



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2020

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/20/3245808

Lower Kinderfield Farm, Hollin Lane, Sutton, Macclesfield, SK11 0NN

- 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 R Rosenburg against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 19/4326M, dated 16 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "*resubmission of refused application ref No 19/0487M for proposed extension and alterations to farmhouse*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building consists of a traditional stone-built barn that has been converted to living accommodation. It now forms part of the dwelling at Lower Kinderfield Farm, although it is visually distinct from the main farmhouse. It is set within open countryside and is close to a public footpath to the rear.
4. The appeal building is set within an area identified as a Local Landscape Designation in the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (2017). Policy SE 4 of that document states that "*in Local Landscape Designation Areas, Cheshire East will seek to conserve and enhance the quality of the landscape and to protect it from development which is likely to have an adverse effect on its character and appearance and setting*". In this regard, the surrounding landscape has an attractive undulating character and forms part of the foothills to the Peak District. The appeal building is an attractive historic structure that contributes positively to the surrounding landscape and the traditional rural character of the area.
5. The development proposes a single storey rear extension with a catslide roof design. It would be constructed in matching materials and would generally be subservient in scale. However, it would occupy more than half of the width of the original building and would obscure most of its rear elevation. It would also have an unduly domestic and discordant appearance that would erode the barn's character. In this regard, it would distort its rectangular shape and

simple proportions and would significantly alter its traditional rural appearance. The extension would also be relatively prominent in views from along the nearby public footpath and would diminish the barn's contribution to the surrounding landscape from these viewpoints. Whilst I note that the adjoining property has also been extended, that development is less conspicuous and does not obscure the original building to the same extent.

6. The residential use of the appeal building was consented under permission Ref 96/1439P, and the appellant states that this permission has been implemented. That scheme allowed for the creation of additional openings including new windows and French doors in the rear elevation of the barn. The appellant states that they have a need to extend or remodel the property and would fallback on this option were the appeal to be dismissed. However, whilst that permission proposed the creation of additional openings, it did not involve any extensions, and its design would not significantly alter the simple form of the barn. In my view, this fallback option would be preferable to the appeal proposal in terms of its effect on the host property.
7. The Council has not formally identified the appeal building as a non-designated heritage asset, nor has it argued that it should be considered as such in its submissions. I see no reason to take a different view. However, that does not alter my other concerns regarding the development, as set out above.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies SD 2, SE 1, and SE 4 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (2017). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new development contributes positively to an areas character and identity, achieves high quality design, and preserves the character and appearance of Local Landscape Designation Areas.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR