



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L2250/Y/19/3231775

Pett Bottom Farm House, Stowting Common, Ashford, Kent TN25 6BH

- 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 & Mrs Peach against the decision of Folkestone and Hythe District Council.
 - The application Ref Y19/0009/FH, dated 20 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2019.
 - The works proposed are erection of a single storey extension to north elevation.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The building is Listed Grade II and the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed works on the architectural or historic interest of the listed building. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the primacy of the Development Plan do 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. These duties are reflected in Policy BE5 of the Shepway District Local Plan Review which states that listed building consent will be refused if the proposals are considered to be detrimental to the character of the building.
3. 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.
4. The existing building is mainly of two-storey construction, but has a deep 'cat-slide' roof to the northern end, and a porch addition to the east has a roof which is well-integrated with that 'cat-slide' being an extension of the north facing slope. There is a vertical joint in the brickwork on the west elevation of the main house at the location of the lower part of the 'cat-slide' indicating that this may have been a later addition, and there is evidence of differing bricks and pointing along the north end. The remainder of the roofs on the building are hip-ended including the porch addition, there being no gable ended roofs.
5. The proposed extension would have a dual pitched roof, which would extend over part of the 'cat-slide', obscuring part of that significant feature of the

building, and would terminate as a full gable end with a glazed triangular upper part and bi-fold doors below, which together with fixed side lights would occupy a substantial part of the end wall. The side walls of the proposal would match the painted brickwork of the rest of the building, and would have painted timber windows and roof lights.

6. The two side walls and the roof would be traditional in appearance but the window openings would be larger than appear on the existing house, while the proposed rooflights are poorly positioned relative to those windows and appear to be standard items rather than the conservation style. The proposed eaves level would be above that of the 'cat-slide' leading to an awkward junction at that point.
7. The Council criticise the angle of the roof relative to that of the main house, but on the drawing supplied to the appeal, 38148/05, the two appear parallel to each other. If all else were acceptable, that could be clarified, or them being equal could be achieved by condition.
8. The end wall would be almost fully glazed, but with poorly proportioned glazing bars that do not line with the bi-fold doors, and the use of a full gable emphasis the length of the extension relative to the existing building. The Council surmise that this would be more obvious and unacceptable if changes were made to the fenestration, but that would need to be tested by a new application.
9. There are occasions where a different, contemporary form of construction can be used successfully in an extension to a listed structure, so as not to appear to vie with the truly historic part, whereas the copying of existing details may not be appropriate and could erode the truly historic significance by confusing the appreciation of the building. Other occasions arise where such copying may be the best solution to integrate the old and new.
10. However, the proposed extension is neither a contemporary addition nor a historically correct copy, and fails for that reason to successfully address the architectural and historic significance of the listed building and its farmland setting, which would therefore be harmed. 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 this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
11. There may well be benefits to the continued preservation of the building in providing additional accommodation, and the Council do not object in principle to some further addition, which appears reasonable. But, 'optimum viable use' should not be taken to mean the *maximum* amount of floor area, and the failing here is in the design of the building to accommodate that floor area. For that reason, the benefits do not outweigh the harm. The proposal fails to accord with the statutory test in the 1990 Act or policy in the Framework, and does not accord with Policy BE5 of the Local Plan. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR