



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2025

by Rachel Hall BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/Y/25/3367592

Bridge House, Daventry Road, Badby, West Northamptonshire NN11 3AB

- 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 Mrs K Brookes against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application reference is 2025/0528/LBC.
 - The works proposed are described as 'inserting internal door between sun room and playroom'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's decision notice refers to the requirements of section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (the Act). However, this section of the Act concerns 'whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting.' As this application and appeal concern 'whether to grant listed building consent for any works', the proposal requires to be assessed against section 16(2) of the Act. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis. As the requirements of sections 66(1) and 16(2) of the Act are the same, namely, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, I consider that no party has been prejudiced by this approach.
3. The main parties consider that the appeal barn is curtilage listed. I see no reason to conclude otherwise and have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The appeal property is the Grade II listed building known as "Bridge House and attached outhouse to rear" (Ref 1075270) (the LB). In that context, the main issue is whether the proposed works would preserve the LB, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

5. The LB was formerly a public house, now a residential house, of the late 18th century with early 19th century additions, in a vernacular style. It comprises a two storey building of coursed ironstone rubble and brick, with a tile roof. An attached outhouse to the rear comprises a single storey, barnlike structure that appears integral with the main house and contains accommodation in its roof space. The appeal barn is of a similar scale to the attached outhouse. Like the main house, it

also comprises stone with sections of brick infill. It is situated in close proximity to the main house and is accessed via its external door, opposite the door from the kitchen in the main house. It is thus closely associated with the main house and makes a positive contribution to the significance of the LB.

6. Accordingly, insofar as it relates to this appeal, the significance of the LB is primarily derived from its illustration of a late 18th century and early 19th century public house in a vernacular style. Important contributions are the use of traditional materials, historic fabric and the legibility of the historic function and hierarchy of the barn relative to the main building.
7. The proposed door would be inserted on the short elevation of the barn which is enclosed within the glass, sunroom structure that connects the main house and the barn. It would require the removal of a section of stone wall to accommodate a single, timber door with a timber frame and a stone lintel. Although more modest than a previous proposal¹ for insertion of a glazed double door here, and of more sympathetic materials, this would nonetheless result in an irrevocable loss of historic fabric, to the detriment of this designated heritage asset. In addition, by providing internal access into the barn from the sunroom, the proposal would alter the historic layout of the LB. This would diminish the building's historic plan form as a separate outbuilding, further subsuming the structure into the combined layout.
8. I accept that the barn's existing external door would be retained and other elevations would remain unchanged. Nonetheless, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent historic interest irrespective of the visibility of proposed changes.
9. Therefore, the proposed works would harm the historic integrity of the LB through loss of historic fabric and by eroding the separate, ancillary character of the barn. As a result, the proposal would harm the special interest of this designated heritage asset. I give these harms great weight in the planning balance of this appeal.
10. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification.
11. Given the scale of the works relative to the building as a whole, the harm to the LB would be at the lower end of less than substantial in this instance, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Where a proposal leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.
12. Enabling the barn to be accessed via the sunroom would make it more usable as a playroom for the current occupants, providing greater visual connectivity with the main house and avoiding the need to use its external door. However, I am not

¹ Application reference DA/2015/0965, dismissed at appeal.

persuaded that the barn is the only suitable space within the LB for use as the playroom. Moreover, alternative uses of the barn would be feasible without altering its historic fabric and layout. As such, no substantive evidence indicates that the continued viable use of the LB as a residential dwelling is dependent on the proposal.

13. It is submitted that the proposal would be more energy efficient, reducing the need to open external doors. I give significant weight to the need to support energy efficiency as required by paragraph 167 of the Framework. However, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal is the least harmful way of achieving better energy efficiency. Furthermore, paragraph 167 of the Framework does not disapply those parts of the Framework set out above or the need to give any resulting heritage harm great weight in the public benefit balance. In addition, given the scale of the works and that it relates to a single house, the extent to which it would represent an improvement to local housing stock would be limited.
14. Accordingly, public benefits arising from the proposal would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused. Therefore I conclude that, on balance, the proposed works would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the LB. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and paragraph 210(a) of the Framework. Insofar as relevant, the proposal would not accord with the requirement in Policies BN5 and S10 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) (December 2014) for designated heritage assets to be conserved.
15. The appellant has drawn attention to local decisions where internal links or door insertions have been permitted. In the absence of further details of these and the nature of the historic significance of the related buildings, those examples have not altered my reasoning. In any event, the appeal scheme must be assessed with specific regard to its effect on the significance of this listed building.

Conclusion

16. Given the above and considering all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachel Hall

INSPECTOR