



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 17 November 2025

by Helen Hockenhull BA (Hons) B.PI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/R0660/W/25/3371521

The Gloucester, Highgrove, Ancoats Lane, Great Warford, ALDERLEY EDGE, SK9 7TT

- 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 Ms Grace Jennings against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0580/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is internal renovations and installation of rooflight.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/R0660/Y/25/3372102

The Gloucester, Highgrove, Ancoats Lane, Great Warford, ALDERLEY EDGE, SK9 7TT

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Grace Jennings against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0581/LBC.
 - The development proposed is internal renovations and installation of rooflight.
-

Decision

1. Both Appeals A and B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the works affect a listed building, I have had regard to sections 16(2) and 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Act.
3. Planning permission and Listed Building Consent are being sought for internal renovations and the installation of a rooflight. The works have already taken place and I have assessed them accordingly. The two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. In the interest of efficiency, I deal with both appeals together in this decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed Ancoats Hospital (Ref: 1329676) and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

Special Interest and Significance

5. The former Ancoats Hospital forms a two-storey red brick building with stone dressings and a slate roof constructed in 1903. It was converted to apartments in

2004. The principal elevation includes a central projecting wing with white stucco at first floor. Two storey wings project forward of the front elevation and take the form of glazed corridors at ground floor level which terminate in pavilions with diagonal buttresses. The rear facade has a central wing with gable dormers to the sides in pairs and lateral gabled staircase wings. The building is set in attractive grounds. A contemporary extension was added to the west side to create a new wing at the time the building was converted to residential use.

6. The significance of the building as it relates to this appeal, is derived from its architectural interest and materiality as a large Edwardian building in Neo classical style and also its historic interest as a former hospital and convalescent home for women and children at the Ancoats Hospital in Manchester.
7. At the original entrance to the site off Ancoats Lane, is a lodge building built in 1904. Constructed in red brick with a slate roof and an off-centre archway with stone dressings, this is also Grade II listed. The Council make no mention of this building in the reasons for refusal or Officer report. Whilst there is group value with the former hospital building, as the appeal proposal would have no effect on the significance or setting of the Lodge, I do not consider it further in my decision.

Impact on the heritage asset

8. 'The Gloucester' is located within the rear wing to the former hospital. The appeal scheme includes internal renovations and the installation of a rooflight in the east facing side of the historic rear central wing of the building.
9. The rooflight is large and on an outward facing roof plane, which is visible from Ancoats Lane. Its forms an obtrusive addition which breaks up the flow of the existing undisturbed roof slope. It has also resulted in the loss of historic fabric.
10. I noted on my site visit that there are existing rooflights in the original part of the building. These are however in discrete locations, mostly on internal facing roof planes, are small and sensitively proportioned. I understand that they were installed at the time of conversion to facilitate the residential use of the building. Their provision was justified to enable the viable use of the building, and they do not set a precedent for further rooflights.
11. Given the above, the rooflight fails to preserve the special interest of the building and therefore causes less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset. As a result of the scale of the works, I consider this harm is at the lower end of less than substantial.
12. The scheme also includes some internal renovations, namely the removal of a partition wall, about which the Council have raised no concerns. I concur with that view.

Public Benefit and balance

13. Having regard to paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) I must weigh the harm I have identified against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate securing its optimal viable use.
14. The National Planning Policy Framework in paragraph 213 states that any harm or loss of the significance of a heritage asset requires clear convincing justification. I this case, the rooflight serves a dressing room/cloakroom area. It provides natural

light to this space which before only had artificial light. The appellant argues that natural light benefits the occupant's wellbeing and the functionality of the living space. I acknowledge that with the cloakroom door open, there may be some light spillage into the bedroom which enhances the quality of the environment. However, the apartment was designed with only artificial light to the dressing room. This is not a habitable room, and natural light is not essential for its use. Whilst borrowed light from the rooflight may lift the light levels in the corner of the bedroom, this room has adequate natural light from existing window openings.

15. It is clear from above that the rooflight provides a private benefit for the individual occupant of the apartment. In light of the above, and in the absence of any defined public benefit, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building.
16. Accordingly, the scheme fails to satisfy the requirements of the Act, the objectives of the Framework and also Policies SE1 and SE7 of the Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy, and Policies GEN1, HER1 and HER4 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document. These policies all seek to conserve the historic environment, ensure development respects existing architectural features and achieves high quality development.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I dismiss these appeals.

Helen Hockenhull

INSPECTOR