



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/W2845/W/25/3372667

3 High Street, Blisworth, West Northamptonshire, NN7 3BJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Ms Leona Bateman against West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1955/FULL.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing glazed canopy and construction of fully glazed extension to rear.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W2845/Y/25/3372666

3 High Street, Blisworth, West Northamptonshire, NN7 3BJ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Leona Bateman against West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1956/LBC.
 - The works proposed are removal of existing glazed canopy and construction of fully glazed extension to rear.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. This appeal is dismissed, and planning permission is refused.

Appeal B

2. This appeal is dismissed, and listed building consent is refused.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeals relate to the same site and the same scheme. Unless stated otherwise, and despite the differences in the planning permission and listed building consent regimes, I have dealt with both appeals together. This is to avoid unnecessary repetition.
4. Within the reasoning of this decision letter, the II* listed building on the appeal site is referred to as Stoneacre, which is the name given to it on the official list entry¹. The appeal site is also within the Blisworth Conservation Area (the CA).
5. Although neither application was determined by the Council, delegated reports have been provided for both. These contain the Council's recommended reasons

¹ Official list entry number: 1189162

for the refusal of both applications, and they have been used to inform the main issue in these appeals.

6. In the Council's delegated report that relates to Appeal B, references are made to the requirements of section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 (the Act). However, this section of the Act relates to 'whether to grant planning permission or permission in principle for development which affects a listed building or its setting'. Consequently, in reaching my decisions, I have exercised my statutory duties under sections 66(1) - for appeal A, 16(2) - for Appeal B, and 72(1) – for both appeals, of the Act.
7. The proposed development and works include the removal of an existing glazed canopy. However, from the evidence before me, I am not satisfied that this canopy - which is affixed to Stoneacre, is authorised. That being the case, the effect of the removal of this feature does not carry any weight in my assessment of the effects of the scheme or when undertaking the heritage balance.

Main Issue

8. The main issue is whether the scheme would i) preserve the Grade II* listed building - Stoneacre, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and ii) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Blisworth Conservation Area.

Reasons

Special interest / significance

9. The evidence indicates that the detached house at Stoneacre, which has a gable end facing High Street, originally dates from the early to mid-17th century and that it was extended in the 18th century. Its external walls are constructed of coursed limestone rubble with distinctive ironstone banding, and it has a fairly steep-pitched thatched roof to its main part, with a front eyebrow dormer. The front of the building also has a greater number of windows that are more regularly arranged, than those on the rear of the building. As a result, there is a clear primacy to the front elevation of the building.
10. The building has been subject of repairs and alterations over time, and a small rear porch-type structure has been rebuilt and enlarged in recent years. However, the exterior of the main part of the building retains much of its early character, and the integrity of its early single-depth plan form remains clearly legible. Moreover, the generally well-preserved early external walls, and the early pattern and design detailing of the fenestration to the front and side elevations, appear to have been largely retained and/or respected in later works. Partly for these reasons, the building has a more than special historic and architectural interest, from which its Grade II* listing, as a designated heritage asset of the highest significance, derives.
11. A special quality of the CA stems from the widespread use of local stone as a building material, with several of the properties being of limestone rubble with distinctive ironstone banding. It is also from the characteristic layout and form of development within parts of this area, whereby smaller cottages often face the road, and larger interspersed houses have gables addressing it. Over time, development in the CA has taken place in a somewhat piecemeal fashion, and

buildings are of varying scales. However, the use of a small palette of often traditional materials and design treatments afford much of the CA a sense of cohesiveness which contributes positively to its significance. Given that the house on the appeal site displays many of the CA's distinctive characteristics, it contributes positively to its significance.

Effects of the works and development

12. The extension would have a low profile, and its roof would join a low part of the roof of the recent stone-faced extension. However, and although its height and scale would be subservient to the house at Stoneacre, its shallow roof pitch and its depth, would give it a boxy appearance that would be at odds with the form and design detailing of this house. Such an extension would also undermine the legibility of the buildings largely single-depth and linear plan form, and undermine the primacy of its front elevation. Moreover, and while the use of large expanses of glazing would enable the historic rear walling of the building to continue to be discerned to a degree, it would also present a large homogeneous and highly reflective surface, which would obscure views of the stonework. In addition, the glazing and the substantial framework that would be required to accommodate the sliding glazed doors, would draw the observer's eye to the extension and away from other parts of the rear of the building that contribute positively to its significance.
13. Furthermore, insufficient information has been provided to enable me to understand how the framework and/or glazing would adjoin the walls and quoins of the building, which are key architectural features that date from the 17th century. Given the importance of these features, it is essential that full details of how the extension would adjoin the building be provided. This is to allow the effect of such works and development to be fully assessed.
14. The Blisworth CA appraisal and management plan² suggests that a main threat to the built form in the CA is the cumulative and often small-scale alterations that occur to unlisted buildings within the village, that can lead to the erosion of the character and appearance of the CA. The same threat and associated harm would result from similar unsympathetic works and development to listed buildings in this area. Albeit boundary treatments and intervening buildings mean that the extension would not be prominent from locations outside the appeal site, it would nonetheless have a form, design detailing and materials that are not typically found in the CA.
15. I accept that development and works of non-typical designs, materials and detailing can often be successfully assimilated into an area. However, for the reasons previously given, the form and appearance of the extension would be incongruous with that of Stoneacre. Consequently, it would erode the property's historic integrity, and the contribution that it makes to the special qualities of the CA.
16. For the reasons given, the scheme would not preserve the listed building or features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses. Nor would it preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As such, harm would be caused to the significance of these designated heritage assets. Consequently,

² South Northamptonshire Council – Blisworth Conservation area appraisal and management plan – adopted September 2015.

the scheme would conflict with policy BN5 of the Council's Core Strategy³, and policies SS2, HE5 and HE6 of the South Northamptonshire Local Plan⁴. Collectively and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that schemes conserve and enhance heritage assets and their settings, and preserve or enhance their significance, as well as to ensure that development is compatible with its surroundings and the distinctive local character.

Heritage balance

17. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.
18. The relatively modest scale of the scheme, which is for a low extension to a single house, means that the harm that would be caused to the CA as a whole, would be towards the lower end of the scale of less than substantial. However, and bearing in mind that the grade II* listed building at Stoneacre is of more than special interest, and that buildings of this grade account for only a very small proportion of nations listed buildings, it is very sensitive to harm as a result of change. That being the case, and despite the fairly modest scale of the scheme, the harm that would be caused to this designated heritage asset would be towards the middle of the scale of less than substantial. These findings of harm to both the CA and the listed building carry considerable importance and weight.
19. Paragraph 215 of the Framework indicates that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
20. Economic benefits would arise during the implementation of the scheme. Moreover, I do not doubt that the enlarged dwelling would afford the appellant and future occupiers with improved living conditions. However, if the scheme subject of these appeals were not implemented, I do not anticipate the cessation of use of the property, or that it would fail to be adequately maintained. Therefore, and because of the modest scale of the proposals, each of the previously identified public benefits would be small, and very little weight can be attributed to them. Consequently, when taken together, these public benefits would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the significance of the listed building at Stoneacre and the CA.

Other Matters

21. Close to the appeal site, but on the opposite side of High Street, is the Grade II listed building – 2 High Street⁵. The special qualities of this building stem from its historic and architectural interest as an C18 thatched cottage with coursed rubble walls. Forming one of a collection of early cottages and houses in the village, nearby dwellings, which include that on the appeal site, form part of the setting of this building and contribute to its significance. Nevertheless, the low proposed extension would be separated from this nearby listed building by a road, a retaining wall and tall close-boarded fencing. As a result, the extension and 2 High

³ West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit - West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) – adopted December 2014.

⁴ South Northamptonshire Part 2 Local Plan 2011-2029 – South Northamptonshire Council

⁵ Official list entry number: 1371567

Street would not be readily experienced together. That being the case, the setting of 2 High Street would be preserved and the building's significance would not be harmed.

Conclusion

22. The development subject of appeal A conflict with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed, and that planning permission should be refused.
23. Moreover, and for the reasons previously given, I also conclude that appeal B should be dismissed and that listed building consent should be refused.

V Simpson

INSPECTOR