
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2017

by Siân Worden BA MCD DipLH MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/Y/16/3156496

Bulls Head, Macclesfield Road, Kettleshulme, SK23 7QU

- 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 David McGowan against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NP/CEC/0516/0463 dated 22 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2016.
 - The works proposed are replacement casement windows to all aspects of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and listed building consent is refused for replacement casement windows to all aspects of the property.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is whether the proposed works would preserve the listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is on the end of a row and attached to three cottages. The group as a whole is listed Grade II. The listing description concentrates on the materials and architectural details, including the windows, of the group. It is within these elements, therefore, that the significance of the listed building lies.
 4. The existing windows are in a poor condition and not in keeping with either the appeal property itself or its neighbours. It is also proposed to remove an existing concrete lintel and install new stone lintels and cills in the side elevation. The proposed works are therefore necessary and to be generally welcomed.
 5. Notwithstanding the poor condition and appearance of the existing windows, installing new windows which are appropriate in all respects is essential to maintaining the significance of the listed building. The submitted drawings do not show fully the construction, opening mechanism or profiles of the proposed windows. Details of the proposed finish and window furniture are also lacking, as are those in respect of the new stone lintels and cills, particularly their dimensions, the type of stone to be used, and its finish. The manner of filling the space resulting from the reduced window width in the side elevation has
-

not been fully specified. Moreover, there is almost no information in respect of the smaller window in the rear elevation, WF04.

6. The appellant's case is largely concerned with whether the level of detail required by the Authority was reasonable. I can understand his frustration particularly as he has incurred expense in commissioning architect's drawings. Nonetheless, as explained above such information is necessary to ensure that the works do not harm the listed building.
7. The health and safety, and security, problems resulting from the poor state of the existing windows do not outweigh the need to protect the listed building. I have noted that the parish council supported the proposed works and saw the upvc windows at the neighbouring property during my visit. Whilst that dwelling is within the national park and conservation area I am not aware that it is listed.
8. My conclusion is that, in the absence of full details, it is not possible to assess properly the effect of the proposed works on the significance of the listed building. I cannot be assured, therefore, that the proposed works would preserve the listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. There is no statutory requirement to have regard to the development plan when considering applications for listed building consent. In any event, the proposal does not clearly demonstrate how the listed building will be preserved and is thus contrary to Policy LC6 of the Peak District National Park Local Plan which was adopted in 2001.
9. I have taken all the matters raised into consideration but not found any compelling reasons to allow the appeal. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should fail.

Síân Worden

Inspector