



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2023

by J Downs BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/23/3320161

Tudor Cottage, The Street, Bossingham, Kent CT4 6DY

- 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 D Hayes against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref CA/22/02459, dated 21 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is rear single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 22 November 2023 all designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in England and Wales became National Landscapes (NL). The legal designation and policy status of AONBs are unchanged, but I have replaced references to the Kent Downs AONB with the Kent Downs NL in my decision to reflect this change.
3. The Council's officer report refers to policies in the draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045. I have not been provided with copies of these policies or advised of the stage at which the draft plan is at. I therefore attach no weight to the draft plan.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the historic and architectural significance of Tudor Cottage.

Reasons

5. Tudor Cottage is identified as a locally listed building. Its significance, as it relates to this appeal, lies in its architectural and historic significance arising from its vernacular design and materials. Of particular note is its distinctive irregular form which results in there being features of interest on each elevation of the building. Of direct relevance to this appeal is an expansive cat-slide roof to the rear elevation which leads to low eaves. As a result of this and the pattern of openings, the rear elevation has a modest, rural appearance, despite the expanse of roof, which contributes to the special interest of the building.
6. The proposed extension would run the width of Tudor Cottage and would have a separate pitched roof. This would rise from eaves height of the existing

building. Consequently, it would obscure from view the form of the rear elevation of Tudor Cottage and much of the detail of the roof. The separate roof profiles do not serve to integrate the proposed extension into the form of the existing building, and its regularity is in stark contrast to the charm of the irregular roof profile of the existing cottage. The modern pattern of openings on the proposed rear elevation would not preserve the historic rural character of the building. The proposed extension would appear as an incongruous addition which would not integrate with the existing building to create a coherent whole.

7. The proposed extension has been designed to preserve the existing roof profile and be subservient to Tudor Cottage in terms of its scale, mass, height and bulk. It would largely only be visible from within the private rear gardens of the host property and its adjacent neighbours. Details of materials could be controlled by condition. Despite these considerations, the proposed development would nonetheless erode the significance of the locally listed building. While this harm would be less than substantial, on balance, I attach great weight to it.
8. The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the historic and architectural significance of Tudor Cottage. This would be contrary to Canterbury District Local Plan (2017) Policies DBE3, DBE6 and HE4 which, insofar as they relate to this appeal, require development to positively contribute to its local context, integrate with different parts of the building to create a coherent whole and preserve and enhance the special features for which locally listed buildings are designated. It would also be contrary to Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires heritage assets to be considered in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Other Matters

9. The site lies within the Bossingham Conservation Area (CA), the significance of which for the purposes of this appeal lies in the relationship of the high quality built form with the historic street pattern. The proposed extension would only be visible in short glimpses when moving along The Street. These views would not be prominent and as such would not affect the relationship of the built form with the street. Accordingly, the character and appearance of the CA would be preserved, in accordance with the duty imposed on me by s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
10. The proposed extension would be a negligible feature in the landscape given its limited scale and the position of the site within the village. As such, the natural beauty of the Kent Downs NL would be conserved, in accordance with the duty imposed on me by section 85(1) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

Conclusion

11. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the policies of the Framework, which would indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

J Downs

INSPECTOR