
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2205/D/25/3366407

5 Monks Hill Cottages, Church Road, Warehorne, Kent TN26 2LR

- 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 Steve Tasker against the decision of Ashford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is PA/2025/0091.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey rear extension and two-storey side extension to the south.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and two-storey side extension to the south at 5 Monks Hill Cottages, Church Road, Warehorne, Kent TN26 2LR in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. PA/2025/0091, subject to the following conditions:

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL01, PL10, PL11, PL12, PL13, PL14.

3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with those stated on the application form.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounds, including Warehorne - The Green Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached, two-storey house with off-street parking on the driveway to the front. A striking feature of the facade is a steeply-sloping, narrow catslide roof. The local neighbourhood is predominantly residential in nature and consists of properties of varying scale and design set in wider open countryside.
4. The special architectural and historic interest of the CA derives from built development extending along either side of The Street, the main road through the village, and encircling the village green. Distinctive and traditional building materials

include white-washed buildings and dark red brick. Apart from the Woolpack Public House and the Church of St Matthew, all the other properties are in residential use. Being situated in the CA, I have applied the statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA by attaching considerable importance and weight to that desirability.

5. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states at paragraph 135(c) that development should not prevent or discourage appropriate innovation or change. I acknowledge that the property is visible from the public domain on a bend in Church Road as it winds its way through the village, and there are public footpaths crossing fields nearby. However, being set back from the highway and slightly below the level of the road, and partially screened by mature trees and vegetation, the dwelling's presence within the local environs is modest.
6. The two-storey side element would be set back from the front elevation and below the main ridge line of the host dwelling, thus creating a sense of subservience. The positioning would ensure that the catslide roof feature would remain the foremost feature of the building, and the development would not unduly compete with its appearance. An appropriate gap would be retained to the side boundary to maintain a degree of spaciousness. The dormer windows are relatively modest in scale and extent, being set within their roof slopes, below the main ridge line and away from each flank wall.
7. Overall, taking into account the multi-faceted character of buildings in the neighbourhood, I consider that the scheme would not appear out of keeping; it would be of relatively small scale and visually connect with the overall appearance of the property, without being imposing or dominant in the context of the street scene.
8. I appreciate that the gable end of the extension is slightly asymmetrical, and the roof pitches of the dormers do not match those of the main house. Moreover, I note that the windows of the dormers are partially below the first floor openings on the existing building. Whilst such design solutions are not ideal, they are barely discernible in the overall context, and I therefore consider that they would not so detrimental as to warrant a refusal of planning permission.
9. Alterations to semi-detached properties will inevitably result in an imbalance to an original pair. Nonetheless in this respect, I share the reasoning of my colleague (appeal reference 3287042) in that it *"is the very nature of placing an extension on one side of a pair of semi-detached houses. Whilst the buildings are pleasant enough, they are not architecturally notable and further extension as proposed in this case would not detract from the character or appearance of the Conservation Area."*
10. The Council does not object to the single storey rear addition, and I have no reason to disagree.
11. I therefore conclude that the scheme would assimilate with the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounds, including the CA. It would meet with Policies SP6, HOU8 and ENV14 of the Ashford Local Plan 2030 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 10 'Domestic Extensions in Urban and Rural Areas, which together seek to secure new development of acceptable scale

and appearance that preserves heritage assets and makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

12. It would also be consistent with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conditions

13. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty.
14. A condition requiring external materials in accordance with those listed on the application form would provide for a satisfactory appearance and accord with the appellant's intentions. I do not consider it reasonable or necessary to restrict Class A permitted development rights.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given and in respect of all remaining matters, the appeal is allowed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR