



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/R0660/W/24/3356867

Saltersley Hall Farm, Saltersley Lane, Wilmslow SK9 5LS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Terence Cummins against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 24/2616D sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 11 of a planning permission Ref 20/5272M, granted on 21 July 2021.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 22 August 2024.
 - The development proposed is discharge of Condition 11 on 20/5272M - Conversion of barn to form 2 dwellings.
 - The details for which approval is sought are: *Prior to the commencement of development, a method statement for all works, including cleaning of brickwork, to be carried out to implement the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall demonstrate a means of ensuring the safety and structural stability of the building throughout the period of the approved works being undertaken. The relevant work shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.*
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/R0660/Y/24/3356884

Saltersley Hall Farm, Saltersley Lane, Wilmslow SK9 5LS

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against the refusal of details of works required by a condition of a listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Terence Cummins against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 24/2608D sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 6 of listed building consent Ref 20/5273M granted on 21 July 2021.
 - The application was refused by notice dated 22 August 2024.
 - The works proposed are discharge of condition 6 on approval 20/5273M: Listed building consent for conversion of barn to form 2 dwellings.
 - The details for which approval is sought are: *Prior to the commencement of development, a method statement for all works, including cleaning of brickwork, to be carried out to implement the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall demonstrate a means of ensuring the safety and structural stability of the building throughout the period of the approved works being undertaken. The relevant work shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.*
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed and listed building consent is refused for discharge of condition 6 on approval 20/5273M: Listed building consent for conversion of barn to form 2 dwellings.

Preliminary Matters and Background

3. Planning permission (ref 20/5272M) and listed building consent (ref 20/5273M) was granted on 21 July 2021 for conversion of barn to form 2 dwellings. These appeals follow the Council's refusal to approve details required by condition 11 on the permission (Appeal A) and details required by condition 6 on the consent (Appeal B). These conditions require works to be carried out in strict accordance with an approved method statement for all works. The reason for both conditions is to ensure the special character and architectural interest of the building is preserved.
4. The barn subject of the appeals dates from the 19th century. It is a U-shaped red brick and slate building in the curtilage of a Grade II listed building "Saltersley Hall Farmhouse" (Ref: 1139564) (the LB Hall). This dates from the 17th century and it is a 2-storey building in sandstone and whitewashed brick with slate roof, brick gables and mullioned casement windows. The vernacular form and construction of the barn complex, historic fabric and layout, and relationship to the former farmhouse illustrate the historic agricultural use and status of the rural LB Hall.
5. For the purposes of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), a listed building includes any structure within its curtilage which has existed since before 1st July 1948. Consequently, as a structure within the curtilage that has a principal and accessory relationship to the main building, the barn is also listed. Accordingly, I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act in the determination of these appeals.
6. Case law has established that there is nothing to prevent a decision being made on an application for the discharge of a condition if the permission expires during the decision-making process, so long as the application was validly made before the expiry date of the permission. In this case, the application forms for approval of details reserved by condition are dated 15 July 2024, which is before the 3-year expiry date of the permission and the listed building consent. On this basis, both applications were validly made and I have determined the appeals accordingly.

Main Issue

7. The main issue in these appeals is whether the submitted method statement addresses the requirements of condition 11 on the planning permission (Appeal A) and condition 6 on the listed building consent (Appeal B), such that it would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building.

Reasons

8. Both conditions set out that the method statement should cover all works to be carried out to implement the development. It is clear from this that the works in question include, but are not limited to, cleaning of brickwork. The method statement is also required to demonstrate the means of ensuring the safety and structural stability of the building throughout the period of works.
9. The appellant has submitted a 'Method Statement for preserving the significance and fabric of the building' (the MS), which he states is document reference Rev B 15 07 24b as was submitted to the Council. However, there is no document reference, version history or date on the MS. Moreover, the introduction states that it should be read in conjunction with applications 24/1318M and 24/1334M, which were refused on 29 August 2024 and are not the subject of these appeals.

10. The introduction to the MS sets out that all contractors will be fully briefed regarding the Grade II listed status of the building, historic boundary treatments, the importance of preserving historic building fabric, and what constitutes harm. However, there is little substantive evidence in the MS in relation to these matters and it is not clear who would be responsible for the briefings or what form these would take. While works affecting existing architectural features would be carried out by specialist carpenters and masons, the MS fails to specify the architectural features or what 'specialist' means in relation to tradespeople.
11. A CARE Engineer and Heritage Consultant would be engaged but, in the absence of a named author, it is not clear the MS was written by suitably experienced and qualified professionals. It is not clear what the watching briefs and weekly site meetings by the Engineer and Consultant would entail. The MS is intended to be a 'living' document throughout construction, but it makes no provision for revisions to include the professionals' site visit reports and instructions nor any robust mechanism for amendments to be provided to the Council for approval.
12. The MS states that where works have the potential to cause harm to the building as works progress, contractors will discuss this with the project manager to resolve matters followed by discussion with the Council if necessary. However, the MS does not appear to specify that contractors would be appropriately qualified or experienced in heritage building work. The project manager is not named nor is it clear that they would be appropriately qualified or experienced to advise contractors. There appears to be little certainty that the Council would be kept informed unless it could commit its Heritage Officer to attend the weekly site meetings, the timing of which is not specified.
13. The MS outlines the works to the building, but it lacks detail and clarity. The scope of works is not clearly set out, nor is there an itemised list of works, key sequences or methods. There is little information about how the site would be accessed by contractors, parking arrangements, construction compounds or secure areas where materials including removed roof timbers, slates and bricks, as well as replacement materials, could be safely and appropriately stored for use.
14. There is little detail as to how the main roof would be carefully stripped, how removed materials would be stored and where. In this regard, the roof of the northwest range has already been stripped and some of the slates from the demolished pig sties were salvaged, but it is not clear how or where these materials are stored for reuse. The figures do not appear to reflect the existing situation or the structural roof repairs required, including in relation the northwest range which is open to the elements and the demolished buildings.
15. In relation to repointing of brickwork, the MS appears to rely upon Historic England Repointing Brick and Stone Walls Guidelines for Best Practice. However, this is aimed at homeowners and non-specialist building professionals and provides a brief technical guide to key issues and stages. It does not specify the works at this site. The MS states that rebuilding of damaged brickwork would be done as per supporting Engineers proposals but does not clearly specify any such proposals or cross-reference a structural report. It is not clear that the heritage consultant would be involved in relation to rebuilding works.
16. The MS states that the existing timber first floor structure would be replaced and repaired as per engineers' proposals, retaining as much of the existing as per the

supporting structural documents. Again, no detailed engineers' proposals or structural documents appear to be included or cross-referenced. Figure 4 refers to existing floors in poor condition with very decayed boards and currently unsafe to access. However, the MS fails to explain how the building would be made safe, the sequencing of works in these locations or the extent of replacement materials. There is reference to like-for-like replacement of materials, but existing materials are not specified in detail nor is it clear from where matching materials would be sourced or how, in the case of external materials, these would be integrated.

17. Although not submitted with the appeals, the Council's evidence refers to a January 2024 Structural Inspection of Existing Barn by Blackett-Ord Conservation Ltd that was submitted with refused planning application ref 24/1334M. This was a visual inspection from ground level only and it concluded that the barn was in a poor state of repair and very vulnerable to deterioration from the weather. It highlighted significant structural concerns and made numerous recommendations including careful dismantling of the roof; setting aside roof trusses, purlins, wall plates and rafters for reuse once these have been allowed to dry naturally; careful dismantling of brick walls to first floor level, setting aside bricks on pallets for reuse; and identification of an area where material can be safely stored for reuse.
18. Given that the MS refers to the earlier refused application, it seems likely that this is the structural report alluded to. However, the report's recommendations are not adequately addressed and the need for extensive dismantling and rebuilding is not reflected in the MS. The MS is also sparse in relation to details of how safety and structural stability would be ensured during the works, including in terms of risk assessment, scaffolding details and sequence of works. However, this is a clear requirement of both conditions and appears to be a particular concern given the findings of the 2024 structural inspection.
19. Drawing all this together, the MS appears insufficiently detailed in relation to the scale of necessary interventions, detailed working methods and schedule, and the extent of fabric replacement. It has not been robustly demonstrated that the building is structurally sound and capable of conversion without substantial rebuilding and structural work. The MS fails to specify the means of ensuring safety, protection and structural stability of the barn during works. Consequently, the MS fails to demonstrate that the special character, architectural interest and integrity of the listed building would be preserved during the works.
20. Therefore, I conclude that the submitted MS does not meet the requirements of condition 11 of planning permission ref 20/5272M and condition 6 of listed building consent ref 20/5273M. The submitted details conflict with the aims of policies MP1, SD1, SD2, SE1 and SE7 of Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 Adopted July 2017 (CELPS) and policies GEN1, HER1 and HER4 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document Adopted December 2022 (SADPD). These require, among other things, that proposals protect and enhance the historic environment including listed buildings, and do not materially diminish the quality of development between permission and completion. Moreover, the submitted details do not demonstrate that the building is of permanent and substantial construction so as to not require extensive alteration or rebuilding, in conflict with the aims of CELPS policy PG3 and SADPD policies RUR11 and RUR14.

Other Matters

21. During the appellant's ownership, the condition of the LB barn has deteriorated and part of it has been demolished without authorisation. In its exposed state, the barn is vulnerable to further deterioration. It would be beneficial for it to be converted and thereby conserved before its condition deteriorates further. Even so, its poor state of repair does not justify approval of details that fail to demonstrate how or even if the special interest of the designated heritage asset would be preserved.
22. A range of evidence has been presented with the appeal, including justification for the unauthorised demolition of part of the listed building, summaries and chronology of recent planning history with references to Counsel advice, and photographs of trenches. I have also been provided with CIL liability notices, relief claim decision notices, acknowledgement of receipts and demand notices. However, wider matters of lawfulness are reserved for the lawful development certificate process and are not within the scope of these appeals.
23. The appellant considers that the appeals could have been avoided if the Council had engaged with his agent and explained the necessary amendments to the MS. However, the Council's alleged failure to engage in proactive dialogue during the processing of the applications does not weigh in favour of the appeals.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that Appeal A is dismissed in relation to the details submitted pursuant to condition 11 and Appeal B is dismissed in relation to the details submitted pursuant to condition 6.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR