
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 8 September 2016

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 04 October 2016

Appeal A Ref: APP/R0660/W/16/3152093

Manor House Farm, Old Newcastle Road, Willaston CW5 7BQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs John Allen against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 16/0734N, dated 6 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is an extension to the existing dwelling.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/R0660/Y/16/3152095

Manor House Farm, Old Newcastle Road, Willaston CW5 7BQ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs John Allen against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 16/0735N, dated 6 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2016.
 - The works proposed are an extension to the existing dwelling.
-

Procedural matter

1. The development/works described above have already been carried out. I have dealt with the appeals on this basis.

Decisions

Appeal A

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to the existing dwelling at Manor House Farm, Old Newcastle Road, Willaston CW5 7BQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/0734N, dated 6 December 2015, and the plans numbered PL.01, PL.02 and PL.03.

Appeal B

3. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the retention of an extension to the existing dwelling at Manor House Farm, Old Newcastle Road, Willaston CW5 7BQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/0735N, dated 6 December 2015, and the plans numbered PL.01, PL.02 and PL.03.

Main Issue

4. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the development/works on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building.

Reasons

5. Manor House Farm is a large detached dwelling that is a Grade II listed building. Planning permission (Appeal A) and listed building consent (Appeal B) are sought in respect of development/works that have already been carried out to this designated heritage asset. The works comprise a single storey extension to the side of the dwelling, measuring around 4m² and forming an entrance into an earlier approved extension. It is constructed in timber and glass, above a brick dwarf wall, under a tiled roof and incorporates a double door opening, which the appellants require to provide disabled access to the dwelling.
6. In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works to a listed building and planning permission for development which affects a listed building the decision maker shall, under Sections 16(2) and 66(1) respectively of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, 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. In determining such applications, the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of the heritage asset should be taken into account.
7. The significance of a heritage asset is defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as its value to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Amongst other things, significance derives from a heritage asset's physical presence and may be harmed by development/works. When considering the impact of development/works on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight attaches to the asset's conservation; the more important the asset, the greater that weight should be.
8. The significance of this heritage asset derives from its historic value (it dates from the early C18) and its architectural value (a T-shaped plan with gabled elevations and Flemish brickwork finishes). In my judgement, the scale of the extension is in proportion with the earlier extension to which it is attached. Its ridge level sits lower than that of the earlier extension giving it a subservient and ancillary appearance when seen with the main dwelling. Its width, scale and detailing, including the glazing pattern and finishes successfully marry it with the earlier extension, such that they both harmoniously blend with the scale and appearance of the listed building.
9. Accordingly, the development/works do not adversely affect the character of this heritage asset as a building of special architectural and historic interest and do not conflict with Policies BE.2 and BE.9 the adopted Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011. As such its significance is sustained and there is no conflict with paragraph 132 of the NPPF. The Council has not suggested any conditions and as the works to erect the extension have already been carried out, I do not consider that any are necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

Richard McCoy

Inspector