



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2019

by Mr A Thickett BA(Hons) BTP Dip RSA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/19/3227473 & 3227469

Sherrow Booth Manor, Bakestonedale Road, Pott Shrigley, Cheshire, SK10 5RU

- The appeals are made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission and under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeals are made by Mr & Mrs Hartley against the decisions of the Peak District National Park Authority.
 - The applications Ref NP/CEC/1118/1097 & 1098, dated 20 November 2108, were refused by notices dated 15th February 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an orangery.
-

Decision

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed orangery would preserve the special character and interest of Sherrow Booth Manor, a Grade II listed building.

Reasons

3. Sherrow Booth Manor was built in 1770. It was built as a farmhouse, of coursed squared bluff sandstone rubble. The front elevation is symmetrical and typically Georgian in its style and proportions with a rough hewn and robust simplicity in keeping with its original purpose and isolated moorland setting.
4. The proposed orangery would be erected on the south side gable which is currently blank other than a glazed door opening and small window above. One can see evidence of an earlier opening which was filled in with the same stone as the rest of the building. The proposed extension would have a flat roof with glazed lantern topped with decorative ridge details. The walls would be largely glazed, sitting on a dwarf wall with a timber fascia.
5. The main bone of contention between the National Park Authority (NPA) and the appellant is whether the orangery's design and detailing would be in keeping with the Manor. The Manor has been sympathetically renovated and its previous additions are largely true to its history and form. The design of the orangery includes decorative details on the lantern and fascia which, although attractive in themselves would not, in my view, sit comfortably alongside the simpler fenestration to the Manor. The difference would be particularly marked

when looking at the front and south elevations. The coursed rubble walls sit on a stone based plinth. The dwarf walls supporting the glazing to the orangery would be higher than the plinth which would add to the incongruity/lack of harmony between the listed building and the proposed addition.

6. The appellant suggests that the design of the orangery could be simplified by removing the ridge detail on the lantern but in my view, it is the form as well as the detailing which is at odds with the simplicity of the Manor. I conclude, therefore that the proposed orangery would have a detrimental impact on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
7. That harm would be less than substantial and, in such circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposed orangery would provide extra living space but this is not a public benefit.
8. The appellant claims that adding to orangery would not require any alterations to the building or loss of any historic fabric. No details are submitted regarding how the roof would be fixed to the gable wall or what works would be needed to ensure that it is watertight. Whilst not doubting that it would be possible to carry out this work sensitively and with minimal loss of the existing fabric, without any detailed drawing or specification, I cannot reach a properly informed conclusion. Sherrow Booth Manor is a Grade II listed building and this is not something that should be left to a condition. This is not a matter raised by the NPA but my findings in this regard add weight to my conclusion that the appeals should be dismissed.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the proposed works conflict with Policy L3 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy 2011 and Policy LC6 of the Peak District National Park Local Plan 2001 and that the appeals should be dismissed.

Anthony Thickett

Inspector