive of the scheme.

13. I have afforded modest weight to the public benefits identified above. In the circumstances of this appeal, they do not outweigh the great weight given the harm to the designated heritage asset.

14. The proposal would result in harm to the significance of the Grade II listed building, and no public benefits have been demonstrated that outweigh this harm. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies CS.8 and CS.9 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy (the DCS) and Policy 7 of the Napton-on-the-Hill Neighbourhood Development Plan (the NDP). These policies, amongst other things, require proposals to be of a high-quality design that enhances the sense of place, respects historic canal structures and protects the historic environment through appropriate materials and design. It also conflicts with the guidance set out within the Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) under Part E which sets out how fully enclosed porches should be avoided. The proposal also conflicts with Chapter 16 of the Framework, including Paragraphs 208 and 215 which identify heritage assets as an irreplaceable resource whose significance should be accounted for and conserved.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, both appeals A and B should be dismissed.

Samuel Watson

INSPECTOR