



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by **OS Woodward MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/Y/25/3365764

27 Church Street, Cogenhoe, Northampton, NN7 1LS

- 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 Mark and Pam Haynes against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/4562/LBC.
 - The works proposed are demolition of existing rear conservatory and replacement with new
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Because the appeal relates to a refusal to grant listed building consent and the appeal site lies within a conservation area, I have had special regard to Sections 16(2) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether or not the proposal preserves the Grade II listed building ‘Shepstone House’¹ or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and,
 - whether or not the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cogenhoe Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

Significance

Listed building

4. The building is a house. The original part is in limestone with a slate roof, originally constructed in the 18th-Century (18th-C), in a vernacular style. It is two storeys although with a tall, gabled roof. A large part of the significance of the building lies in this original part of the house, in particular its surviving historic fabric, age, and as an attractive example of early 18th-C vernacular architecture.
5. The building has been extended at various times. There is a 19th-C rear wing extension which creates an ‘L’-plan form. This uses appropriate limestone material

¹ List entry number 1189983

and is subservient to the original part of the building because it is only one storey, albeit also with a tall roof. Nevertheless, the rear wing extension remains as a subservient extension because it is shorter than the original part of the building and is narrow. The extension also has architectural and historic interest in its own right due to its age and from it creating the 'L'-plan. Therefore, despite the use of pantiles rather than slates to its roof, this part of the building positively contributes to its significance.

6. There is a single-storey side extension to the front elevation, which has garage doors and is used as such, or as an incidental storage area. This is constructed of limestone to match the original building, but with pantiles to its roof. It is unclear from the evidence when this was constructed. However, it uses appropriate limestone material and has a significantly smaller footprint than the main part of the building and is significantly shorter, at only one storey. It therefore remains subservient to the original part of the property. Overall, it is a neutral contributor to the significance of the building.
7. Of particular relevance to the proposed works, there are also two modern² additions to the rear of the property, on the inside corner of the 'L'-plan. The largest is attached to the original rear elevation of the 18th-C element of the property. It is made of limestone, although cut to narrower and smaller sizes than the stone used on the original property. It has a large expanse of glazing with a horizontal emphasis and with individual panes of glass which are much larger than those used on the windows to the historic part of the house. The roof has a shallow slope. What appears to be an original door opening in the rear elevation has been retained, along with internal doors. This partially separates the internal space created by the extension from the original rooms in the historic part of the house. Nevertheless, the combination of its size and the excessive and poorly design glazing detract from the significance of the property.
8. The other extension is to the 19th-C rear wing. Internally, the space it has created has been subsumed into a kitchen but any effects on the layout of the building are limited because of the small size of the extension. Externally, there is a pitched roof made from pantiles, but at a shallower angle than the main roof of the wing extension above. The roof is successful because of the use of the same materials and the way the two different roof slopes join, and therefore frame, just below the corner of the window to the first floor of the original part of the building. However, there is extensive glazing in a horizontal band sitting just below the eaves and running down approximately half the height of the walls of the extension. Similarly to the large extension, this level and type of glazing detracts from the significance of the property.
9. The two extensions are separate but very close to one another and a small gap is retained between the extensions. This causes further harm to the significance of building from the awkward relationship between the two.

Conservation area

10. The CA covers the historic core of the village. Insofar as relevant to the proposed works, its key characteristics include limestone, vernacular buildings and the expansion of the village in the 19th-C due to the railway. The appeal property

² Possibly from the 1970s although the evidence is not clear

demonstrates both these features, as it is an attractive and historically important listed limestone, vernacular property which was significantly extended in the 19th-C. Its front elevation is also prominent, fronting one of the main roads in the village. The building therefore positively contributes to the character and appearance of the CA. The rear elevations and courtyard area of the building are not visible from public areas, and contribute little either way to its significance, other than through their own intrinsic architectural and historic value.

Assessment

Listed building

11. It is proposed to demolish both existing modern rear extensions. As set out above, the existing extensions detract from the significance of the listed building. The proposed demolition of both structures would therefore be acceptable in-principle and would, in isolation, enhance the property. However, this is subject to considering what is to replace them.
12. In this regard, the proposed replacement extension fully connects across the inside corner of the 'L'-plan. This would be harmful to this layout by directly linking the original and 19th-C elements of the building across an internal courtyard corner, removing the current separation of these two, distinct elements of the building. The main rear walls of the 18th-C part of the building would remain, albeit with the internal doors removed. However, the kitchen/garden room that would be created would be large in comparison to the size of the retained existing living areas, and would dominate the layout. This would also be harmful.
13. Externally, the extension would have a flat roof, in contrast to the steep slopes of the main building, and 19th-C and side extensions. It would also have a top heavy structure with a wide band of limestone to the upper part of the extension, creating a horizontal emphasis at odds with the rear elevation of the original part of the building. It would, therefore, not be subservient to the original or 19th-C wing extension to the building.
14. The roof, by being flat and above the eaves, would also have an uncomfortable relationship to existing sloped roof to the 19th-C wing extension. This is a fundamental principle of it being a large flat roof above the existing eaves line, and this relationship could not be successfully resolved by condition or detailed design.
15. Extensive glazing is proposed. It would partially mimic the pattern of glazing bars used to the front elevation of the original part of the building. However, large parts of both elevations of the extension would be glazed and without limestone separating the individual windows, which does not reflect the original building. The individual panes of glass would also be much larger than on the existing building. Whilst the amount of glazing would allow a certain degree of visibility of the retained original wall of the main house, this does not overcome the harm caused by the inappropriate introduction of such large amounts of glazing.
16. The proposal would be clearly legible as a modern addition to the building. However, this does not overcome the fundamental issues with the design, materiality and effects on the layout of the building that I have set out above.

Conservation area

17. The proposed works are all to the rear of the building, in the courtyard area. As set out above, this would not be visible from the public realm. However, the intrinsic harm to the listed building, including to facets of the building that particularly link the building to the significance of the CA such as it being a high quality vernacular building from the 18th-C with a 19th-C extension, would still harm the character and appearance of the CA, albeit only to a limited degree.

Overall

18. Given the above, and particularly because of the harm to layout, top-heavy structure, poor relationship of the proposed roof to the 19th-C roof, extensive glazing, and excessively sized panes, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the Grade II listed building. I assess the level of harm to be less than substantial, towards the lower end of this scale. It would also fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. I assess the level of harm to be less than substantial, at the lower end of this scale. The proposal thus fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act, Paragraph 210 of the Framework and development plan policies insofar as relevant.
19. 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. In this regard, the proposal fails to comply with Policies BN5 and R1 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) 2014, Policies SS2 and HE5 of the South Northamptonshire Part 2 Local Plan 2011-2029, and Chapter 4 of the South Northamptonshire Design Guide. Individually and cumulatively, these policies and the Design Guide reflect the Act and the guidance in the Framework with regard to heritage assets, and require high quality design.

Planning Balance

20. In accordance with Paragraph 212 of the Framework, I place great weight on the conservation of designated heritage assets. Although less than substantial, I place considerable importance and weight on the harm that I have identified to the listed building and the CA. As set out at Paragraph 215 of the Framework, where there is less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
21. As set out above, the removal of the existing extensions would be a positive aspect of the proposal. The appellant has stated that relocating and remodelling the kitchen would resolve issues of damp and condensation, therefore preventing harm to historic fabric. However, no specific evidence is provided of damp or of damage to historic fabric. In addition, such matters could be treated in other ways and without involving the proposed extension. The proposed extension would also create more floorspace for the house, including a more open-plan kitchen area. Whilst this would be a benefit, the existing home already provides several different living areas to the ground floor, and any such benefit would therefore be limited. It is also only of very limited public value, other than as an improvement to the useability of one home in the housing stock.

22. I therefore place limited weight on the positive factors, and the harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets that I have identified clearly outweighs the limited public benefits.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

O S Woodward
INSPECTOR