



---

## Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 12 July 2022

Site visits made on 11 and 12 July 2022

**by A Edgington BSc (Hons) MA CMLI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 12 August 2022**

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/R0660/W/21/3284801**

**Former Tithe Barn, The Manor House, Homes Chapel Road, Chelford SK11 9AH**

- 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 Matthew Sanders against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
  - The application Ref 21/0617M, dated 29 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2021.
  - The development proposed is Conversion and extension of former tithe barn to form swimming pool and associated works to Wisteria Cottage.
- 

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/R0660/Y/21/3284800**

**Former Tithe Barn, The Manor House, Holmes Chapel Road, Chelford SK11 9AH**

- 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 Matthew Sanders against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
  - The application Ref 21/0618M, dated 29 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2021.
  - The works proposed are Conversion and extension of former tithe barn to form swimming pool and associated works to Wisteria Cottage.
- 

## **Decisions**

### **Appeal A**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Conversion and extension of former tithe barn to form swimming pool and associated works to Wisteria Cottage at Former Tithe Barn, The Manor House, Holmes Chapel Road, Chelford SK11 9AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/0617M, dated 29 January 2021, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule attached to this decision.

### **Appeal B**

2. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for Conversion and extension of former tithe barn to form swimming pool and associated works to Wisteria Cottage at Former Tithe Barn, The Manor House, Holmes Chapel Road, Chelford SK11 9AH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/0618M dated 29 January 2021, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule attached to this decision.

## **Preliminary Matters**

3. There is a dispute between the parties regarding the accuracy of Historic England's 2019 listing of the Former Tithe Barn. However, I have approached the appeal on the basis that as the decision maker, it is my responsibility to determine the significance of heritage assets affected by the proposals on the basis of what is before me.
4. The appeal site lies within the Green Belt. However, the Council is satisfied that the proposals fall within the exceptions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and I see no reason to disagree. As such I have not considered the effect of the proposals on the Green Belt further.
5. These are linked appeals. In order to avoid duplication, I have considered them together where appropriate.

## **Main Issues**

6. The main issues are whether the development would preserve the Grade II listed Former Tithe Barn (the Barn), the Grade II\* listed Manor House (the Manor) and other curtilage listed buildings, or any features of special architectural and/or historic character that they possess, including setting. (Appeals A and B).

## **Reasons – Appeals A and B**

### *Heritage Assets*

7. The estate of the Manor is located a short distance to the south-east of the crossroads that forms the historic focus of Chelford village. The core of the two and three-storey Manor, which dates from the early 17<sup>th</sup> century, has a striking appearance with intricate black painted timber framing and white rendered infill, under a slate gabled roof with decorative brick stacks. The 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century wings are less decorative but their pitched roofs, brick stacks and rendered finish sit comfortably with the earlier construction phase.
8. Early maps suggest the original and formal approach to the Manor was located through the extensive grounds to its west. The ancillary buildings, including a glasshouse, stables and other outbuildings were located in a cluster to the Manor's north, across a rear yard.
9. The Manor and its ancillary buildings, one of which appears to be the Barn, were first recorded in 1789. The 1897 Ordnance Survey map clearly shows the footprint of the Barn and Wisteria Cottage (the Cottage), to its immediate south, and a building now forming the garage to its immediate east. The Barn is now attached to the Cottage on its southern elevation, and to the garage via an open sided cartshed on its eastern elevation.
10. The Barn is listed as a timber framed barn with 16<sup>th</sup> century origins. It was substantially rebuilt following an extensive fire in 2006. The original barn presents as a simple timber box framed structure with brick infill, and a graduated stone slate pitched roof. An additional bay providing a stable and hayloft appears to have been added in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The former hayloft continues the Barn's simple pitched roof, but on its southern elevation is attached to the Cottage by a contemporary two-storey link with a glazed roof.

11. To the south of a pair of cart doors on the Barn's eastern elevation, there is a single-storey lean-to extension with entrance door and porch, which has rather incongruous cottagey styling in an otherwise utilitarian setting.
12. Externally, and notwithstanding its attachments to other buildings, the Barn's simple form is clearly distinct within the group. Its scale and underlying functional appearance reflects its former ancillary use within the estate, most likely to be as a threshing and winnowing barn. The graduated stone slates, the timber framing and the brick infill suggest a building of some considerable age, built in the local vernacular style.
13. Internally the original three bay barn is lofty, with an exposed roof structure, and the configuration of the timber framing is readily apparent. There are two pairs of timber framed fin walls, one on each side of the cart doors. The end bay, adjacent to the former hayloft, has been subdivided by studwork to create a store and access to a dogleg staircase and Wisteria Cottage.
14. The former hayloft's end gable is now largely enclosed by the link between the Barn and the Cottage, and is formed entirely of brickwork. The former hayloft and stables are now habitable rooms accessed from both the Cottage and the Barn.
15. The evidence suggests that the Barn's reconstruction used original materials salvaged from the fire, as well as imported reclaimed material. It's underlying construction is readily apparent and as such, its overall appearance is at first sight, convincing. However, the appellant has presented detailed evidence that although the Barn appears to be an authentic period structure, a more detailed examination suggests that this is not entirely the case.
16. The distribution of new timbers in the barn's external envelope and internal partitions is clearly set out in the heritage appeal statement<sup>1</sup>. The new timber can be readily identified as it is clearly unweathered, mechanically sawn, and has a regular profile. Having reviewed the timber at my visits I see no reason to disagree with this assessment.
17. The box framing of the northern elevation comprises wholly new timber. The infill brickwork on this elevation is laid in herringbone bond which is a departure from the original stretcher bond with diamond vents, clearly apparent in the post-fire photographs<sup>2</sup>. The pre-fire bricks are also a more uniform colour than those now forming the infill.
18. The timber framed section of the western elevation is a mix of historic and new timbers. However, it is apparent that where historic timbers have been used, they have not necessarily been returned to their original positions. This view is supported by the observation that some historic timbers have been sawn to fit into a particular slot, and there are cross bracings where a break in the stone plinth clearly indicates that at one time in the Barn's history there was a door. As such, not only are the original timbers not in their original positions, but the configuration of the box framing on this elevation may not be wholly authentic.
19. The eastern elevation is supported at its northern end by the cart shed and it is suggested that the additional support prevented the collapse of this section of wall during the fire. The evidence suggests that the section of wall between

---

<sup>1</sup> Heritage Statement, Donald Insall Associates, February 2021

<sup>2</sup> Plate 2.9, Heritage Statement

the full height barn doors and the northern elevation has remained largely intact.

20. Internally, the photographs taken immediately after the fire indicate that the northern pair of fin walls (under Truss B) has replaced a former full width partition<sup>3</sup>. However, Truss B does not have redundant mortice sockets on its underside which would have been required for the posts supporting the pre-fire partition. Moreover, the tie beam at the location shown in the photographs above the full width partition appears to have a different profile from the current tie beam of Truss B. Furthermore, the fin walls themselves are supported by semi-dressed stones which appear incongruous with the rough hewn sandstone forming the perimeter plinth, and are also of a different geological origin. I conclude that the fin walls under Truss B are a post-fire adjustment to the original barn layout and that the tie beam was not originally in this location.
21. There is another pair of fin walls to the south of the cart doors, supporting Truss C. The tie beam is charred and has a series of empty mortice sockets on its underside. Moreover, the sockets are offset to one side of the beam which suggests that this tie beam was originally part of an external wall. The fin walls are again supported on what appears to be semi-dressed stone plinths which contrast with the perimeter stones. The post-fire photographs indicate that there was a full width partition supporting Truss C, that the fin walls are a post-fire adjustment to the Barn's layout and that the tie beam above was not originally in this location.
22. The wall supporting Truss D contains a mix of historic and new timber, as well as new brick infills and a crude pastiche of the original wattle and daub formed around the hatch. The wall sits on a concrete plinth which is visible above floor level.
23. The previous listing indicates that the Barn was subdivided into three equal cells, which is reinforced by the photographs. Those walls were not reinstated after the fire and as such the Barn's original plan form has been substantially altered. Moreover, the tie beams have not been replaced in their original positions, and the brickwork has, at least in the case of the northern elevation, neither used the same bricks as the original nor replicated the original laying pattern. Furthermore, the cement mortar used is brittle and some of the panels are now clearly coming loose.
24. As such, and on the basis of what is before me, I am satisfied that the anomalies identified in the heritage statement can be verified. I conclude that although some original fabric has been reused in the Barn's reconstruction, not only has the internal plan form been altered, even where original materials have been reused a significant proportion has been positioned in areas that confuse the reading of the barn's history, its original construction methods and materials.
25. The Cottage is curtilage listed as a consequence of its current attachment to the Barn. It is a two-storey brick painted building with a broadly vernacular character, whose modest and unornamented form suggests former service accommodation. The width of the walls in the original cottage indicate that the ground floor plan form remains largely intact in the earliest part of the building.

---

<sup>3</sup> Plate 2.7, Heritage Statement

However, later additions appear to include the rear extension which has attached the Cottage to the former hayloft and stables, which are now habitable rooms. On the first floor the wall width and layout are indicative of considerable alterations.

26. The habitable rooms of the former hayloft have a historic appearance as a consequence of the prominence of the Barn's southern gable wall in each room, and the retention of the timber beams and wall protrusions in the ground floor living room. However, notwithstanding that the Cottage and the Barn are now attached, the link is understated and the Cottage's original external form appears largely intact and in keeping with its former ancillary function.

### *Significance*

27. The Barn and the Cottage dominate the cluster of out-buildings set out around the yard. Their respective forms, articulation and materials reflect their original function and contribute to an understanding of the Manor's history, evolution and the original estate layout. They make a positive contribution to the setting of the Manor and the other ancillary buildings.
28. However, although I attach considerable significance to the overall position, form, scale and appearance of the Barn, which reflects its evolution and former agrarian function within the wider estate, I give far less weight to the significance of retained historic fabric. This has considerable decorative value, in that it reflects the original construction and is highly attractive in its own right. However, it appears that even where material that formed part of the original barn has been salvaged, it has not necessarily been returned to its original position in the post-fire construction. Moreover, the current layout does not reflect the former three cell plan form.
29. The significance of the Cottage lies primarily in its external form, materials and scale and its spatial relationship to the Manor, the Barn and other ancillary buildings. Given the degree of internal alteration I attach very little significance to the Cottage's internal historic fabric and plan form.

### *Proposals and their effects*

30. The proposals comprise the installation of a swimming pool, accommodated by the removal of the fin walls and the northern gable to enable the space to be extended. The brick infill panels of the external walls would be replaced by a composite panel comprising brick slips on each side of insulating board, and glazing panels in the case of the Barn's contained southern gable. High level ducting would allow the management of the internal microclimate and steel ties would provide additional roof support. Extensive piling would provide additional support to ensure the barn's future stability.
31. Externally, the simple form of the extension would reflect that of the Barn and its footprint would appear to mirror a former attached barn which was destroyed in the fire and not rebuilt. The ridge would be set down from the Barn and it would be separated from the older building by a narrow glazed link. The zinc cladding would have a distinctly contemporary appearance, but as such would not compete with the detail of the Barn's timber framing or the graduated slate roof. It would also appear separate from and subservient to, the listed building. The lean-to extension on the eastern elevation would have

glazed panels in place of its current entrance door and the porch would be removed.

32. Although the appreciation of its original footprint would be diminished by the complete loss of the northern gable and the partial loss of the southern gable, the Barn's overall scale and form would remain evident. It would still be appreciated as a distinct and discrete structure within the grouping of buildings around the yard.
33. I accept that internally, the proposals would further open up the Barn. The significance arising from its former plan form has already been lost, but nonetheless the proposals would further erode the relationship between the Barn's original layout and its former function.
34. There would be no loss of authentic historic fabric through the removal of the northern gable. The brick infill in the southern gable is not authentic, and the timber framing of this gable, which contains some historic timber, would be retained. The loss of the gables does reinforce my reasoning that the appreciation of the Barn's original extent and form would be diminished by the proposals, but as noted above, this has already been compromised to some extent.
35. The ducting and the steel ties, and the pool itself, would appear highly incongruous. However, they would be seen as modern interventions, separate from what would appear to be the historic timber framing of the external walls. As such they would not obscure the appreciation of the internal elevations, the trusses and the tie beams. Notwithstanding that this fabric is not necessarily authentic, it makes a substantial contribution to the internal appearance and character of the Barn.
36. Concerns have been raised with regard to the Barn's internal microclimate. However, I see no reason to doubt the specialist advice that this could be managed to avoid deterioration of the barn's fabric. Concerns have also been raised with regard to the risk posed by selective demolition and piling. However, I am satisfied that the imposition of a condition to set out a clear methodology which considers all risks and appropriate safeguarding measures, could address these concerns. Moreover, the thoroughness of the investigative material provided by the consultants supporting the appeal suggests that the development and works would have appropriate oversight.
37. Although I have some concerns with regard to the suitability of bricks with the necessary rustic appearance for use as slips, this has not been raised as a concern by the Council. Moreover, the appearance of bricks could be the subject of a condition. In any case the existing brick panels have little significance and need replacing anyway. Moreover, any proposed habitable use of the Barn would necessitate thermal improvement.
38. The ground floor of the Cottage would be opened up by the removal of the central dividing wall and an enlarging of the existing opening into the garden room. This would remove some original fabric and loss of references to the original plan form.
39. The habitable rooms now occupying the space of the former hayloft and stables would become a massage room and seating area, and the spiral staircase in

the glazed link would be replaced by a dog leg in the extension to the Cottage. The plan forms of these rooms would remain largely intact.

40. Although the position of the external entrance into the link between the Cottage and the Barn would be repositioned, this is a recent extension and would not particularly alter the Cottage's internal fabric or external envelope.
41. There would be very little impact on the setting of the Manor or the Cottage or other ancillary buildings as a consequence of the proposals as the spatial relationship and the hierarchy evident in their overall form and articulation would remain. There would be negligible to minor adverse effect on the setting of the Manor arising from the proposals.
42. In the light of the above, I conclude that there would be some loss of significance as the Barn's overall plan form would be further altered. There would also be some loss of historic fabric in the provision of a new door to the lean-to extension, as well as fixings for glazed screens over existing doors, and securing the ducting and vents. However, superficially the barn would retain its appearance as a 16<sup>th</sup> century threshing barn. As I have concluded above that its current significance is considerably compromised by the anomalies set out above, I give that diminution of significance only moderate weight.
43. There would be some loss of internal plan form and historic fabric at the Cottage, but as noted above, it is the Cottage's external envelope that has particular significance. I give the loss of significance with regard to internal changes minor weight.
44. Nonetheless, the proposals would fail to preserve the special architectural and/or historic character of the Barn and the Cottage. This would be contrary to Sections 16 (2) and 16(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), as well as Section 16 of the Framework. The proposals would also conflict with Policy SE7 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy and Saved Policies BE2, BE15 and BE18 of the Macclesfield Borough Local Plan, which, taken together are considered with the safeguarding of heritage assets. However, given my conclusions with regard to the key areas of significance, I give the conflict with the Act and these policies moderate weight.

#### *Heritage balance*

45. The harm outlined above would amount to less than substantial harm. In this regard I disagree with the Council, but the threshold for substantial harm is very high and is usually associated with total loss of the asset. That is not the situation before me, and in addition, I have concluded that the existing alterations have somewhat compromised the Barn's historic integrity.
46. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits or the proposal, including where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
47. A swimming pool and associated facilities within a private curtilage is clearly a private benefit. The Barn is an ancillary building within a large estate and there appear to be a number of other ancillary buildings. The appellant appears to have no need for additional living accommodation within the plot, nor is there any requirement for office space or ongoing storage space.

48. Consequently, even though I agree with the Council that there probably are alternative uses that might require less intervention, I also appreciate that there may be limited alternative uses that provide sufficient benefit for the appellant to warrant the investment in and ongoing maintenance for, a redundant building. Given that the appellant has identified a use that justifies considerable investment and retains the key elements of the asset's significance, I conclude that the swimming pool could be considered to be an optimum viable use. The public benefits of the proposal are probably limited to those arising from the preservation of the asset. Moreover, although there is no need to identify the magnitude of less than substantial harm, I conclude that the degree of harm within that category would be moderate. Any residual and adverse effects on heritage significance would be outweighed by the long-term maintenance of the Barn and such historic form and fabric as remains.

### **Conditions**

49. The parties have agreed suggested conditions. I have imposed the standard time and approved drawing condition for the avoidance of doubt. I have also imposed pre-commencement conditions requiring the submission and approval of samples to be used externally, as well as a methodology to inform the demolition works. This is to ensure that all materials are in keeping with the Barn's heritage status and also to ensure that adequate arrangements are in place before works start, to ensure that the buildings remain stable and weatherproof throughout the development, also to safeguard the Barn's heritage status.
50. A further pre-commencement condition requires the submission and approval of an archaeological investigation to ensure that hidden assets are recorded before the works commence, also to safeguard the Barn's heritage status.
51. I have also imposed a condition to restrict the introduction of any external elements over and above those shown on the drawings, and a requirement for written approval of the colour of the pool and all fenestration. These conditions are to safeguard the heritage assets and to ensure the development and works are in keeping with the underlying built form.
52. Where appropriate I have altered the conditions in line with best practice.

### **Conclusion**

53. I conclude that the proposals would lead to some loss of significance in relation to the Barn and Wisteria Cottage. However, that harm would be outweighed by the benefits of ensuring that the Barn, even with the proposed modifications, is preserved. Consequently, Appeal A is allowed. Appeal B is also allowed and listed building consent is granted.

*A Edgington*

INSPECTOR

## **APPENDIX 1**

### Appeal A – Schedule of 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:

S0302-100A Site Location Plan  
Job No 18068 Sheet 010  
Job No 18068 Sheet 09  
18068/BG 02 N-S Section Phreatic Surface  
18068 SK012  
18068 SL01 Piling Layout  
18068 SL20  
23\_025\_SK\_01 Chelford Manor Barn Refurbishment Rev I1  
S0302-106A Demolition Site Plan  
S0302-120A Demolitions Ground Floor Plan  
S0302-121A Demolitions First Floor Plan  
S0302-125A Demolition Elevations  
S0302-126A Demolitions Internal Elevations  
S0302-127A Demolitions Sections  
S0302-105A Existing Site Plan  
S0302-110A Existing Ground Floor Plan  
S0302-111A Existing First Floor Plan  
S0302-115A Existing Elevations  
S0302-116A Existing Internal Elevations  
S0302-117A Existing Sections  
S0302-107A Proposed Site Plan  
S0302-130A Proposed Ground Floor Plan  
S0302-131A Proposed First Floor Plan  
S0302-135A Proposed Extensions  
S0302-136B Proposed Internal Elevations  
S0302-137A Proposed Sections  
S0302-140A Proposed Details  
S0302-141A Proposed Details  
S0302-150, 151, 152, 153 Proposed Visuals 01, 02, 03, 04  
S0302-154, 155, 156 Proposed Visuals 05, 06, 07

- 3) No development shall commence until details and/or samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces, including rainwater goods, of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.
- 4) No development shall commence until a methodology and structural engineers' drawings describing the extent, process and phasing of the demolitions and reconstruction works affecting the Former Tithe Barn and Wisteria Cottage, including temporary support, has been submitted to and approved in writing by

the local planning authority. The methodology shall include details of ensuring the stability of the Former Tithe Barn and Wisteria Cottage, and details of how the aforementioned buildings are to be secured and protected against the weather, accidental damage or loss during the development, and measures to effect drainage. All subsequent demolitions, temporary support and temporary works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. No part of the building other than indicated in the methodology shall be removed or demolished without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

- 5) Prior to the installation of any fenestration as part of the development hereby approved, drawings indicating details of all windows and external doors, including cross sections of glazing bars, to a scale of not less than 1:20 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved details shall be carried out in full and retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.
- 6) Prior to the installation of the swimming pool hereby permitted, details of its finish and colour shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The swimming pool shall be finished in accordance with those details and retained as such thereafter.
- 7) No rainwater goods, external alarm boxes, lighting, satellite dishes, flues, vents, extracts or other appurtenances shall be attached to the external faces of the Former Tithe Barn or Wisteria Cottage other than those shown on the approved plans.
- 8) No demolitions or development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The implementation of subsequent archaeological investigation shall be carried out in accordance with that Written Scheme of Investigation.

## Appeal B – Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The works hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

S0302-100A Site Location Plan  
Job No 18068 Sheet 010  
Job No 18068 Sheet 09  
18068/BG 02 N-S Section Phreatic Surface  
18068 SK012  
18068 SL01 Piling Layout  
18068 SL20  
23\_025\_SK\_01 Chelford Manor Barn Refurbishment Rev I1  
S0302-106A Demolition Site Plan  
S0302-120A Demolitions Ground Floor Plan  
S0302-121A Demolitions First Floor Plan  
S0302-125A Demolition Elevations  
S0302-126A Demolitions Internal Elevations  
S0302-127A Demolitions Sections  
S0302-105A Existing Site Plan  
S0302-110A Existing Ground Floor Plan  
S0302-111A Existing First Floor Plan  
S0302-115A Existing Elevations  
S0302-116A Existing Internal Elevations  
S0302-117A Existing Sections  
S0302-107A Proposed Site Plan  
S0302-130A Proposed Ground Floor Plan  
S0302-131A Proposed First Floor Plan  
S0302-135A Proposed Extensions  
S0302-136B Proposed Internal Elevations  
S0302-137A Proposed Sections  
S0302-140A Proposed Details  
S0302-141A Proposed Details  
S0302-150, 151, 152, 153 Proposed Visuals 01, 02, 03, 04  
S0302-154, 155, 156 Proposed Visuals 05, 06, 07

- 3) No works shall commence until details and/or samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces, including rainwater goods, of the works hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.
- 4) No works shall commence until a methodology and structural engineers' drawings describing the extent, process and phasing of the demolitions and reconstruction works affecting the Former Tithe Barn and Wisteria Cottage, including temporary support has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The methodology shall include details of ensuring the stability of the Former Tithe Barn and Wisteria Cottage, and details of how the aforementioned buildings are to be secured and protected

against the weather, accidental damage or loss during the works, and measures to effect drainage. All subsequent demolitions, temporary support and temporary works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. No part of the building other than indicated in the methodology shall be disturbed, removed or demolished without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

- 5) Prior to the installation of any fenestration as part of the works hereby approved, drawings indicating details of all windows and external doors, including cross sections of glazing bars, to a scale of not less than 1:20 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved details shall be carried out in full and retained in accordance with the approved details thereafter.
- 6) Prior to the installation of the swimming pool hereby permitted, details of its finish and colour shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The swimming pool shall be finished in accordance with those details and retained as such thereafter.
- 7) No rainwater goods, external alarm boxes, lighting, satellite dishes, flues, vents, extracts or other appurtenances shall be attached to the external faces of the Former Tithe Barn or Wisteria Cottage without the written approval of the local planning authority, other than those shown on the approved plans.
- 8) No demolitions or works shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The implementation of subsequent archaeological investigation shall be carried out in accordance with that Written Scheme of Investigation.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

D Madeley QC  
H Hutchinson  
P Williams  
R James  
A Cross

Donald Insall Associates  
Mosaic Planning  
Structural Engineer  
C Squared Architects

FOR THE COUNCIL

T Higon  
A Ramshall  
N Hulland

Cheshire East Council  
Cheshire East Council  
Cheshire East Council