



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 14 March 2025

by **A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th March 2025

Appeal A: APP/X2220/W/24/3351429

Great Weddington, Weddington Lane, Ash, Kent CT3 2AR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Ray against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application reference is 24/00373.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey side extension.
-

Appeal B: APP/X2220/Y/24/3351433

Great Weddington, Weddington Lane, Ash, Kent CT3 2AR

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Ray against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application reference is 24/00374.
 - The works proposed relate to the erection of a single storey side extension.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the proposal relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
4. Since the Council issued its decision notices, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been revised, with the latest version published on 12 December 2024 and amended on 7 February 2025. In this case, the most relevant parts of the Framework remain broadly the same. As a result, I have not sought comments on this matter and I am satisfied that no party has been prejudiced by my approach.
5. The Council's Statement of Case confirms that since the Council issued its decision notices, the Dover District Local Plan to 2040 (the Local Plan) has been adopted (October 2024). Accordingly, the policy referenced on the Council's decision notices is now given full weight. The appellant has had the opportunity to comment on the Council's submission.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building, known as 'Great Weddington' (Ref: 1363284), and any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

7. Great Weddington is a large, detached dwelling, which is set within spacious grounds. It is a Grade II listed building, which dates back to the early 19th century. The dwelling is two storeys high, with accommodation in the roof. It is constructed of yellow brick and has a slate roof. The front elevation is symmetrical in its form with a regular pattern of fenestration and a central door, with fanlight above and Doric columned porch. The building features traditional, timber framed sash windows, with splayed brick arches above. The dwelling has a rectilinear plan form.
8. Based on my site visit and the evidence before me, I find that the listed building's special interest insofar as is relevant to this appeal is derived from its historic and architectural interest, as an illustration of a Georgian country house. The building's classical style, symmetrical form and proportions, along with its surviving historic fabric and its pleasing architectural style make important contributions in these regards.
9. The proposal seeks to erect a contemporary, single storey extension to the side of the building. The proposed walls and brick plinth would be constructed of yellow stock brick, which would match the brickwork on the existing building. The walls would be terminated by a coping stone, with a clerestory above, under a terne-coated stainless steel flat roof. A large, glazed screen is proposed on the north-east elevation.
10. The proposed extension as a result of its contemporary design would be read as a modern addition to the appeal property. It would utilise high quality materials, which would complement those used on the existing building. Given its single storey height and the fact that it would be set back from the front elevation, it would appear subservient in relation to the existing building. The design seeks to reflect the garden wall on the other side of the building that runs contiguously with the front elevation. However, in comparison to the garden wall the proposal would be higher in height and set back behind the front elevation. Its roof design would also lead it to be read as an extension to the listed building, rather than as a garden wall. Nevertheless, given its subservient nature, set back position and its contemporary design, I do not find that it would disrupt the symmetry of the principal façade.
11. I appreciate that the listed building has evolved over time, including the addition of a single-storey projection on the south-west corner of the building. Alterations to the elevation in which the proposal would be sited include modern ground floor windows, the installation of a tripartite window at first floor level and changes to the roof, including the provision of a small dormer window. Changes have also been made to the plan form of the building, including the removal of a wall to create a larger living room.
12. The appellant advises that the proposed extension equates to approximately 20% of the ground floor area. While the proposed room would be a similar width to the principal rooms on the ground floor of the dwelling, it would be of a greater depth.

The proposal would create a new room that would be larger than any of the rooms on the ground floor of the existing building, including the living room, which has already been enlarged. While the existing plan form and the shape and form of the existing kitchen would still remain legible, the proposal would fail to respect the hierarchy of the existing plan form.

13. The proposal seeks to remove a tripartite sash window and the brickwork below to facilitate access into the new extension. As this is a modern window, the removal of this window would not result in the loss of any historic fabric. The appellant states that the brickwork that would be lost is of low significance. However, based on the evidence before me and my site visit, it appears that the proposal would result in the loss of historic brickwork. The loss of this historic fabric would harm the special interest of the listed building.
14. The side elevation of the property is currently unobstructed and this allows one to appreciate the form and architectural interest of the listed building. While only glimpsed views of the side elevation are available from the public realm, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the building can be gained. While views of the side elevation would be available through the proposed glazing, the proposal would obscure part of the side elevation of the building. I appreciate that this elevation is not the principal elevation of the listed building and it does not exhibit the same degree of grandeur and symmetry. However, given its architectural style and use of traditional materials, it still makes a positive contribution to the special interest of the listed building. Consequently, harm would arise from the partial obstruction of this elevation.
15. Although the appellant advises that the splayed brick arch above the kitchen window would be retained, it is not shown on the proposed drawings and it is unclear from the information before me whether the proposed roof would interfere with this splayed brick arch on this window and the adjacent window. Accordingly, I am not fully convinced from the information before me that the proposal would preserve this architectural feature.
16. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the listed building and would harm the significance of this designated heritage asset.
17. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 advises that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have clear and convincing justification. I find the proposal would result in less than substantial harm; however, this should not be equated with a lesser planning objection and is still of considerable importance and weight.
18. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use.

19. The proposal would result in investment into the property and also provide employment for local craftsmen or women, which would have a small economic benefit. This carries limited weight in favour of the proposal as a public benefit.
20. The proposal would provide improved living accommodation for the appellant, which would improve the use and functionality of the house, which is a private benefit. The appellant also argues that the proposal would better connect the house with the garden visually; however, there are already numerous openings on the side elevation of the building, which provide views onto the garden and I find no benefit in this regard. There is also no evidence before me to suggest that the use of the building as a residential dwelling would cease in the absence of the proposed changes and I do not find the proposal necessary to secure the viability and long-term conservation of the building as a result.
21. Overall, I give the public benefits limited weight in my decision. Consequently, in attributing great weight to the harm that would be caused to the significance of the designated heritage asset, I find that there would be insufficient public benefits arising from the proposal to outweigh this harm.
22. Given the above, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest and significance of the listed building. The proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the historic environment policies of the Framework. The proposal would conflict with Policy HE1 of the Local Plan. This policy among other things requires that proposals conserve or enhance the heritage assets of the District, sustaining and enhancing their significance.

Other Matters

23. The appellant has drawn my attention to extensions to listed buildings in the locality, which have been consented. Full details of the circumstances of the other schemes are not before me and I therefore give them limited weight in my decision.
24. I note that the Parish Council does not object to the proposal and that no comments were received from local residents. However, this does not alter my findings set out above.

Conclusion

25. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

A James

INSPECTOR