



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 March 2023

by Jonathan Bore MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 April 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/X2220/W/21/3286746

52 King Street, Sandwich, CT13 9BL

- 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 Richard Barber against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01055, dated 28 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two front and one side dormer windows (three Velux roof lights to be removed).
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/X2220/Y/21/3286739

52 King Street, Sandwich, CT13 9BL

- 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 Richard Barber against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01056, dated 28 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2021.
 - The works proposed are the removal of three Velux roof lights and the construction of three dormer windows.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of two front and one side dormer windows (three Velux roof lights to be removed) at 52 King Street, Sandwich, CT13 9BL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01055, dated 28 June 2021, and plans 02-A and 03-B, subject to the condition that the development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the removal of three Velux roof lights and construction of three dormer windows at 52 King Street, SANDWICH, CT13 9BL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/01056 dated 28 June 2021 and plans 02-A and 03-B, subject to the following conditions:
 - (1) The tiles to be removed to make way for the dormer windows must be stripped from the roof, inspected for defects and set aside for reuse on the roof of the dormer windows. Samples of the proposed tiles to replace any unsuitable for re-roofing, together with samples of the proposed bonnet and hip tiles, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by

the local planning authority before work is commenced. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- (2) Within one month of the completion of the dormer windows, the three existing rooflights identified for removal on drawing 02-A shall be removed and rafters shall be reinstalled in their place to match the existing fabric.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the architectural and historic significance of the building.

Reasons

4. 52 King Street is a Grade II* listed house with a symmetrical front elevation of red brick, consisting of three bays with a central wooden pedimented doorcase, a dentilled eaves cornice and a roof of Kent peg tiles. Below the eaves is a plaque with the date of 1771; this is likely to have been the date of the Georgian re-modelling of the house, because the internal layout, timber work and fine decorative plaster ceilings point to an earlier date, likely early 17th Century. The significance of the building is a function of its age and history, its timber framed method of construction, its plastered ceilings, its plan form, its Georgian front façade and its Kent peg tiled roof.
5. The scheme would entail the installation of two front dormer windows facing King Street and a further dormer window to the side roof slope. The side dormer window would not be noticeable from the front and would have no impact on the building's significance. The front dormer windows would be of traditional hipped roof form with lead cheeks and casement windows in a plain simple design; they would be proportionate in size, being considerably smaller than the principal windows; and they would not detract from the character of the house and would maintain its symmetry. The Kent peg tile roof slope would continue to be appreciated, but there would be some impact on the architectural significance of the building because of the interruption to the roof slope and the removal of tiles to make way for the dormers. There would be no harmful effect on the structure of the building because the rafters would be retained. The impact on the significance of the heritage asset would be less than substantial, at the lower end of the scale.
6. The dormer windows would illuminate a roof space which is currently lit by rooflights installed following a consent in 1988. The rooflights were intended to make the space habitable, but they provide a less than ideal top-lit space which does not have an adequate aspect. They were located so as not to be seen from the front of the house, but they are discordant features when viewed from inside the roof space: they are of modern pattern, they cut across rafters, and pay insufficient regard to the quality of the shape of the roof space or the pattern of historic roof timbers. Currently therefore they detract from an appreciation of the significance of the building. The scheme would involve the removal of these rooflights and the repair and reinstatement of the missing rafters, which would allow a better appreciation, albeit only internally, of the form of the roof and the pattern of the timberwork within it. A better-quality habitable space would be created with an improved aspect, thus helping to secure the optimum long-term use of the building without detracting from its character or integrity, and without harming the conservation area. These

benefits would outweigh the less than significant harm to the significance of the building caused by the insertion of dormer windows.

7. The Council do not regard the scheme as having any impact on the significance of the Sandwich Conservation Area, and Sandwich Town Council resolved to support the scheme as it considered that it fitted in with the town and conservation area. There are several examples of front dormer windows in the town and the windows would not appear out of place in the street scene. The character of the conservation area and the settings of nearby listed buildings would be preserved.
8. The emerging Dover District Local Plan has only just been submitted for examination and carries limited weight. However, it is noted that Policy HE1 of the plan broadly reflects the policies for the historic environment in the National Planning Policy Framework. Having regard to all the above, the scheme would not conflict with emerging Policy HE1 or with the relevant parts of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, the appeals are allowed and planning permission and listed building consent are granted. A condition is required requiring the re-use where possible of the existing tiles to be removed from the roof slope together with samples of any new tiles including the proposed bonnet and ridge tiles of the dormers. A further condition is required requiring the removal of the existing rooflights and the reinstallation of the rafters within one month of the completion of the dormer windows. These conditions are required to protect the architectural and historic interest of the building.

Jonathan Bore

INSPECTOR

Appendix 1

List of those who have appealed

Reference	Case Reference	Appellant
Appeal A	APP/X2220/W/21/3286746	Mr Richard Barber
Appeal B	APP/X2220/Y/21/3286739	Mr Richard Barber