



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2020

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 30 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X2220/Y/19/3243010

Churchill House, 6 Castle Hill Road, Dover, CT16 1QN

- 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 Mrs Betty Dimech against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00329, dated 13 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2019.
 - The works are described as:
'Two proposed alterations to the exterior of the property are;
 - 1. Change the colour of the exterior masonry.*
 - 2. Change the colour of the front and lower ground floor entrance doors.'*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The first element of the proposal description has already been undertaken; with photos supplied within the *Appellant's Full Statement of Case* and section 2 confirming that the colour has been changed from *Farrow & Ball Cream No.44* to *Farrow & Ball De Nimes No. 299*. At the time of my site visit, the second element of the application (painting doors in *Lakelands Buttercup Yellow*¹ after removal of existing black gloss finish) does not appear to have been implemented. Neither appears to have any separate listed building consent approval, and I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the works on the special interest of the Grade II listed building.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a semi-detached Grade II listed building, built around 1834 located on Castle Hill Road. It is a 3 storey and basement stuccoed, with slate roof dormers, with varied historic uses such as offices and residential accommodation, with the most recent and current use as a hotel. The street scene, which includes the Dover Castle Conservation Area, mainly comprises cream, off-white coloured or unpainted brickwork buildings. The result collectively is that the area has a reasonable strong visual uniformity. In part, this contributes to the significance of the listed building.

¹ See *Design and Access Statement*

5. The works for which consent are sought result in a dramatic and stark change in the external appearance of the building. For example, there is a clearly visible change from the previous cream colour to the 'De nimes' colour that the building has been painted since the proposal was submitted. The 'De nimes' colour appears as an earthy blue. Whilst not offensive in itself, its use in this instance has significantly detracted from the colour scheme of the wider area which is typified by creams and whites or light shades of colour; especially on older buildings in the street scene.
6. I note the appellant's point that there is a nearby building painted in a light shade of green. Setting aside the fact that this is not listed nor appears to be subject to any mechanism such as an Article 4 direction which might remove permitted development rights, this shade of colour has introduced a less visually contrasting colour into the existing street scene. Moreover, whilst I recognise the Appellant's desire to differentiate from the adjoining building (No. 4) to emphasise the hotel use of the appeal building this could potentially be achieved using a subtler colour. Indeed, a more subtle colour within the cream/white/pastel shades would be less likely to erode the uniformity of these Group Value listed buildings of Numbers 4 and 6 Castle Hill Road.
7. The Appellant points to other examples of colour changes within the local area; including a nearby Travelodge. However, that building is clearly a modern addition to the locality. What is more, in the main has a light colour finish, with bold colours mainly limited to signage.
8. Furthermore, the use of a buttercup yellow finish the external doors, as indicated in the application literature (but not yet having been implemented) would further emphasis the incongruity and disunity of the proposed changes. As such I find that both aspects of the scheme for which consent is sought would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building as required by s16(2) of the PLBCA 1990, as amended, and for similar reasons would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area as required by s72(1) of the same Act.
9. This results in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building. Considerable importance and weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets. I note the potential public benefits arising from the proposal, which the Appellant indicates includes the retention and development of this tourist accommodation; a vital part of the local economy in Dover and South East Kent, and the desire to improve the external appearance of the building more generally. I afford these benefits modest weight. However, I do not find that these benefits outweigh the less than substantial harm identified to the significance of the listed building as designated heritage asset.
10. I also note the correspondence in support of the proposal from the local community; however, this does not override the harm I have identified above to the listed building.
11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail and listed building consent is refused.

Cullum J A Parker

INSPECTOR