



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by **Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/V4250/W/25/3359675

4 Rectory Farm, Rectory Lane, Standish, Wigan WN6 0XD

- 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 Mrs Victoria Whittle against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref is A/24/97778/HH.
- The development proposed is two storey rear extension together with internal and external alterations including new windows and door.

Appeal B Ref: APP/V4250/Y/25/3359677

4 Rectory Farm, Rectory Lane, Standish, Wigan WN6 0XD

- 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 Mrs Victoria Whittle against the decision of Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref is A/24/97813/LB.
- The works proposed are two storey rear extension, together with internal and external alterations including new windows and door.

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed and Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the appeals relate to a listed building I have had special regard to section 16(2) and section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).

Main Issues

3. The main issue in these appeals is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and in particular whether it would preserve a Grade II listed building "Rectory Farmhouse" (ref: 1228474), and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

4. Rectory Farmhouse (the LB) was listed in 1988 and it dates from the mid 18th century. It is a 2 storey building finished in brick, with brick band over the ground floor and gauged-brick cambered arches to ground floor windows and entrance, a stone base and slate roof. The farmhouse is set back from Rectory Lane and to the east of a large yard. To the north of the yard lies Nos 2-3 Rectory Farm, a converted large 2-storey stone and brick barn with slate roof, full height central arched opening, and numerous somewhat domestic windows openings.
5. The appeal property lies on the west side of the yard, where historic maps illustrate a building since at least the mid 1800s. It was converted to residential use

in around 1995¹, prior to which it was described² as comprising a small 2-storey outbuilding with brick elevations over 5 courses of stone and a pitched slate roof and a 5-bay single storey stable block in whitewashed brick with a pitched corrugated roof. The building has been altered internally and externally, including its roof, openings and a porch canopy has been added. Nevertheless, it retains its modest scale and simple plan form which reflect its rural agricultural origins.

6. There has been development in the wider setting of the LB, and the historic curtilage of Rectory Farm has been subdivided to provide separate residential plots. However, the farmstead group, comprising former farmhouse and curtilage listed former farm buildings, remains widely separated from neighbouring development and the yard frontages remain substantially open. Consequently, the historic farmstead remains legible, including in terms of the visual, physical and functional relationship between the former farmhouse, farm buildings and yard.
7. For these reasons, I find that the significance of No 4, insofar as it relates to these appeals, to be primarily associated with its architectural and historic interest as an early outbuilding and stables connected to the LB farmhouse. Its simple form, design, historic fabric and siting serve to illustrate its former function ancillary to Rectory Farm and thereby it contributes positively to the special interest of the LB as a historic farmhouse and farmstead.
8. The proposal would be a substantial 2-storey extension with large pitched roof. It would be a little lower in height than its 2-storey host and set in from the corner of the building. Even so, it would be a markedly bulky feature that would overwhelm the 2-storey rear of its host, significantly disrupting the linear plan form and simple roof slopes of the former outbuilding. The full height windows where it attached to its host would be conspicuous contemporary features serving bedrooms and the associated light spill would emphasize the residential use.
9. Although not readily visible from the LB farmhouse or yard, the extension would dominate the rear of No 4. Moreover, notwithstanding some vegetation screening, it would be prominent in views along the road and markedly out of keeping with traditional agricultural building extensions. No 4 would have the appearance of a domestic 2-storey dwelling with single storey extension rather than a former farm building. Consequently, and irrespective of materials, the extension would not contribute positively to local distinctiveness or historic sense of place.
10. The historic rear elevation of No 4 would be incorporated into the building. Existing window openings would be enlarged to create internal doorways and there would be a new window opening in the exposed gable end. As such, there would be a loss of historic fabric including part of the ground floor stone courses. There is little detail in relation to the treatment of the remainder of the historic elevation following its incorporation as internal bedroom walls.
11. The erosion of the historic and architectural interest of the modest former rural agricultural building would harm its significance. The enlarged dwelling would have an urbanising effect on the rural building group and it would fail to respect the primacy of the former farmhouse, thereby eroding the legibility of the LB and farmstead. In turn, this would harm the character and appearance of the area.

¹ Ref A/93/40450 Change of use of existing barn and stables to 3 no dwellings with associated garages; and Refs A/94/42461 and A/94/42468 Conversion and extension of stable block and outbuilding into dwellinghouse.

² Standish: An Archaeological Assessment, Langtree Valley Golf and Country Club (1991).

12. Given the above, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building. This is a matter that carries considerable importance and weight in the planning balance of these appeals.
13. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 advises that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification. Given the scale and nature of the proposal, I find the harm would be moderate in the category of less than substantial, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
14. Where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The extension would increase the size of the property and provide an additional bedroom. This would be a private benefit and not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. Moreover, the continued viable use of No 4 as a dwelling is not dependent on the proposal as the residential use would not cease in its absence.
15. Given the above, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal subject of these appeals would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 212 of the Framework and conflicts with the heritage protection aims of policy JP-P2 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document for Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan 2022 to 2039 Adopted March 2024 (the PfE) and policy CP11 of Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy Adopted September 2013 (the CS). As a result, the proposal would conflict with the development plan.
16. The harm to the character and appearance of the building, farmstead group and hence area, would conflict with PfE policy JP-P1 and CS policy CP10. Among other things, these require proposals to integrate with their surroundings, respect and acknowledge character and identity and enable a clear understanding of how place developed. There would also be conflict with the SPD House Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document June 2019, including in terms of extensions being subordinate in form and scale, enhancing the character and reflecting the architectural detail of their host.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict.
18. Therefore, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR