



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by Robert Hitchcock BSc DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/20/3249030

Chorlton House, Fulshaw Park, Wilmslow SK9 1QH

- 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 Colin Mellor against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 19/5090M, dated 30 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension at Chorlton House, Fulshaw Park, Wilmslow SK9 1QH in accordance with the terms of planning application Ref 19/5090/M, dated 30 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on plan numbers: 1:1250 Location Plan; 1074/A/010 Proposed Site Plan Rev B; 1074/A/011 Proposed Basement Floor Plan Rev B; 1074/A/DR/012 Proposed Ground Floor Rev D; 1074/A/013 Proposed First Floor Plan Rev C; 1074/A/014 Proposed Second Floor Rev A; and, 1074/A/DR/016 Proposed Elevations Rev D.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external elevations of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building.

Reasons

3. Chorlton House is a large detached villa set deep within generous grounds to the eastern side of Fulshaw Park, a private residential road of mixed age and character development. The house is included in the Cheshire East Local Development Framework Local List of Historic Buildings Supplementary Planning Document.
4. The heritage significance of the building derives from its architectural styling and scale. The building is an early Victorian villa with classic Italianate styling with notable architectural detailing including a rotunda, grouped slender arched windows, feature chimneys, dentilated brickwork detailing, and ornate timber

- bracketing and purlin ends. The original building is finished in a distinctive cream brick.
5. The proposed two-storey extension with basement would utilise a contrasting block form with a flat roof. Although this approach would conflict with the supplementary planning guidance document 'Development in Established Residential Areas - The Three Wilmslow Parks' (2004) which seeks extensions sharing the characteristics of the existing building, the main parties agree that contrasting forms of extension can be an appropriate approach. This provides clear interpretation between old and new.
 6. The extension would be substantially glazed to the rear elevation but incorporate a central vertical stack of matching brickwork. The side would be finished in render where it would conjoin with an existing rendered two-storey side extension. The proposal would sit entirely to the rear of the later two-storey projection and an original three-storey projection north of the principle front gable. Extending rearwards, it would square off the existing footprint of the building.
 7. The form and materials would provide a sharp contrast to the original styling of the villa. Although the extension would further alter the building's footprint this lies in an area that has seen several previous additions. Of the additions which remain to the north side of the building, there is little faithful replication of the original features or materials and the resultant mismatched elements have little consolidation with the original character of the building.
 8. The proposed position would remove some later poor additions but mask part of the original side elevation and the joining elements to the three-storey bay. However, aside from the eaves bracketing and short lengths of stone and brick banding, there is little of primary architectural significance on the side elevation. Window openings here are limited in scale and have nothing of the vertical emphasis of the villas defining openings.
 9. Although the overall scale of the extension would be significant this would remain subordinate to the existing building and be commensurate with its stature. The lower overall height would preserve the bracketing detail at the overhang of the eaves of the original roof that would reveal the visual interpretation of the original villa's scale. Despite the contrasting design, it would result in a more coherent and consolidated form of development than at present.
 10. From Fulshaw Park, views of the extension would be extremely limited to restricted glimpses through mature evergreen hedging along the front boundary backed by dense landscaping and a mature fir within the forward garden area. To the rear the extension would be visible across a field from Alderley Road, however, its context in this view would also be obscured on account of the mature hedging and trees to the rear boundary.
 11. The direct effect of the proposal would therefore be limited to masking of detailing of limited architectural merit or contribution in the context of the building's identified significance. This would be outweighed by the benefit of a more consolidated appearance and one that is readily interpreted as a contrasting later addition. It would be visually contained such that the primary features of significance will remain unchallenged. Although the design approach

would not replicate the architectural features of the building it would substantially preserve them.

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal offers a properly considered design approach in the context of the appeal building that is sensitive through contrast and simplicity, and that avoids harm to the building's significance. I therefore find that the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building would be negligible and the identified significance of the building would be preserved.
13. The proposal would therefore be consistent with the aims and requirements of policies SE7, SE1 and SD2 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (2017) and saved policy DC2 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan 2004 as they seek to preserve non-designated heritage assets and enhance the character and appearance of buildings.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. To achieve a high standard of development a condition specifying the external materials is necessary.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, the appeal should be allowed.

R Hitchcock

INSPECTOR