

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2017

by R Barrett BSc (Hons) MSc Dip UD Dip Hist Cons MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U2235/Y/17/3168729

63 Sandling Road, Maidstone ME14 2RJ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Woodward against the decision of Maidstone Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/507448/LBC, dated 18 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2016.
 - The works proposed are 'changing the front door'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal works have already taken place. As those works accord with the appeal documentation, I am determining the appeal, as the Council did, on the basis of works carried out on site.

Main Issue

3. Whether the appeal works preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the grade II listed building.

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes a grade II listed 18th century cottage, which sits near the end of a listed terrace. Buildings in the terrace share some similarity in their age, form and design features. Multi-paned, white painted timber sash windows of a traditional design along with painted, generally solid and simply designed doors, and its simple vernacular design, all contribute to the significance of the terrace as a listed building.
5. The previous door was part of the history of the appeal building and its fabric. However, as it was a recent addition, little harm is a consequence of its removal.
6. I appreciate that there is some variety in the design of doors in the listed terrace. However, the door in place has a modern design, with doubled glazed panels in the upper section. It is made of a modern material which differs from a painted timber door, in that it appears more uniform. It has modern beading and profiles of the panels and modern door furniture, including an external door handle. Further, the glass is patterned with decorative leaded effect detailing. For all these reasons, it does not replicate the other doors in the terrace or that of a traditional timber painted door. It appears out of place in

the terrace with its simple vernacular design and erodes the general cohesion in the design of its doors and windows.

7. I appreciate the benefits of the door, in terms of its thermal properties, the effect that has on energy usage, enhanced security and that it lets more light into the internal spaces. I note the dark colour, which is low key. However, those matters do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
8. I conclude that the appeal works fail to preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building. For this reason, they are contrary to section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which aims to conserve and enhance the historic environment. Further, they fail to accord with Policy DM3 of Maidstone Borough Local Plan Publication (Regulation 19) February 2016, to which I accord some weight as it is at an advanced stage of preparation. That policy generally aims to protect and enhance the historic and natural environment.

Public Benefits

9. In accordance with paragraph 132 of the Framework, I accord great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets. I consider that the harm to the significance of the listed building would be less than substantial; a matter to which I attach considerable importance and weight, mindful of my statutory duties¹. However, in this case, no public benefits, as identified in paragraph 134 of the Framework, are before me sufficient to outweigh that harm.

Other Matters

10. I have noted the appellant's comments regarding the Council's handling of the appeal application and its advice generally. However, that is a matter between the appellant and the Council in the first instance.
11. I also appreciate that the appellant was unaware that the works required listed building consent and that he has attempted to improve the appearance of the listed building, having spent a considerable sum on the door. However, in the circumstances of this appeal, those matters are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
12. The appellant points out that he considers the building next door to be derelict and directs me to works to No 62. However, those matters are for the Council to deal with in the first instance. In any event, they do not justify the appeal works.
13. The appellant has raised the matter of the door frame in place. The Council has not raised concern regarding this and I have determined this appeal on the basis of the evidence before me.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, and taking all other matters raised into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Barrett

INSPECTOR

¹ section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990