



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2025

by R Gravett BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/25/3363265

The Gate House, 19 Adlington Road, Wilmslow, Cheshire East SK9 2BJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Clive against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/4399/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'application for the change of use of garage/outbuilding to dwelling including external alterations/extensions'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Paul Clive against Cheshire East Council. This application is subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matter

3. Planning permission has previously been granted for the change of use of the appeal property to a dwelling, together with alterations and extensions¹ ('the approved scheme'). It was clear from my site visit that works were well advanced, but do not appear to fully accord with the approved plans. Therefore, I have determined the appeal based on the latest plans which were before the Council at the time of the planning application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site was originally part of East Lodge which is a two-storey dwelling, located on the corner of Adlington Road and Wilmslow Park North. It comprises an existing outbuilding which was constructed as ancillary to East Lodge with a simple steep pitched roof and facing gable. It has now been divided off from its host.
6. East Lodge is a late Victorian entrance lodge and is the counterpart of South Lodge, which is situated at the entrance to Wilmslow Park South. The Council consider that East Lodge has sufficient heritage significance to warrant it being considered as a non-designated heritage asset, but this is disputed by the appellant. The setting of East Lodge has changed over the years, including the

¹ LPA ref. 21/5575M

construction of the outbuilding and more recently the subdivision of its plot. Nevertheless, it is still legible as an entrance lodge, and it has some historic interest providing evidence of the development of the area. Therefore, the significance of East Lodge is principally derived from its setting and historic connection with Wilmslow Park.

7. However, although East Lodge itself has been altered and extended, it has retained its aesthetic interest, characterised by its prominent roof with steep pitches, gable ends, dormer windows and a large chimney stack. Even though the Council does not appear to have undertaken an objective criteria-based assessment of the building, and it is not recorded on the Historic Environment Record, it is of sufficient historic interest to be considered a non-designated heritage asset.
8. The proposed development is a revision of the approved scheme which involved the change of use of the outbuilding to a single dwelling and an extension to the gable which faces Adlington Road. Although the works undertaken to the outbuilding do not appear to fully accord with the approved plans, I am satisfied that there is a real prospect that this scheme would be built should this appeal fail. Therefore, the approved scheme represents a genuine fallback position.
9. There is a footpath which runs alongside the side boundary of the appeal site between Adlington Road and Wilmslow Park North. The eaves of the roof on the elevation facing this footpath would be high and four gabled dormer windows are proposed. These dormers would not be dissimilar in size or appearance to the existing dormer on the front elevation (facing Adlington Road) of East Lodge, and the eaves levels and dormers would not be particularly conspicuous features in this location.
10. On the elevation facing Adlington Road, the approved scheme retained the steep roof pitch of the original outbuilding with low eaves which broadly aligned with the eaves of East Lodge. The steep roof pitch would have encompassed a wide dormer which would have been set close to the eaves. Nevertheless, the pitch and low eaves of the roof would have been visible from Adlington Road over the boundary fencing and would have appeared sympathetic to the character of East Lodge.
11. The appellant's case is that the roof slopes and massing of the appeal proposal match the approved scheme, and the character of the adjacent lodge. However, the plans show that a much shallower roof pitch is proposed with high eaves which would sit just above the eaves of the gable extension to the outbuilding. There would be an area of panelling below the eaves which would have a similar appearance to the dormer of the approved scheme, but the characteristic steep pitch of the roof would nonetheless be lost.
12. Further, it is proposed to lower the ridgeline of the gable extension, and the shallow roof pitch would be visible above this when viewed from Adlington Road. It would appear as an offset double gable. I observed that residential properties along both Adlington Road and Wilmslow Park North differ in size, age and style and there is some variety in roof forms including examples of gables which face the road. However, fronting a bend in the road, the double gable would appear unduly prominent in the streetscene and a discordant addition to the host outbuilding.
13. For the reasons given above, I find that the fallback position of the approved scheme would be less harmful than the appeal proposal. Consequently, it is a matter which affords little support or justification for the appeal proposal before me.

14. The parties have drawn my attention to a previous appeal scheme for the change of use of the outbuilding to a dwelling and external alterations and extensions, which was dismissed in June of last year.² Amongst other things, that scheme proposed a continuous ridge line between the existing outbuilding and the extension, a shallow pitched roof and high eaves level. The appellant considers that the concerns of the Inspector have been fully addressed.
15. However, whilst lower than the appeal scheme, the proposed eaves level of the outbuilding would nevertheless be much higher than the low eaves of East Lodge. Combined with the shallow roof, it would still result in a scale and massing which would fail to maintain a subordinate relationship with the host lodge, and it would have a jarring effect when viewed alongside its characteristic steep pitched roof. As a result, the proposed development would cause harm to the significance of East Lodge, a non-designated heritage asset.
16. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with policies SE1 and SD2 of the Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (2017) (LP), Policies GEN1 and HOU11 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (2022) (SAD) and Policy H2 of the made Wilmslow Neighbourhood Plan (2019). Amongst other things, these seek to ensure high quality design and development which makes a positive contribution, protects distinctiveness and is in keeping with the scale, character and appearance of its surroundings. It would further conflict with LP Policy SE7 and SAD policies HER1 and HER7 which seek to avoid harm to heritage assets.

Other Matters

17. The appellant has raised concern about a lack of correspondence from the Council during the application. Further, the comments of the Conservation Officer were not shared with the appellant at an early stage. Whilst I understand these concerns, they are matters which have no bearing on this appeal, which I have considered solely on its planning merits.
18. I note the representation made by a neighbouring developer in respect of the potential for the proposed development to overlook an apartment building being converted to the rear of the appeal site. The appeal proposal would introduce additional windows facing the common boundary, but this apartment building is set well back within its plot so would not be overlooked. Further, the removal of trees beyond the appeal site is a legal matter which falls outside the scope of this appeal, so has not influenced my decision.

Conclusion

19. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

R Gravett

INSPECTOR

² APP/R0660/W/23/3336116