
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/Y/18/3214746
64 Park Road, Ramsgate CT11 9TJ

- 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 R Gardener against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application Ref L/TH/18/0552, dated 18 April 2018, was refused by the Council by notice dated 5 June 2018.
 - The works proposed are the insertion of dormer window to the rear elevation and formation of Juliet balcony together with installation of bi-folding doors to kitchen at ground floor.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The property is listed Grade II and the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed works on the architectural or historic significance of the building.
3. Whilst the Council refer to Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan 2006 which sets out the requirement for all new development to provide high-quality and inclusive design, this is a material consideration only as section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the primacy of the Development Plan does not apply to applications and appeals made under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Section 16(2) of the latter Act requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any special architectural or historic features it possesses.
4. Paragraph 193 of the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
5. Number 64 is part of a terrace of listed buildings, 64 and 64A being referred to in the listing description as a pair. The front elevations display a high level of architectural and historic significance, in particular on the roof-scape of small, barge-boarded dormers placed high on the roof, the ridge of the dormer roof lining with that of the main house. Whilst there are detailed differences between the houses in the terrace, they together form a distinctive feature of the street-scene.

6. To the rear the significance is less, and the prominence on the street-scene of number 64, furthest from Grange Road is very limited, the site of the proposed dormer not being readily apparent, if visible at all. Other possible viewpoints are private land or a private road, although the significance of a listed building does not rely on a public view. There are already dormers to the rear of the terrace, those on number 66/68 being a flat roofed one that does not sit well on the roof slope facing into a valley gutter, the other being smaller and more discreet. The appeal property also has a large two storey addition infilling the one-time gap between the closet wing and the boundary, so that the eaves of the rear roof slope are not distinct.
7. It is on this rear roof slope that the new dormer is proposed to be placed, and the Officer's Report makes clear that an earlier scheme that included access to the flat roof of the addition had been replaced by a Juliet balcony, as described in the Refusal Notice and the Appeal Form. Whilst the Conservation Officer's comments refer mainly to the earlier scheme it is confirmed that the revised scheme did not overcome the objection to the 'roof door and balcony'.
8. The dormer would light a small attic bedroom, which already benefits from the small front dormer, and would be full-height, allowing a pair of glazed doors to open inwards and having a guard rail immediately outside the doors. As a result, the roof slope would be cut from eaves level either side of an indent. The dormer itself would follow the design of the existing front ones, with barge-boards and a ridge meeting the main roof ridge. It would however be significantly wider than the simple sash window version to the front and this together with its position on the roof and the gap in the roof slope formed in front of the guardrail all lead to an incongruous and intrusive addition to the roof.
9. As stated by the Conservation Officer, a modest rooflight or dormer in this location may be acceptable, and that in place on number 66 appears modest and well-located in the roof slope. But, the conclusion with regard to that which is proposed is that harm would be caused to the significance of the listed building. The level of harm would be 'less than substantial', a differentiation required between paragraphs 195 and 196 of the Framework. In this case the latter applies and this states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
10. The tapered plan form of the house restricts room sizes and the house is small, but there does not appear to be any real risk of it falling out of its viable use as a dwelling, particularly considering its location. The attic bedroom has limited headroom in parts and the present natural light is limited and north-facing. However, having mind to the positive comments of the Conservation Officer and the limited truly public benefits that can be identified, the dormer and balcony proposed would cause harm that is not outweighed by benefits or otherwise justified, and would be contrary to the tests in the 1990 Act, as well as national and local policy. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR