
Appeal Decisions

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 A: APP/E2205/W/19/3230746

Hill Cottage, Egerton Road, Pluckley TN27 0PE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Southall against the decision of Ashford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00285/AS, dated 28 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension.
-

Appeal B: APP/E2205/Y/19/3230803

Hill Cottage, Egerton Road, Pluckley TN27 0PE

- 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 Southall against the decision of Ashford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00286/AS, dated 28 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 April 2019.
 - The works proposed are single storey extension.
-

Decisions

1. I dismiss both appeals.

Reasons

2. The building is listed Grade II and the main issue in these appeals is the effect of the proposals on the architectural or historic interest of the listed building. The Ashford Local Plan 2030 Policy SP1 sets out the strategic objectives which include to conserve and enhance designated heritage assets. The promotion of high-quality design is the subject of Policy SP6 while Policy HOU8 sets out criteria for residential extensions. Policy ENV3a lists aspects of landscape character to which regard is to be had, and Policy ENV13 seeks the conservation of heritage assets. Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 10 entitled '*Domestic Extensions in Urban and Rural Areas*' details advice and design principles for such development.
3. Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. 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 original dwelling was of a modest size and simple plan-form and is recognisable by the ragstone walls. To that was added in the 1980s a sizeable brick and tile-faced 2-storey extension to the north end and projecting to the rear of the previous east wall, and there is a step-back along the west wall to denote the line of the addition.
5. The roofs however have been well-integrated and the eastward projection terminates as a cat-slide roof so that the eaves are only a little above the level of the rear eaves of the original house. That lower termination of the cat-slide overhangs the main end of the ground floor and within that overhang is a narrower bay window. This area of the previous extension is not attractive and does not conform with any other feature on the house, it introduced a somewhat jarring vertical line at the outer extent of brickwork and the small size of the bay window does not give the arrangement a firm footing on the ground, this end appearing unbalanced and not reflecting the obvious care that went into the 1980s extension generally.
6. From this it can be concluded that as a listed building, the historic significance lies in the pre-1980's structure, and that is where the greater part of the architectural significance lies, although the quality of the addition at that time means that there is architectural significance as a whole, diluted to an extent by the overhang just described.
7. The proposal is to remove the bay window and part of the masonry either side, and to form an opening into a single storey timber-framed addition with glazed walls and a lantern light sat on a flat roof. The aesthetic is that of an orangery or sun-room, and no historic fabric would be removed or even affected.
8. The new structure would be set-in from the side walls and be tucked under the overhang with brackets providing that missing visual connection with the ground, but the level of the flat roof would meet the cat-slide a little up the slope while the side elevations show the verge of the existing roof to extend to their present lower eaves level. This risks an awkward detail in order to weather the various junctions.
9. In addition, the orangery aesthetic, and particularly the visually isolated lantern light, would be at odds with the restrained nature of the previous addition and would introduce a form of building that would not sit well as an attachment or in what would be the setting of the truly historic part. The proposal would perpetuate aspects of the unattractive overhang while introducing new incongruities to the detriment of the listed building and its setting. Whilst the preservation of listed buildings does not rely on a public view, the fact that this end of the 1980s work with the proposed addition, and again particularly the lantern light, might be seen from the public right of way that runs along the front of the house, adds weight to the finding that harm would be caused.
10. 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. The justification put forward by the appellants is that room would be provided for a dining area, and the present arrangement of a long, narrow dining area to the rear of the historic part and entered straight from the porch, was seen at the site inspection. The Council refer to the 1980s approved applications as being to provide an additional bedroom and dining room (Ref: 82/00859/AS and 00860/AS dated 5 October 1982). What was also seen at the site inspection was a kitchen occupying a large part of the ground floor area of the previous addition with a small part into the bay window that clearly does not allow room for more formal dining.
12. A choice appears to have been made to not, or to no longer, use the addition as a dining room and to occupy the space with a kitchen, and that is for an occupier to decide. However, this does reduce the weight that can be attached to the wish to locate the dining room in a new, further addition, and in a dwelling that does not appear to be lacking in space and facilities, the fulfilment of that wish cannot be seen as a public benefit. The upkeep of listed building by private owners is a public benefit, but the works are not essential to that end and although the present arrangement of the overhang and bay window is not attractive and causes some harm, it is not as large or intrusive to the significance of the building and its setting as the appeal proposal.
13. As a result, the proposed addition would cause harm that is not justified or outweighed by benefits, and would be contrary to the Development Plan policies that seek the conservation of heritage assets and promote high quality design, and would not reach the standard sought in the statutory tests in the 1990 Act or accord with the aims of the Framework in those respects. For the reasons given above it is concluded that both appeals should be dismissed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR