



Appeal Statement

Norton Terrace, 363 Wilmslow Road, Manchester

Client: Feltham Group
by Jane Leach, iarchitect Limited

Statement of Experience

This Statement has been produced by Jane Leach, who is an award winning chartered architect and a registrant on the RIBA conservation register. She joined the architects register in 2004 and the RIBA Conservation Register in 2015.

Professional Studies Include:

- Barch hons, bachelor degree and DipArch post graduate studies at Edinburgh College of Art affiliated to Heriot-Watt University
- Erasmus exchange at Escola Tecnica Superior d'Arquitectura de Barcelona
- Advanced Diploma in Professional Practice in Architecture with the RIBA North West
- Eco-Refurbishment particularly of historic buildings with traditional construction through several courses with the Green Register
- RIBA Conservation Course

Since founding iarchitect Limited in 2009, Jane has designed alterations to well over 100 private homes, many of which have been in conservation areas, and several within the context of listed buildings, such as one in the context of Sawley Abbey, Grade I listed. She has also worked on the Grade II listed Northenden War Memorial funded by the War Memorial Trust. In previous public sector and corporate roles, Jane has been lead project architect for several multi-million pound projects involving community and education use, often within heritage buildings, including large-scale alterations to existing buildings within the curtilage of William Hulme's Grammar School, Grade II listed.

iarchitect Limited was instructed to advise on architectural matters following the grant of permission and consent in June 2021 for planning application reference 127016/FO/2020 and listed building consent reference 127016/LB/2020.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The background to these appeals is addressed in the Statement prepared by Mr Nicholls and is not repeated here. I address the Site's planning history below (in Section 3).

1.2 The main issue raised by these appeals as far as is relevant to the scope of this evidence is the impact of the proposed alterations to the approved scheme on the character and appearance of 363 Wilmslow Road. It is this character and appearance, particular to the street frontage as a group of buildings, that constitutes the principal heritage significance of this property.

1.3 The following are the elements of the approved scheme which the Appellant is seeking to change:

- i. the restriction on occupation of the premises prior to completion,
- ii. the requirement to remove insitu suspended ceilings, repair of the original lathe and plaster ceiling and cornices above, hanging a new suspended ceiling, and installation of a replica cornice,
- iii. the rainwater goods materials (to change from black painted cast iron to black painted aluminium),
- iv. the material for the main entrance steps (to change from natural stone to artstone), and adjustment of the jointing layout,
- v. the design details to the rear elevations, the fenestration pattern, window head and cill details, and decorative brickwork details, and,
- vi. internal details to the skirting, picture rails, cornices, and window shutters.

2.0 The Heritage Asset's Significance

2.1 The principal significance of 363 Wilmslow Road stems from its architectural aesthetics to the front elevation and oblique views of its side elevations, particularly as a group of buildings in a terrace designed to be viewed as a whole. There is some minor significance in its rear elevation and internal detailing, from an architectural aesthetic perspective. There is no archaeological and only minimal artistic or historic value.

2.2 From the perspective of public appreciation of significance, the front view of Norton Terrace is the most significant. Internal elements and the rear elevations are obviously less visible to the public and, while this does not mean that they have no significance, they are much less significant and have lower heritage value from the perspective of design quality and uniqueness.

2.3 This assessment of significance is in line with the appeal inspector's conclusion (in respect of the enforcement notice appeal), the English Heritage consultation response as referenced within the appeal inspectors report, and by the heritage assessment previously carried out by Savills. Extracts from each of those documents (that I append) are as follows:

“The overall interest and significance of the building relates in large part to the high aesthetic value of the visual coherence and legibility of the front elevation and its group value with the other properties in the terrace, with the gable ends also contributing significantly to the design composition of the group.” (at paragraph 13 of the inspector's decision – my Appendix 1).

“The Historic England consultation response to the 2015 scheme (dated 5th May 2015) referred to the importance of the 'collective aesthetic' of this row of terraces... This response also indicated that, whilst the scheme would have involved the loss of the lower levels of the outrigger, this structure forms a 'marginal contribution to the site'... reference was made to the 'minor loss' of original interior fabric...” (at paragraph 12 of Historic England's consultation response – my Appendix 1).

“The significance of the Grade II listed 363 Wilmslow Road lies chiefly in the features of the principal elevation fronting onto Wilmslow Road, which is visually dominant and coherent.” (at paragraph 5:2:3 of Savills heritage statement - my Appendix 2).

2.4 The rear and the interior of 363 Wilmslow Road, whilst having some marginal or minor heritage significance, have much lesser heritage significance, and alterations made to both, along with small alterations made to the side elevation, have caused no harm to the principal significance of the building, and minimal impact to the heritage significance of this building overall.

2.5 The official listing for 363 Wilmslow Road is similarly focused on describing details to the front elevations which are the most significant elements of this property.

2.6 The listing entry is (underlining added to highlight sections particularly significant to 363):

“Terrace row of 3 houses, No.363 now offices. Mid C19; altered. Stucco painted white, with sandstone dressings painted black, slate roof. Double-depth plan with short back

extensions, No.359 single-fronted and the others double-fronted. Two storeys with basement and attic, an 8-window range, almost symmetrical, with 2-window gabled centre, banded and vermiculated corner pilasters, 1st-floor sill-band, and bracketed eaves. The ground floor has 5 canted bay windows (1, 2 and 2) with pilasters and bracketed cornices, and doorways which have Corinthian pilaster doorcases, doors with round-headed glazed upper panels and rectangular overlights. The 1st floor windows have shouldered architraves with keystones, between those in the centre is a plaque lettered "NORTON PLACE", and in the gable above this is a small round-headed attic window with pilastered and keyed architrave. Brick chimneys on the ridge and at both gables. Rear and interior not inspected."

2.7 Although the principal significance of this property derives from its architectural aesthetic merit as a group of buildings in a terrace it does not meet normal listing parameters for significance as it is not a unique example of its architectural style, nor of any innovative architectural construction, nor does it hold any special historic importance either from the perspective of national or local history.

2.8 Wilmslow Road has a relatively consistent building pattern along this stretch, with the original properties typically being of a similar scale and massing set back from the street with a generous frontage. There are a number of properties of a similar period to Norton Terrace, though they have not generally been conserved as sensitively.

2.9 There are several modern replacements and extensions in the area (and forming part of the context of Norton Terrace) which are not in keeping with the style or scale of Norton Terrace and its Victorian period setting, such as the single storey MacDonalds and the flat roof on pilotis hotel extension. These sit directly opposite to Norton Terrace and are both detrimental to its heritage value.

2.10 However, incremental changes to buildings on neighbouring sites has not substantially harmed the significance of Norton Terrace. Its character and appearance as seen from the street is robust enough to overcome these local alterations and visual distractions.

3.0 The Planning History

3.1 Following its listing in 1974, when it was in use as offices (and having been subject to some alterations), 363 Wilmslow Road was converted to a medical practice.

3.2 In 1977 Listed Building Consent and Planning Approval was granted for a single-storey rear extension. (Ref. No: F06312/LB)

3.3 In 1979 Listed Building Consent and Planning Approval was granted for change of use from residential to consulting space for the then first floor flat (Ref. No: F12314/LB). Internal alterations were likely to have been necessary to form the new spaces described, though not explicitly referred to in the overview description. Proposals for internal alterations may have been included on the 1979 application drawings, which are not available to view online.

3.4 In 2001 and 2008 further applications were made and approved, which were considered to have minimal impact on the heritage significance of the building, and to not adversely affect the character of the terrace. (2001 Ref. No: 061665/FO/SOUTH1/01 and Ref. No: 061666/LO/SOUTH1/01)

3.5 In 2001 Listed Building Consent and Planning Approval was granted for a single storey rear extension, new entrance at side of property with access ramp, parking at rear, and internal alterations.

3.6 Drawings are not available online for the 2001 application, but existing floorplans for the 2008 application (Ref. No: 086581/LO/2008/S1 and Ref. No: 086507/FO/2008/S1) show that there had already been extensive internal alterations, to what was the original layout. These included new openings to original internal walls and additional internal partition walls. It is not clear when those alterations were made.

3.7 In 2008 Listed building consent and Planning Approval was granted for a part single/part 2 storey rear extension, new access ramp and side entrance, car parking in rear garden and associated landscaping. The footprint of the proposed rear extension was 8.5m deep from main body of existing building, 8.5m wide, in line with side elevation at lower ground floor level. This application was a repeat of the earlier 2001 application.

3.8 The planning officer comments on the 2008 scheme included the following:

“proposed works do not adversely affect the character of the terrace, being located in the main at the rear of the property. The side entrance has minimal impact.”

“Permission has previously been granted for these works”

3.9 A photograph of the original rear of 363 Wilmslow Road on the drawings submitted in 2008 titled “Proposed Site Plan” and “Existing Elevations / Sections” show that, to the rear outrigger, original windows with stone lintols had flat heads, while windows with brick soldier courses had swept arch heads. There is a mix of header treatments to the original windows, with some having a stone lintol and others having a brick soldier course. Although the quality of the photograph is not

good, all windows to the rear elevation of the main body of the building appear to have flat heads with brick soldier courses and to have not been altered since the original configuration, as is evident in the windows at the rear of the main body of the building to the neighbouring property.

3.10 A new window, proposed in the 2008 application, to the first floor of main body of original building to the rear was approved with a flat head, not a swept arch head, as seen on the proposed floor elevations and floor plans. A proposed new window to the rear outrigger at first floor level is drawn possibly with a stone lintol as a flat head, although notes elsewhere describe similar graphic representations as brick soldier courses. These 2008 proposal drawings show swept head windows with brick soldier course to the new windows to the extension. All proposed new windows are noted to be sash style. While windows proposed to the side of the rear extension have cills at floor level, creating a vertical fenestration pattern.

3.11 In 2014 there was a planning application for change of use to flats along with a rear extension, with the same form as the 2008 application (Ref. No: 106424/FO/2014/S1 and Ref. No: 106425/LO/2014/S1). Listed Building Consent and Planning Approval were granted for erection of part single, part two-storey rear extension together with excavation of a rear garden and internal alterations in association with the creation of nine flats. This established the principle for this property to be converted into nine flats, including internal alterations to make that possible, with a rear extension reconfirmed as being acceptable and not detrimental to the heritage significance of this property.

3.12 The 2014 scheme followed the footprint and massing of the earlier 2008 granted extension to the rear. There are few details described in notes on the drawings or accompanying documents but the elevations appear to propose flat head lintols to all new windows to the 2014 proposed extension.

3.13 The 2014 floorplans show non-original internal partitions added to the building as being removed. There are fewer internal partitions visible on these floorplans than were in place at the time of the 2008 application. Substantial internal alterations were proposed with partition walls shown as being removed, existing door openings at basement level were blocked up and new spiral staircases added to connect basement to ground floor, along with additional kitchens and bathrooms, which would also include their associated services.

3.14 A further application for a larger rear extension to that approved in 2014 was made in 2015. Listed Building Consent and Planning Approval was granted for the construction of a two-storey rear extension with internal alterations to form 9 flats (Ref. No: 107449/LO/2014/S1 and Ref. No: 107448/FO/2014/S1). This 2015 approval included a two-storey rear extension, with vertical format flat head windows with artstone surrounds, UPVc rainwater goods to the rear extension, and white artstone parapet capping, painted timber sash effect top hung casement windows, the windows to the rear elevation were each of an equal size, and substantial internal alterations in order to form 9 residential units including additional internal staircases. The format of the fenestration to the rear elevation of the rear extension included four similarly sized vertical windows.

3.15 The planning conditions included requirements for samples and specifications for materials to be used on external elevations, hard and soft landscaping scheme, acoustic treatment to the

windows facing Wilmslow Road, and detailed scheme for refuse storage to be submitted for detailed approval. The listed building consent conditions also included for detailed design to be submitted and approved for a lockable side gate, soft strip-out of interior, refurbishment/repair of the roof, and refurbishment/repair of windows.

3.16 This approval addressed the interior of the property more sensitively than previous approvals, while a larger rear extension with flat head windows of regular sizes was considered to not be detrimental to the heritage significance of this property. There is a conflict between the requirement in the planning condition to incorporate acoustic insulation to windows facing Wilmslow Road and the listed building consent condition to limit works to existing windows.

3.17 The latest listed building consent and planning approval was the subject of applications submitted in 2020 and granted in 2021 (Ref. No: 127016/FO/2020 and Ref. No: 127017/LO/2020). Listed Building Consent and Planning Approval was granted for construction of a two-storey rear extension to create 9 self-contained flats, including internal alterations, rebuilding gate piers, car parking, cycle and refuse stores. The application included the following details to the rear extension: brick soldier course lintols with segmented arched heads to windows, painted timber sprung sliding sash windows, retained patio door opening replaced with timber patio doors with all other window openings rebuilt and resized recessed dummy windows to the North East side elevation. The approval drawings also included fitting all black aluminium rainwater goods with heritage profile, alterations to rooflights, refinished main entrance steps, replacement of UPVC windows with painted timber, reconstruction of original form of rear outrigger, internal alterations to include removal and infilling existing openings, fitting internal staircases, removal of internal partition walls and installation of kitchens and bathrooms. The overall size and form of the rear extension was the same as that approved in the 2015 application.

3.18 In light of that extensive planning history, I note the following:

- substantial internal alterations through the addition of partition walls, internal staircases and alteration, removal or addition of internal openings, removal of significant internal decorative features such as fireplaces, have previously been permitted,
- a two-storey rear extension, of the bulk, scale and mass approved in 2015, has been found to be not detrimental to the heritage significance of this building and does not adversely affect the character of the terrace,
- flat head windows with modern detailing to the rear extension and rear elevation have been found to be not detrimental to the heritage significance of this building, in particular the use of artstone rather than natural stone for cills and window surrounds,
- minor alterations to the sides of the existing building, such as addition of a new door opening, have been found to have minimal impact on the heritage significance of this building,
- use of the building is suitable for residential use, in the form of nine self-contained flats with a mixture of one and two beds, and,

- conversion of the roofspace within the original building, with the provision of rooflights has been found to be acceptable.

4.0 The Appeal Proposals

4.1 This application is seeking to amend the following:

- i. The condition which limits occupation prior to completion.
- ii. The condition requiring removal of the in-situ suspended ceilings, repair of concealed lathe and plaster ceilings and cornices, fixing of new suspended ceilings and installation of a replica cornice.
- iii. The condition which specifies cast iron to be used as rainwater goods.
- iv. The condition which requires use of natural stone and specifies the size and layout of the finishes to the main entrance steps.
- v. Design details to the rear extension, particularly the fenestration pattern, window head details, cill details, and decorative brickwork details.
- vi. Internal details to the skirting, picture rails, cornices, and window shutters.

Proposed alteration to the condition to allow partial occupation prior to completion

4.2 The planning officers report appears to suggest that the restriction on partial occupation is only based on installation of obscure glazing. However, the conditions for both the planning permission and the listed building consent place restrictions on first occupation of the property in five separate conditions, as listed below.

4.3 Listed building consent conditions:

- Condition 6 states that cast iron rainwater pipes must be in situ prior to the first occupation of the development.
- Condition 8 states that the picture rails, moulded skirting boards, acanthus design console brackets within the hall shall be installed prior to the first occupation of the development.

4.4 Planning permission conditions:

- Condition 7 states that the car parking shall be laid out and demarcated prior to the first occupation of the development
- Condition 8 states that the bicycle store shall be installed prior to the first occupation of the development.
- Condition 10 states that obscure glazing to the north elevation of the rear extension must be installed prior to first occupation.

4.5 This application seeks to amend each of the conditions listed above to allow partial occupation of the building prior to their completion.

Proposed alteration to the condition to remove the suspended ceilings, repair the original lathe and plaster ceiling and cornices above, hang a new suspended ceiling, and install a replica cornice.

4.6 This application seeks to alter the drawings and documents previously approved, by both planning approval and listed building consent and named in conditions 2 for each decision notice, that detail the works to be carried out to the ceilings within the ground floor apartments, and to amend listed building consent condition 5. Condition 5 includes for required details for installation of a new false ceiling, refurbishment and repair of original fabric concealed by the ceiling, and a new cornice to be installed to the new false ceiling.

4.7 We seek to retain the current insitu suspended ceilings, instead of removing them, so doing to protect the original ceiling and cornicing above from further damage without refurbishing or repairing them, and to omit the addition of new replica cornices to the suspended ceilings.

Proposal to alter the materials to be used in the rainwater goods

4.8 This application seeks to alter condition 6 in the Listed Building Consent, which states that no rainwater goods nor pipes shall be installed nor affixed other than rainwater goods and pipes constructed of cast iron and coloured black.

4.9 We seek to change the material of the rainwater goods and pipes from cast iron to aluminium with a heritage profile and powder coated black, to give the appearance of traditional cast iron rainwater goods.

Proposal to alter the materials and layout of steps to the main entrance

4.10 This application seeks to alter drawings and documents that specify the materials and jointing details of the front steps, that were submitted in order to discharge Planning Permission condition 4 and Listed Building Consent condition 4.

4.11 We seek to change the material of the steps from natural stone to artstone, and for the jointing to be minimised and simplified by removal of all joints to the centre of the steps between the handrails, with one joint to each side of each step, underneath and in line with the handrail to each side. This giving three pieces to each step with two consistent joint lines with no staggering.

Proposal to alter the Design Details to the Rear Extension, particularly the fenestration pattern, window head details, cill details, and decorative brickwork details.

4.12 This application seeks to amend the drawings and documents previously approved, by both planning approval and listed building consent and named in conditions 2 for each decision notice, that detail the design of and works to the rear elevation, rear extension and relate in particular to new fenestration and external decorative brickwork details.

4.13 We seek to change:

- the fenestration pattern to the rear elevation of the rear extension to create four identically sized vertical format windows by lowering the cill level and retaining the width as built,
- the window head details to be retained as flat head with a brick soldier course, instead of changed to swept arch heads,
- to retain, fill and paint black the jointed artstone cills, instead of replacing them with single piece natural stone cills, and,
- to omit the dummy windows to the north elevation of the rear extension.

Proposal to alter the internal details to the skirting, picture rails, cornices and window shutters.

4.14 This application seeks to amend the drawings and documents submitted in order to discharge the following Listed Building consent conditions:

- condition 5: relating to new cornicing to be installed
- condition 7: relating to works to timber panelling and shutters to ground floor windows, and,
- condition 8: relating to details of picture rails and moulded skirting boards in the hall

4.15 We seek to omit new replica cornices to be fitted within the ground floor apartments, and to only fit new replica cornices to the entrance hall and stairs, to omit the installation of replica timber panelling and shutters to ground floor bay windows, and to omit replica picture rails, additional moulded skirting boards, and other new replica profiled timber architraves and other timber details throughout the building.

5.0 Relevant Legislation and Policy / Guidance

5.1 The relevant legislation and guidance which I have taken into account in assessing the heritage issues raised by the appeals are as follows:

- Sections 16(2) and 66 of (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990;
- Policies within the Development Plan, the most relevant being the “saved” Unitary Development Plan Policy EN3: Heritage and Core Strategy Policy DC19.1: Listed Buildings;
- Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF- 2021), which deals with Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment
- Statements of Heritage Significance: Analysing Significance in Heritage Assets. Historic England Advice Note 12.

6.0 Impact on Significance Assessment

6.1 The officers report on the current proposals lacks an application of policy and fails to analyse impact on the heritage significance of the changes proposed.

6.2 The proposed scheme would represent minimal to no impact on the significance of this heritage property. In terms of architectural conservation these proposals are not only not detrimental but they are beneficial.

Allowing Partial Occupation

6.3 While certain conditioned works would prevent full occupation due to the necessity to carry out the work within specific apartments within the building, such as those conditioned in the listed building condition 8 or planning permission condition 10; all others such as those conditioning rainwater pipes, bicycle store and car parking demarcation could be carried out following a partial occupation of the property without detriment to the inhabitants of this building or those of neighbouring properties.

6.4 It is unreasonable to prevent partial occupation of the property prior to all of the conditioned works being completed, as previously listed in 4.3 and 4.4 of this document. The completion of conditioned works and a partial occupation could be phased to cause no detriment either to inhabitants or to those of neighbouring properties. Not allowing partial occupation of the property prior to all of these works being completed delays occupation significantly more than is necessary, and therefore also has financial implications for the owner.

6.3 Altering the conditions that prevent partial occupation prior to completion would have no impact whatsoever on the heritage significance of Norton Terrace.

The Suspended Ceilings and Cornicing

6.4 The listing from 1974 includes the following description: “No.363 now offices. Mid C19; altered.” The alterations are not detailed in the listing.

6.5 Subsequent to listing, Number 363 was in use as a medical centre from 1977. Internal alterations were made during its period of use as a medical centre, and possibly also during its use as offices. There is a limited record of which internal alterations were made, at what time and for which purpose, and most of the original fabric of the building which is a record of these changes has since been removed or repaired. Drawings from the planning application made in 2008, show many internal alterations having already been made to the original layout, such as partitions and new internal openings. The drawings (see Appendix 3) do not make it clear when these alterations were made.

6.6 According to Historic England guidance in advice note 12, alterations made both prior to as well as since this building was listed are considered to be protected under listed building legislation. The many internal alterations that have been made to this building add to its history. The only remaining evidence of these changes is within the ceilings and cornices which are above the suspended ceilings currently in place. This material evidence should be preserved.

6.7 Preservation of architectural history does not mean replicating that which is now gone. Nor does it mean refurbishing or repairing original material. It means maintaining in as good condition as possible, by preventing further damage, any original material which exists and acts as a record of the architectural history.

6.8 Removing the suspended ceiling and repairing the original ceilings and cornices above, will act contrary to the requirements of preservation. Removal of the insitu suspended ceiling will cause additional damage, while repairs to the ceiling and cornice above will obliterate the historical evidence of past uses and building alterations that the damaged cornices and ceilings represent.

6.9 The requirements of the condition to add replica cornices below a suspended ceiling to the four ground floor principal rooms, would be detrimental to the preservation of the architectural heritage of this building. Fitting replica cornices will never enable the appreciation of these rooms as they were originally designed and intended to be viewed. The substantially raised floor and lower suspended ceiling, with the resulting lower room height makes this impossible. This would still be the case, even if the suspended ceiling were to be raised the nominal amount required by the condition. Adding replica cornices to the suspended ceiling would confuse the reading of the space and the architectural history of the building, rather than enhance it.

6.7 The principal ground floor rooms have been altered substantially internally, with the addition of partitions and openings, as well as removal of key decorative features, that it has not been possible to appreciate these spaces as they were originally built since at least 2001 and possibly since prior to listing in 1974. The works that have been carried out to remove internal partitions that previously subdivided these principal rooms has enhanced our ability to appreciate these rooms as they were originally designed. However, seeking to return these spaces to their original configuration and internal decorative detailing goes against the principles of the preservation of heritage significance.

6.8 It is far better, in terms of preserving and enhancing the architectural history of this building to make it clear which is new and which is original. Using a contemporary language for the modern additions, that is sympathetic to the original, makes the new clearly legible and distinguishable from the original, resulting in a design that both preserves and enhances the architectural history and significance of this building. Attempting to replicate traditional design approaches confuses the heritage and significance and therefore does not preserve nor enhance it, even if on face value it appears as though it might.

6.9 Retaining the insitu suspended ceilings would conserve the evidential heritage present in the concealed ceilings and cornices and prevent further damage, and confusion. The suspended ceiling, currently in place, represents minimal harm to the heritage significance of this building. This needs to be considered alongside the base point of the interior that had been altered internally even prior to its listing and the alteration of which has not reduced the significance of this building. The conservation of original fabric by retaining the current suspended ceiling would be beneficial to the significance of the heritage interest of the building to a moderate degree.

The Rainwater Goods

6.10 The original rainwater goods, assumed to be cast iron, across the whole of Norton Terrace were (at an unknown point of time) removed and replaced with uPVC rainwater goods. The current owner, and applicant, of 363 Wilmslow Road purchased this property with the current uPVC rainwater goods in place.

6.11 The visual difference between a cast iron and an aluminium heritage profile set of rainwater goods and pipes is minimal and would be very difficult to distinguish (even by experts). There would be absolutely no harm caused to the significance of this building should the specification of cast iron painted black be altered to aluminium painted black with a heritage profile. The design quality of this building would not be diminished in any way by this proposed amendment to the listed consent condition 6.

6.12 In addition, there are significant benefits to using aluminium both from a heritage perspective (and a health and safety perspective in terms of less onerous maintenance requirements that require working at height).

6.13 Cast iron is a reasonably durable material, but is relatively heavy and requires regular maintenance in order to retain functionality when used for rainwater goods. Accordingly from a heritage perspective, there is a risk that cast iron elements will not be properly maintained.

6.14 Aluminium in contrast to cast iron is a much more durable material, it does not rust and is relatively lightweight, requiring minimal maintenance. In heritage terms, aluminium rainwater goods are likely to provide long term benefits.

6.15 The use of black painted cast iron changed to black painted aluminium rainwater goods will have no appreciable aesthetic impact on the heritage significance of this building, and will protect the evidential value of this building by ensuring clarity for future generations understanding. There will be no material impact on the significance of the heritage interest of the building by allowing this change.

The Main Entrance Steps

6.16 The value of the front elevation, which is the part of this building which holds most heritage significance, is largely derived from its aesthetic decorative quality. The original materials have largely been lost or disguised, because the aesthetics have been preserved by replicating, repairing and refurbishing original material. Where original materials have been lost, it preserves heritage value more effectively to use a modern alternative material, rather than attempt to replace the lost original element with a replica in a material assumed to be the same as the original. Where there is no evidence of the original material, such as for the front steps, it is better to use modern materials that are aesthetically sensitive because it reduces confusion in understanding of, and harm to, the heritage value.

6.17 The design of this terrace uses a rigorous decorative style with a limited palette of materials. There are several new elements that have been added, all using the same reconstituted stone, called Artstone. Although it can be assumed that the original steps were a natural stone,

there is no other example of unpainted natural stone in the existing palette of materials currently visible on this frontage. It is also not known which particular type of natural stone was used for the steps, as there is no evidence of any original material for the steps to match to.

6.18 The planning approval for the 2015 scheme established the principle that incorporation of the modern material of Artstone was acceptable and did not diminish the heritage significance of this building. Artstone was incorporated into the 2015 approved proposal as a finish to several elements including to parapet cappings and window surrounds. Artstone is a reconstituted stone.

6.19 There are examples of reconstituted stone used elsewhere across the frontage of this building. Repeating the use of the same reconstituted stone for the steps will create a more sympathetic and harmonious aesthetic result than would be gained from introducing another material, such as natural stone.

6.20 It is the jointing of the steps, rather than the material of the steps, which is detrimental to the aesthetic value of the buildings. Replacing the steps with the same material but in a simpler configuration would remove the visually jarring joints from the centre of the steps. The proposal drawings show a jointing layout that would maintain the central portion of the steps clear of joints and have a single consistent joint in line with the hand rails at each side.

6.21 Because of health and safety requirements as well as manufacturing limitations it is not possible to create the steps as single pieces of material, so joints for each step are essential. By lining the joints up with the handrails this will remove the visual clutter of the current multiple staggered joints in the central portion of the steps. This will also meet the manufacturing and installation limitations of the material, as well as aesthetic requirements.

6.22 The change from natural stone to Artstone with a simplified jointing layout to the main steps will have minimal impact on the aesthetic heritage significance of this building, and will protect the evidential value of the material of this building by ensuring clarity for future generations understanding of it.

Fenestration and Details to the Rear Extension

6.23 The fenestration pattern to the rear elevation of the rear extension in the approved applications of 2015 was for four identically sized vertical format windows. The fenestration pattern proposed now is also for four identically sized vertical format windows. Although the windows proposed now are larger than those proposed in 2015, the fenestration pattern and vertical format is the same.

6.24 Diminutive windows of various sizes may reflect the original utilitarian nature of the rear outriggers, but as has already been established, the rear outriggers make only a marginal contribution to the significance of this building. While the design of the windows should be sympathetic to the original design intent of this building, it is also important to implement changes that are consistent with its viable use as inhabitable residential spaces (whilst respecting its heritage significance). Larger windows that provide more natural light are important for the enjoyment and well-being of future inhabitants.

6.25 The windows proposed to the sides of the rear extension remain smaller scale as previously approved, which is indicative of the hierarchy of the extension relative to the front and side of the main body of the original building, and is also relevant to the uses of the spaces that these windows let onto. The four windows to the rear of the building in contrast, have minimal harmful impact on the significance of the building, they cannot be seen from the front or side of the building, and they are also living rooms and bedrooms which require a higher level of natural light than other spaces in these residential units.

6.26 The four larger vertical format windows of equal sizes, proposed for the four windows to the rear elevation of the rear extension, is an authentic design response based on Victorian approaches to fenestration design and the architectural language of this building. This proposed change of fenestration pattern would result in no harm to the heritage significance of Norton Place.

6.27 The original window head details to the rear of the main body of the building had mainly straight heads and all windows to the front and side of the main body of the original building are also straight head windows. Windows to the outrigger on the adjacent terrace buildings are a mix of swept arches and straight head, with neither version predominant. Photographs of the original rear of 363 Wilmslow Road, included in previous planning applications, show a similar mix of swept or segmental arch heads along with straight heads as in the adjoining properties. See my Appendix 4.

6.28 It cannot be said that either a segmental or swept head arch window head most closely reflects the rear elevations of Norton Place, and even less the overall architectural language of the building style. Taken overall the straight head window is more typical of the architectural style of this building, with windows to the rear being a mix of straight, and swept or arched heads, with almost entirely straight window heads to the most significant street frontage.

6.29 Given that there is a mix of window head styles to the rear elevations and that overall the rear outriggers make only a modest contribution to the heritage significance of this building, it would not be harmful for all the windows to the rear to have a straight head. There is no additional benefit from the perspective of preserving heritage significance to rebuild the new window heads in the extension with a segmental arch.

6.30 The window heads to the existing windows in the rear elevation of the main body of the building are unaltered from their original form as straight head windows. Changing these to segmental or swept arch heads would be harmful to the preservation of the heritage of this building.

6.31 The windows cills as built to the rear extension are Artstone. This material was designed to surround the windows in the 2015 approved scheme. The approved scheme in 2020 is for natural stone cills to replace the Artstone cills. This proposal is to reuse the Artstone cills, fill the joint, and paint them black to give a visual continuity to the rear extension informed by the frontage treatment.

6.32 The natural stone cills used originally elsewhere on this property have been painted. The cills to the front in particular are painted black. Since the stone is painted it is impossible to see the

base material, so using a stone cill or any other material and painting it the same colour would give the same aesthetic finish.

6.33 The Artstone material used to the extension windows cills that is currently insitu is in two pieces with a joint. This joint is proposed to be filled prior to painting to give the same effect as a single replacement natural stone cill.

6.34 The decorative brickwork details in the 2020 submitted scheme, approved in 2021, to the side elevation of the rear extension facing the adjoining neighbours, consist of two dummy windows. They have no functional purpose and although aesthetically they replicate the position of two proposed windows in these positions in the approved 2015 application, they do not add anything beneficial from a heritage perspective.

6.35 The omission of the two dummy windows will have no impact on the heritage significance of this building, and in particular will not alter the character of the terrace.

6.36 Along with the proposed alteration to the rear elevation for the rear extension fenestration pattern is an alteration to the windows themselves. While the proposal is to use painted timber windows this proposal is to create two pairs of patio doors to the ground floor, and floor length 4 panel timber framed windows to the first floor with a fixed bottom panel and top panel sliding sash.

6.37 In the approved planning application of 2015 there are two floor length windows shown on the side elevation of the rear extension. The floor length windows / patio doors proposed here, to the rear elevation of the rear extension, would be very similar to those included in the approved application of 2015. This approach to create a vertical fenestration pattern by the use of tall windows with cills at floor level has been established as having no detrimental impact on heritage significance.

6.38 Overall the rear extension has minimal impact on the heritage significance of this building and the change to the fenestration pattern, the window head details, the window sill details, the omission of the dummy windows, and the floor length windows have precedence in the 2015 approval when they were considered not to be harmful to the heritage significance of this building.

Internal Decorative Details

6.39 As previously set out in this report there have been many internal alterations to this building throughout the years. An exact record is not available, but according to planning drawings associated with the planning and listed building consent applications made in 2008 (see Appendix 3) many alterations including new openings in walls, doorways through chimney breasts with fireplaces removed, and internal partition walls had taken place. The listing states that the building was altered and was in use at the time, 1974, as offices. In 1977 it was converted to use as a medical centre and further works were carried out following further approvals and consent in 1979 and 2001.

6.40 According to Historic England's guidance note 12 on the protection of listed buildings all alterations made to listed buildings are considered to be protected by the listing. This is true for

alterations made prior to listing as well as to alterations made with consent following listing. These alterations form part of the history of the building and it is considered to be important to protect the history of a listed building through material evidence.

6.41 Since there is evidence in the planning records that there were many alterations made prior to 2008, these alterations must be considered to be protected works as part of the whole building. Those internal alterations form part of the history of the building and is the base point from which we must start.

6.42 To attempt to return a heritage building back to its original first built state is contrary to architectural conservation and the preservation of heritage assets. Planning legislation requires us to enhance and protect evidential historic value, rather than treat any one particular style of design or period of construction preferentially and replicate it.

6.43 Restoring and replicating the original aesthetics of a building is contrary to protecting the evidential and historic fabric of the building, since it can obfuscate what is original along with the history of changes to the building. Repair of original features is not necessarily a positive in architectural conservation since it can remove the natural ageing of the material and disguise or remove heritage value.

6.44 In the case of 363 Wilmslow Road, the removal of internal alterations and repairs of the damaged staircase and balustrade, considered in the appeal inspectors report to be “harmful elements” and “beneficial” repairs of original features, could be considered to be harmful actions that have removed material evidence of the history of the building.

6.45 The many internal subdivisions and alterations that have been made to this building, to accommodate its changes in use since prior to its listing, have diminished our ability to appreciate the original internal proportions and decorative details throughout the building, and particularly within each of the original principal ground floor rooms.

6.46 Proposals approved in 2015, included a raised ground floor which further altered the proportions of the principle ground floor rooms. This raised floor level was not explicitly included in the schedule of works included in the applications at that time and the work was carried out without consent. The raising of the ground floor level was subsequently approved as part of the 2020 applications for listed building consent and planning approval.

6.47 As a result of raising the ground floor level, much of the original internal decorative timber work to the ground floor was necessarily removed, such as the skirting, dado rails, picture rails, window shutters and doorways with associated framing. This work was an unavoidable consequence of the approved raising of the ground floor height.

6.48 A modern approach was taken to the installation of new timber details for skirting, frames and architraves. While it is to be regretted that the original details were lost, these changes now form part of the history of this building. The modern profiles that have been used in the now contemporary interior ensure that there is no confusion concerning which is original and which is not. This has created a clear body of material evidence showing the history of this building and the changes that it has undergone. This is an appropriate approach to detailing this now modern

interior, which respects the history of the building more by not attempting to replicate and confuse it, but instead by creating a clear distinction that better allows what is left of the original interior to be better appreciated.

6.49 The original proportions of the hall and the four principal ground floor rooms have been altered by the raised ground floor level. However, removal of the internal partitions which subdivided all the principal ground floor rooms, except for the front room to the left of the hall, has opened up these rooms so they are now of a more similar scale and plan form to that originally built. Given that these principal rooms have been unable to be appreciated in their original form since at least 2001 and potentially since prior to listing in 1974, it is not imperative to be able to appreciate these principal rooms as they were originally designed in order to protect the heritage significance of this building. However, it could be seen to be beneficial from a heritage perspective that these three principal rooms are more similar in plan form than in previous compartmentalised configurations.

6.50 As a result of works that have been carried out, the window shutters to the three large bay windows were lost. Attempting to replicate original fabric is not consistent with architectural conservation best practice. There is also a precedence that the interior decorative details do not impact the heritage significance of this building. Therefore this application seeks to omit the addition of look-alike replica window shutters to the three bay windows.

6.51 The original cornices are covered by the suspended ceiling to the ground floor principal rooms and, as argued elsewhere in this report, there should be no additional modern replica cornice fixed below the suspended ceilings. Replica cornices will confuse the heritage of the building. It will also remain impossible to appreciate the original decorative design since the vertical proportions of the ground floor rooms has changed.

6.52 The original cornices have been lost in much of the hall and first floor. Although it is not concurrent with conservation best practice to replicate lost original detail, the appeal inspector in 2019 decided that the interior has a contribution to play in revealing the hierarchy of design language. Therefore, we propose to replicate the original cornicing within the hall to illustrate the hierarchical design language. This will be visible by the use of replica cornices, as a journey from the principal elevation, through the main entrance at principal ground floor with a larger more decorative cornice, into the hall and up through the building, into the secondary private spaces of the first floor and upwards with a smaller swan neck cornice. The lost acanthus brackets in the hall are also proposed to be replicated in order to maintain the original design journey intent through the building.

6.53 This application proposes that cornicing is not replicated where it has been lost within the residential units, since the replication of cornicing to these spaces cannot enhance the heritage significance of this building. However, a swan neck style cornice has been installed to the first floor front rooms and landing areas in accordance with the approved drawing 363-OD-0211 Rev 01-WIP.

6.54 The many internal alterations that have been carried out prior to 2008 have set a precedent that the interior has at most only minimal contribution to the heritage significance of this building. The alterations to the 2021 scheme, regarding replica skirting, picture rails, door frames, window shutters and additional cornices to residential units, represent minimal impact on the heritage

significance of this building. Limiting the replication of original elements in turn limits future confusion surrounding the historic evidence present in the fabric of the building and better protects this buildings historic significance.

6.55 Overall these proposed alterations represent no change to the overall impact of this development on the heritage significance of Norton Terrace and its character, when compared with the 2021 approved proposals.

7.0 Summary and Conclusions

7.01 The property of 363 Wilmslow Road has seen many alterations made to its use and as a result to its internal configuration. These changes form part of the history of this building and, where material evidence of these remains, should be preserved for the understanding of people in the future. Even at the date of its listing in 1974 it was noted that the building had been altered and it was considered to be of heritage significance regardless of these alterations.

7.02 The precedents set by the subsequent planning approvals and listed building consents are that the frontage of this building and its character, form and scale on the streetscene as a terrace are the key characteristics that should be protected as being significant historically. In the context of the body of planning history it can be seen that changes to the rear with extensions and new windows, as well as substantial internal alterations have been shown to have no impact on the heritage significance of this building, while changes to the side elevation have been shown to have only minimal impact.

7.03 The changes proposed by this application seek both to preserve the material historical evidence of the building by preserving what remains of both the original and of the cumulative changes made through time. Alongside this the proposals prevent future confusion of historical understanding. This approach includes avoidance of falsifying history with replica details, particularly those with no existing material historical evidence for their use, such as the dummy windows to the rear extension or the use of a non-specific natural stone to the front steps. This rigorous approach of protecting the existing, while not replicating or falsifying history particularly where there is no evidence or where this could confuse historical understanding, along with sensitively adding modern elements is the best way to protect and enhance this building for the future.

7.04 While the rear extension and its details to the side, the Artstone to the frontage, and the loss of the window shutters to the three bay windows can be seen from the street to a very minimal extent, and therefore have some visual impact on the main heritage significance of this building, all other proposed alterations have no visual impact on the main heritage significance of this building. Overall given the precedents set in previous planning approvals and listed building consents it has been established that the rear extension and its detailing along with internal alterations causes less than substantial harm to the heritage significance of this building. Any harm can be seen as minimal, with precedence for approval and is offset by the public benefits of the provision of housing. The alterations that have been proposed all seek to preserve original fabric and use alternative materials that are clearly modern to avoid future confusion, and overall this approach could be considered to be beneficial to the heritage interest of this building.

7.05 These proposed amendments to the 2021 approved scheme have precedence in previous proposals that have been considered to have no harmful impact on the heritage significance of this building or on the terrace as a whole.

7.06 Overall the proposals will be beneficial for the future of this building. They will enable future appreciation and understanding of the historic significance of this building and of its material evidence, while ensuring a sustainable ongoing future use. Most importantly the principal heritage significance of this building will be enhanced and preserved by these proposals.

8.0 Appendix to Appeal Statement

The following are the documents that form the appendix to this report and accompany this submission.

1. The appeal inspectors report
2. Savills heritage statement
3. Drawings from the 2008 planning application showing as existing floor plans
4. Drawing from 2008 planning application showing elevations and photograph of the rear