



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2022

by E Brownless BA (Hons) Solicitor (non-practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/21/3283470

Ivy Lodge, Tabley Road, Knutsford, WA16 0NE

- 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 Hughes against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref: 20/3836M, dated 4 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to an existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extensions to an existing dwelling at Ivy Lodge, Tabley Road, Knutsford, WA16 0NE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 20/3836M, dated 4 September 2020, and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; Proposed Block Plan 4035_00_12 Rev A; Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations 4035_00_13 Rev D; Site Plan as proposed 4035_00_11 Rev B; Comparison Drawing 4035_00_23.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials matching those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Knutsford Town Centre Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Ivy Lodge (the host dwelling) and Ivy Cottage form a pair of semi-detached two-storey cottages that occupy a prominent position part way along Tabley Road close to its junction with Sugar Pit Lane, towards the edge of the Knutsford Town Centre Conservation Area (CA). The pair of dwellings are non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs) with Ivy Lodge, an early 20th century Edwardian Vernacular Revival property, being taller and more visually dominant and being read as a later and clearly legible addition of contrasting style to the modestly proportioned Ivy Cottage. The significance of Ivy Lodge is principally derived from its group value with Ivy Cottage and is both

architectural, in terms of its modest vernacular revival appearance in contrast to Ivy Cottage, and historical, in respect of being an early 20th century addition to an 18th century cottage on the Tabley Estate.

4. By reason of the location of the host dwelling within the CA, I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA in accordance with Section 72(1) of the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act (1990). The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) also requires a balanced judgement to be taken in respect of NDHAs, having regard to the scale of the harm or loss and the significance.
5. The special qualities of the CA are derived from its origins as a historic linear settlement fronting principal streets surrounded by open green spaces. It contains an abundance of historic buildings. The significance of the CA is derived from its surviving historic core, the varied and contrasting built form and streetscene and its numerous mature trees. The relationship between these, and the views in which they are experienced form the essential character, appearance and special interests of the CA. Ivy Lodge makes a positive contribution to the CA, primarily through its group value and its historic relationship with Ivy Cottage, and the subsequent architectural contrast between them.
6. Notwithstanding the proposed height of the two-storey addition, it would largely replicate the existing gable and its position below the existing eaves and ridge line together with its short depth beyond the rear elevation would ensure a subservient addition of modest scale, tucked to the rear of the host dwelling where public views are limited by reason of the extensive boundary vegetation. The significance of the building would not be diminished and albeit the loss of a small extent of the original fabric of the building together with two brick arch casement windows are noted, this would not undermine the overall character of the NDHA, which would largely retain all other notable features on the more publicly visible sides particularly its front elevation.
7. The host dwelling presently has a number of later modern extensions to the rear which add considerable bulk to the rear elevation particularly when viewed in combination with the closely positioned dense mass of the neighbouring dwelling, Chestnut Cottage. The removal of some of these elements, in particular, the pitched roof structure to the garden room, would reinstate the degree of openness and separation between the two dwellings, and together with the use of a traditional design together with matching materials, the appeal scheme would appear as a harmonious and subservient addition to the NDHA, preserving its townscape merit and the architectural and historical significance of the CA.
8. Taking everything into account, the overall character and appearance of the NDHA would be preserved. Similarly, given the small scale of the appeal scheme relative to the CA and its siting mainly away from public viewpoints, I consider there would be a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the CA and therefore its significance would be preserved.
9. Accordingly, the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the host building and the significance of the CA would be preserved. Thus, the appeal scheme would accord with Policy SE7 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (2017) and Policies HE2 and HE3 of the

Knutsford Neighbourhood Plan (2019) insofar as these policies collectively require high quality development that protects and enhances heritage assets. For similar reasons, it would accord with the aims of the Framework which recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the various matters raised including objection to the scheme. The Council have raised no concern with regards to outlook, overbearing, privacy and light and I see no reason to take a different view. Whilst neighbouring occupiers would experience some change, it would not materially compromise their living conditions.

Conditions

11. A draft list of conditions was provided by the Council. I have considered these against the advice in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.
12. In addition to the standard time condition relating to the commencement of development, a condition specifying the plans is necessary as it provides clarity.
13. I have imposed a condition specifying external materials as this is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. The proposed development complies with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it.
15. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

E Brownless

INSPECTOR