



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2023

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision Date 26 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/Y/22/3306257

126 Audlem Road, Nantwich, Cheshire, CW5 7EA

- 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 Charles Frank against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref. 21/3817N, dated 2 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2022.
 - The works proposed are replacement of the existing UPVC windows x 10 and 1 wooden window, 2 UPVC doors, 1 UPVC sliding Door and 1 wooden door with flush casement UPVC with Georgian bars in the glazing of the windows. Replace Wooden door at the rear with composite door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the appeal relates to a listed building consent, I have had special regard to section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
3. The Council states that the existing UPVC windows are unauthorised and there is no record of any listed building consent having been granted amongst the history provided. The appellant has not disputed this or provided any evidence to the contrary. As such, I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building, Beehive Cottages, and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is one of four cottages now occupying an 18th Century Poor House. The building is of historic interest due its former use and function and there is architectural interest in its form and traditional materials.
6. The original windows have been replaced with UPVC windows that are bulky and modern in their design and appearance, particularly the shiny plastic finish and contrived glazing bars between the panes. These detract from the historic

and architectural interest of the building. However, as I have noted above, they are unauthorised alterations to the listed building and should not be used to justify the installation of similar windows and doors. This is notwithstanding that they were apparently installed many years ago.

7. The proposed windows and doors would be made using more modern UPVC and composite materials. They would appear more sympathetic than the existing windows and doors, as a result of advances in technology and the use of flush fitting casements. However, they would nonetheless have a distinctly modern appearance with a plastic finish and pastiche glazing bars on or within the modern sheet glass. As such, they would harm the listed building, since this modern style and material would be uncharacteristic.
8. The harm arising would be less than substantial in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) but is nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. I note that the existing windows and doors are said to be in a state of disrepair but that is a private matter for the applicant and no public benefits have been identified that can be weighed against the harm.
9. As such, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 197 of the Framework and conflict with Policy BE.9 of the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan (2011) and Policy SE.7 of the Cheshire East Local Plan (2017), which seek to preserve and enhance heritage assets. As a result, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

10. In light of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR