

- a) **DOV/21/01159: Planning Application - Erection of a single storey rear extension and rear porch (existing porch to be demolished)**

**DOV/21/01160: Listed Building Consent - Erection of a single storey rear extension and replacement of a rear porch**

**Canterbury Gate House, Ash Road, Sandwich**

Reason for report – Number of third-party supporting representations on the planning application (7).

- b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning permission and Listed Building Consent be refused

- c) **Planning Policy and Guidance**

Dover District Core Strategy (2010)

DM1 – Settlement boundaries

DM15 – Protection of the countryside

DM16 – Landscape character

Regulation 18 draft Dover District Local Plan

The Consultation Draft Dover District Local Plan is a material planning consideration in the determination of this planning application. At this stage in the plan making process however the policies of the draft Plan have little weight and are not considered to materially affect the assessment of this application and the recommendation as set out.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)

Paragraphs 2, 7, 8, 11, 130, 134, 174,199 and 202

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Section 66(1) – Listed buildings

- d) **Relevant Planning History**

DOV/09/01134 – Erection of a two-storey extension with a glazed link and brick wall (existing garage and porch to be demolished). Granted.

DOV/09/01133 – Erection of a two-storey extension with glazed link and brick wall (existing garage and porch to be demolished). Granted.

DOV/00/00714 – Internal and external alterations. Granted.

DOV/88/01204 – The erection of a porch. Granted.

- e) **Consultee and Third-Party Representations**

Sandwich Town Council – Approve the application.

KCC Archaeology – No comments received.

DDC Heritage - Unable to support the principle of the extension. The reasons for this have been summarised below:

- The proposed extension would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building. The planform of the extension and its siting is of concern and it is at odds with and created a complicated form to the simple historic L shaped planform of the listed building.
- There are design issues which make the proposal an inappropriate addition which is not a natural evolution of the building: the part pitched/part flat roof form, triangular glazed lantern, exposed timber framing and aluminium door design appears completely unfamiliar to this building; the extensive glazing between the frame is also contrary to the modest proportioned windows on the listed building; although the design specifically limits contact with the main C18th part of the building and is attached to a later C20th addition, the size, bulk and design creates a dominant feature in this context and draws the eye away from the main historic rear façade of the building.
- The result is a structure that does not sit comfortably with the listed building and would cause harm to its character and appearance. With this building I cannot find a suitable solution for further extension and would comment that a significant 2 storey rear addition has previously been added that provides additional accommodation (including existing kitchen, WC and first floor bathrooms).
- The principle of replacing the rear porch could be supported as it is a modern addition under a previous permission (DOV/88/01204). There are however design issues which make it inappropriate, as the proposed steep pitched tiled roof, exposed timber framing and large paned glazing set within it are again unfamiliar and do not relate to this building.
- A utility room although desirable is not an essential space within this listed building and therefore could potentially be incorporated into the existing rear 'snug' or first floor bathrooms with no alterations to the planform or layout of the building.

Third Party Representations – 6 letters received supporting the planning application with the following summarised comments:

- The plans are sympathetic for this listed property. They will improve and maximise the character and practicality of the house.
- Good enhancement to the house.
- Support the upgrade of listed properties while retaining their original character.

f) **1. The Site and Proposal**

- 1.1. The application relates to a detached two-storey dwelling Grade II listed building on the south side of Ash Road. The property is finished in red brick to the front of the property with the side and rear elevations being finished in whitewash. The property has white timber windows and a tiled roof. The doorway on the front elevation has fluted pilasters with a pediment segmental fanlight and a six-panel moulded door.
- 1.2. The site lies within the settlement boundaries of Sandwich. Canterbury Gatehouse is bounded by the KCC Sandwich highway depot to the east, and Sandwich fire station to the east. The area comprises a mixture of single storey and two storey dwellings which are both detached and semi-detached.
- 1.3. The principal elevation of the dwelling faces Ash Road. There is a driveway

located to the east of the property, sufficient for approximately two cars. There is also a garage which is sited to the east of the property.

- 1.4. The application is for the erection of a single storey rear extension and replacement of the rear porch. The proposed rear extension would be in an L-shape and would measure a maximum of 5m wide and 8m deep, with an eaves height of 2.2m and a maximum roof height of 3m. This would also include a roof lantern with a maximum height of 3.4m metres. The rear porch would have a maximum width of 1.8m with a maximum depth of 1.5m, an eaves height of 2m and a pitched roof height of 2.9m.
- 1.5. Both the rear extension and the porch would have a traditional oak frame structure. The proposed materials would be red brick to the external walls on the west side of the extension and red brick plinth walls to the south and east with oak posts above. The proposed roof would have clay tiles up to the rubber membrane flat roof with the glass lantern. The external doors would be grey powder coated aluminium French doors.

## **2. Main Issues**

2.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Principle of development
- Heritage and design considerations
- Residential amenity
- Other matters

### **Assessment**

#### **Principle of Development**

2.2 The proposed development is within the settlement boundary of Sandwich and is an extension to an existing dwelling. As such the development accords with Policy DM1 and is therefore acceptable in principle, subject to its details and any material considerations.

#### **Heritage and Design Considerations**

2.3 This application concerns works to a Grade II listed building. The main aim of the proposal is to create additional accommodation to form an enlarged kitchen and utility space within a single storey oak framed rear extension on the south elevation. Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that "In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority of the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

2.4 The listed building is formed as an C18th L shaped compact planform composed of well-proportioned spaces. The formal rooms at ground floor level, include two front living rooms and a rear dining room. A kitchen and WC are within a C20th rear addition and there is also a rear 'snug' within the C18th rear range. It is considered that the compact layout is a key aspect of the special interest of the listed building and the historic planform, although part altered under previous consents (DOV/00/00714), it is still intact and clearly legible.

2.5 The planform of the proposed extension is of concern as it is at odds with and

adds a complicated form to, the simple historic L shaped planform of the listed building. Its siting would interrupt the regularity of the building and appears tacked on as a poorly considered addition that would harm the existing plan form.

- 2.6 The design and appearance of the existing house is predominantly characterised by its brickwork and modest, domestic proportioned window and door openings. The proposed extension design does not relate to this character and makes a bold, dominant statement, with extensive use of large glazing, introducing exposed timber framing to the existing material palette and a part pitched roof, incorporating a flat top with glazed lantern design. This would appear incongruous in this context and with its bulk would draw the eye away from the main listed building. The result is a structure that does not sit comfortably and would have a detrimental impact on the significance of the listed building. The works would also result in space within the existing listed building being made redundant rather than an integral part of the residential accommodation. As existing the listed building has a well-proportioned kitchen and a separate dining room.
- 2.7 The proposed materials include the use of brick work and a part tiled roof, they are acceptable, but their appropriateness does not outweigh the harm identified by the size, design and siting of the proposed extension.
- 2.8 The principle of replacing the rear porch is acceptable in principle, as it is a modern addition approved under a previous permission (DOV/88/01204). There are however design issues which make it inappropriate, as the proposed steep pitched tiled roof, exposed timber framing and large paned glazing set within it, are unfamiliar and do not relate to this listed building.
- 2.9 Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. It is considered that no overriding public benefits have been presented demonstrating that the proposed extension is necessary for the continued preservation of the listed building; rather it is considered that the benefits are of a private nature. Consequently, it is considered that the less than substantial harm caused by the proposal is not outweighed by the benefits.

#### Residential Amenity

- 2.10 The nearest buildings to the host dwelling relate to the KCC depot and Sandwich fire service, which are located to the west and east. Neither of these properties are habitable buildings. As the nearest residential property to Canterbury Gate House is located a significant distance away it can be considered that there would be no impacts to the amenities of any neighbouring properties to an undue degree by the proposed rear extension and porch replacement.

### **3. Conclusion**

- 3.1 The proposed extension by reason of design, bulk and siting would not represent a sympathetic addition to the listed building but would rather result in an incongruous addition that would cause detrimental harm to the architectural and historic character and appearance of the listed building for which no overriding justification has been demonstrated, and as such would be contrary the National Planning Policy Framework. I therefore recommend that planning permission and

listed building consent be refused.

g)

**Recommendation**

- I. Planning permission under DOV/21/01159 be refused for the following reason:
- II. Listed Building Consent under DOV/21/01160 be refused for the following reason:
  1. The proposed extension by reason of design, bulk and siting would not represent a sympathetic addition to the listed building but would rather result in an incongruous addition that would cause detrimental harm to the architectural and historic character and appearance of the listed building for which no overriding justification has been demonstrated, and as such would be contrary to paragraphs 199 and 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Case Officer**

Alice Pitts