



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3RD March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/21/3279636

The Coach House, 87 South Road, Faversham, Kent, ME13 7LY

- 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 Mrs Ann Hill against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/501937/FULL, dated 7 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a garden shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The address for the appeal site given on the application form is St Ann's Cross, 81 South Road. However, the address given on the Council's decision notice is The Coach House, 87b South Road. As this is the address used on all the other documents and reflects the address shown on the Ordnance Survey plan, I have adopted this address in the header above.

Main issues

3. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the setting of numbers 87b listed grade II and whether the works would serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Faversham Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 87b is the former coach house to the adjacent dwelling, number 87, previously a public house. Both buildings are listed grade II, located in the Faversham Conservation Area, and now occupied as residential dwellings.
5. The coach house is a two-storey structure, brick up to first floor level with timber boarding above. It is a very simple unadorned building. Due to its design and detailing it is clearly an ancillary structure to the former public house.
6. The appellant proposes the erection of a garden shed in the courtyard garden of the coach house. Due to the size of the coach house the shed is required, for general storage as well as to provide a quiet study space for the appellant's son. The garden is located above street level and is accessed from the first floor of the coach house.

7. A garden building here would be in the setting of the listed building. However, and while it would be for the Council to consider any proposal in the first instance, in my judgement, a small, appropriately designed, well-mannered, weatherboard clad garden building, reflecting the simple design of the coach house would, given the domestic setting of the listed building, not necessarily cause harm to its setting.
8. However, the proposed garden shed would be quite large in relation to the small courtyard garden. Further, by reason of its 'log' form of construction, cantilevered roof, ornate facias, and roof covering it would, in contrast to the vernacular form and detail of the coach house, appear more as a Scandinavian style garden chalet. It would therefore, in my judgement, appear as a fussy, incongruous and prominent structure that would cause harm to the setting of the listed building.
9. While I have found that the proposal would cause harm to the setting of the listed building I concur with the Council, that due to the residential nature of the area it would have a neutral impact on the character of the conservation area.
10. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, which include listed buildings. It draws a distinction between substantial harm and less than substantial harm to such an asset. For the latter, which applies here, the test is that the harm should be weighed against public benefits, including securing the optimum viable use.
11. The works would provide some very limited economic benefit. However, given the harm that has been identified I conclude that the public benefits would not outweigh this harm, or the conflict that the works would have with the objectives of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Framework and Policies DM14 and DM32 of the Swale Borough Local Plan *Bearing Fruits 2031* (Adopted July 2017) as they relate to the preservation of the setting of listed buildings.

Other matters

12. Given the limited size of the coach house, in particular the appellant's son's bedroom, I appreciate the need of the appellant for additional space. While I am sympathetic to these matters, on balance, they do not outweigh the harm the outbuilding as designed would cause in the long term.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR