



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 4 February 2026

by Rachel Hall BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th February 2026

Appeal A: APP/W2845/W/25/3374321

**Passenham Manor, The Tithe Barns, Passenham Road, Passenham,
West Northamptonshire MK19 6DH**

- 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 Dr Jagjit Singh against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0348/FULL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'construction of a single storey garden room as an extension to the Manor house and erection of a garden machinery store shed in the garden of the listed building'.
-

Appeal B: APP/W2845/Y/25/3374322

**Passenham Manor, The Tithe Barns, Passenham Road, Passenham,
West Northamptonshire MK19 6DH**

- 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 Dr Jagjit Singh against the decision of West Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0349/LBC.
 - The works proposed are described as 'construction of a single storey garden room as an extension to the Manor house and erection of a garden machinery store shed in the garden of the listed building'.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).
4. The appeal site is in the vicinity of a Grade I listed building known as 'Two Barns at the Manor House' (the two barns) along with a number of other listed buildings in the locality. The Council did not identify harm to the significance of those assets or any of their features of special architectural or historic interest as a result of the proposal. On the evidence before me, including my own observations, I am satisfied that the proposal would preserve the significance of those heritage assets.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are whether the proposed development would preserve a Grade II listed building known as “The Manor House and Attached Walls and Gates” (Ref: 1371240) (the LB), and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses and the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area bearing in mind the special attention that should be paid to the desirability of preserving the setting as it relates to the special interest of the nearby Grade I listed building, known as “Church of St Guthlac” (Ref: 1041642) (the church), and the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Passenham Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

6. The LB is said to date from the early 17th and 18th centuries but with possibly older origins and having been extended mid-19th century. It is said to have been first constructed in the 1600s by Sir Roger Banastre, owner of the manor estate, with subsequent alterations designed by Sir Edward Lutyens. It comprises a substantial two storey building of coursed squared limestone and a plain-tile roof. Its form is defined by its three gabled cross-wings that are striking features on both front and rear elevations. The garden is partly enclosed by coursed limestone rubble walls capped with plain-tile slopes with brick coping to ridge.
7. Given the above, I find that the special interest of the LB, insofar as it relates to these appeals, to be primarily associated with its historic fabric and architectural features that are characteristic of its historic status as a prominent manor house. Although the front elevation has more formality to it, that does not diminish the contribution made by the rear elevation which adequately reflects the status and architectural interest of the manor house. The historic fabric of the garden walls and their role in defining the space around the building are also important features of the LB and contribute to its significance. The appeal building is located close to the church, which is highly visible from the appeal site garden and from within the lounge to be extended. Consequently, unrestricted views of the church tower from the LB’s house and garden make a positive contribution to its setting.
8. The church is said to date from the 13th century with some rebuilding and repairs in the 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. It comprises of coursed squared limestone, with limestone dressings and lead roofs. Its four-sided tower with pilaster buttresses faces onto the appeal garden at close range. From there, the tower and crenelated parapet of the nave are highly visible features. Accordingly, I find that the significance of the church for the purposes of this appeal relates to its architectural, historic and social interest to which its tower positively contributes.
9. The historic context of the building would have been a rural village with notable buildings such as the LB, the two barns, and other prominent rural buildings emerging as the village prospered, set within open countryside. The current context in which it is experienced comprises a rural hamlet with notable buildings, including the LB, within its setting.
10. Given the above, I find that the setting of the church, insofar as it relates to these appeals and its special interest, to be primarily associated with its immediate surroundings. This includes the appeal site garden from which it is highly prominent and from where its historic significance can be very readily appreciated.

Consequently, although not contemporary with the oldest elements of the church, the appeal site garden contributes to its special interest.

11. The CA covers an area encompassing the rural hamlet of Passenham and adjacent pasture and water meadows. The settlement has a linear form, with buildings following the line of Passenham Road. Its significance is derived from its concentration of historic buildings, including the church, the LB and tithe barns, and their historic association with the development of the settlement within an agricultural landscape. Given the above, I find that the significance of the CA, insofar as it relates to these appeals, to be primarily associated with the historic form and function of its historic buildings and their position within a rural landscape.
12. The proposal would add a single storey extension on to the rear elevation of the LB, with a flat, green roof. I note that the ground floor rear patio door that would be enclosed by the appeal scheme is not thought to be historic, having previously comprised a window. Also, that the building appears to have been extended at its northern end, along with alterations including the addition of a former conservatory, porch and outbuildings within its grounds. However, no substantive evidence indicates that this gable has previously been extended. In any event, the proposal would diminish the extent of visible historic fabric on the rear wall of that gable, on a historic part of the building.
13. Also, even though to the rear of the property, the addition of a flat roof extension projecting from that gable would reduce the prominence of the characteristic repeating two storey gable feature when viewed from the rear garden. Although other alterations have taken place on the rear elevation, and the proposal would be glazed, it would nonetheless be particularly conspicuous given its location on the corner of the building where it would be highly visible from its open gardens to the rear and side of the building. Consequently, the proposal would harm the significance of the LB.
14. The boundary wall between the church and the appeal site restricts views of the appeal building from the churchyard. As such, it is unlikely that the proposal would be visible from the churchyard. However, in some views from the rear garden of the appeal site, the proposal would intrude on the currently open views of the church, diminishing the ability to appreciate its significance from there. Given the proximity of the LB to the church, I consider that visibility of the church from its garden would likely have been planned rather than incidental. Consequently, the proposal would harm the setting of the church.
15. The appellant has suggested that the proposal would not harm the listed building because it would not be more widely visible. However, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the building can be gained. I note the planning history, including for construction of a summer house adjacent to the garden wall that is closest to the coach house. Full details of that scheme are not before me, albeit I consider that that would likely be less intrusive on the LB given its location away from the main built form of the house.
16. That approvals have been granted for various alterations to the curtilage listed coach house, the rebuilt rectory, the two barns, and other nearby schemes in the vicinity of listed buildings, does not indicate that the specific proposal relating to

this LB should also be accepted. The LB has also undergone changes over many years. Nonetheless, for the reasons given, the nature of the proposed extension subject of this appeal and the sensitivity of its proposed location, would result in harm to the LB and the setting of the church.

17. Despite the harm that would be caused to the LB I do not find that the proposal would be detrimental to the character or appearance of the CA. This is because the extent to which the proposal would be visible from the public domain would be highly limited and it would only have limited prominence in the CA from the private domain. Paragraph 220 of the Framework states that proposals must be judged according to their effect on a CA as a whole and must therefore have a moderate degree of prominence.
18. The Council's officer report raises no concern in respect of the proposed location of the garden machinery store shed. I see no reason to conclude otherwise. In the event of the appeal being allowed, I consider that suitable conditions could be imposed to control the effect of the appearance of that part of the proposal, without harm to the LB and the setting of the church.
19. Nonetheless, the harm to the special interest of the LB and the church attracts great weight in the planning balance of these appeals. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the 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.
20. Given the scope of the works impacting on part of the rear elevation of the LB and its setting, and on part of the setting of the church as seen from the appeal site, I find the harm to be at the moderate level of less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, 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.
21. The proposed extension would provide a way for the occupants to enjoy their garden. However, that is a private benefit and is consequently beyond the scope of this test. Although there would likely be minor economic benefits associated with the purchase of materials and construction work, these would not be sufficient public benefits to outweigh the harm that I have identified in this instance. I also note that the continued viable use of the appeal property as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposal as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence.
22. Given the above and in the absence of public benefits that would outweigh the harm that would be caused, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the LB and the church.
23. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 210(a) of the Framework and conflict with Policies BN5 & R1 of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Local Plan (Part 1) (December 2014), and Policies SS2 and HE5 of the South Northamptonshire Part 2 Local Plan 2011-2029. These seek,

among other things, to protect the historic environment and ensure proposals are designed having regard to the character of the site's surroundings.

Conclusion

24. With regard to Appeal A, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no considerations that would outweigh that conflict.
25. Consequently, given the above and considering all other matters raised, the appeals should be dismissed.

Rachel Hall

INSPECTOR