



Appeal Decisions

Site Visit made on 25th January 2021

by Anne Jordan BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 February 2021

Appeal A, APP/R0660/W/20/3263174

1 Waterloo Barn, Alderley Park, Congleton Road, Nether Alderley, MACCLESFIELD, SK10 4JW

- 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 David Clarke against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 20/2672M, dated 26 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension to existing residential property.
-

Appeal B, APP/R0660/Y/20/3263176

1 Waterloo Barn, Alderley Park, Congleton Road, Nether Alderley, MACCLESFIELD, SK10 4JW

- 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 Clarke against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 20/2673M, dated 26 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2020.
 - The works proposed are a single storey rear extension to existing residential property.
-

Decision

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue for both appeals is the impact the works would have on the listed building, listed as "Training Centre and Stores at Alderley Park", or on any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

3. S16(2) and S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Policies SE1 and SE7 of the Cheshire East Local Plan (LP) and Saved Policies BE15 and BE18 of the Macclesfield Local Plan (MLP), amongst other things, seek development which maintains the architectural and historic integrity of the building and makes a positive contribution to the character of Cheshire East's historic and built environment. This reflects the statutory duties defined in the Act.

4. The listed building in this case, also known as Waterloo Barn, is Grade II listed and was originally an agricultural building constructed to serve the stables for the former Alderley Park House. The building is believed and to date from the early 19th Century. It was later used in association with the nearby business use, before being restored and converted as part of the wider residential development that it now forms part of.
5. The building is a standalone red brick structure with sandstone dressings and a welsh slate roof. Round arched brick panels dominate the front elevation where the decorative stonework and round windows within the panels provide an attractive front façade. To the rear the recessed panels have been infilled with glazing and panelling and this gives the rear elevation a more domesticated appearance. Nevertheless, the origins of the structure are still evident in the proportions and materials of the building and in its proximity to the other original stable buildings nearby.
6. The proposal relates to the construction of a single storey addition on the rear garden elevation. This would be constructed in matching brick with floor to ceiling glazing and its design would mimic the contemporary form of the newer dwellings within the wider development.
7. Notwithstanding the fact that the rear elevation has been somewhat altered by the addition of glazing, it retains a symmetrical appearance and the height and proportions of the glazed openings are striking features on the façade. The proposed addition would interrupt these and unbalance this symmetry. Furthermore, although the addition would use some elements that reflect the form of the barn, such as the decorative brickwork, it would still have a clearly contemporary form which would represent a stark contrast with the traditional appearance of the building behind and so, notwithstanding the presence of other contemporary design in the vicinity, would fail to sit comfortably alongside it.
8. Whilst the high boundary wall to the properties would partially screen views of the addition from the side and rear, the addition would still be clearly evident in close range views. Therefore whilst I take into account that the building originally had some attached outbuildings, as I have no evidence they disrupted the character of the main building to the extent of the proposal before me, I do not consider this factor, in itself would provide justification for an addition of the form proposed.
9. The harm identified would amount to “less than substantial harm” which the Framework advises must be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. The appellant has advised that the proposal would provide enhanced living accommodation. However, as I have no evidence that the existing accommodation is sub-standard this limits the weight I can attribute to this matter as a public benefit. The appellant argues that the proposal would improve privacy, as due to the juxtaposition of dwellings to the rear there is a degree of natural overlooking to the rear. Some degree of inter and overlooking is a normal feature of relatively dense development of this type. I have no convincing evidence that this situation materially diminishes the living conditions of the occupiers of the property and so I do not consider that the development would provide a public benefit in this regard.
10. The development would be carried out using sustainable construction techniques and materials which would have public benefits in terms of energy

and resource use, and I attribute this matter some limited weight commensurate with the scale of development proposed.

11. The Framework is clear that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and that in considering the impact of development on the significance of heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The significance is partly derived from its appearance which would be diminished by this proposal. I therefore attribute great weight to the harm which would arise to the significance of the asset. The identified public benefits would not outweigh this harm. It follows that the proposal fails to comply with national policy outlined in the Framework and with policies SE1 and SE7 of the LP and BE15 and BE18 of the MLP.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would harm the significance of the listed building. No public benefits identified would outweigh this harm. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeals be dismissed.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR