
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/W/25/3360090

St Lawrence Tavern, High Street, Ramsgate CT11 0QP

- 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 Stephen Barrie against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application ref. is F/TH/24/1297.
 - The development proposed is for minor alterations to existing timber pergola including installation of full height timber weatherboarding screens to side and front elevations, timber square trellis panels to front elevation and erection of timber fence and gates to front bin store area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At my site visit, I saw that the development has been completed, and I note that the application has been submitted retrospectively.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the existing building and the local area; and b) the living conditions of the occupants of surrounding properties with regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The site relates to a public house on the junction of High Street and Ashburnham Road in an urban neighbourhood comprising predominantly residential properties, with some commercial units mainly to the north along the A255.
5. The Council has provided a historic image of the pergola, which is a useful visual tool in comparing the element as it previously existed against what has now been constructed. To my mind, the enclosure of the bin store and part of the seating area appears acceptable; the timber slats, door and gates are finished to a reasonable standard and have a function in screening the bins and managing any unwanted access by persons directly from the street into the establishment.
6. However, the trellis arrangement is an unattractive feature. It presents as an ad hoc solution and, given the location of the site on a prominent junction, constitutes a harmful visual incursion into the streetscene. There is no evidence to suggest that alternative measures have been considered by the appellant, and in particular I am

not clear why the trellis is required at such a height when there are metal railings immediately in front to provide a barrier between the private seating area under the pergola, and the public highway beyond.

7. I appreciate that the appeal site accommodates a long-established use and architectural form, which is divergent from the prevailing residential land use and built form of the local townscape, and the overall height of the approved structure has not been changed. However, the trellis does not achieve a high quality of design as I have reasoned above, and these matters do not outweigh this harm.
8. I therefore conclude that the scheme results in detriment to the character and appearance of the existing building and local area. It would fail Policies SP35 and QD02 of the Thanet District Council Local Plan July 2020 (LP), which require new development to be of an acceptable scale and design and to respect and enhance an area. It would also be inconsistent with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Living conditions

9. There does not appear to be any dispute that the public house has historically had the use of the covered outdoor seating area; the Council acknowledges that it has previously been established that the pergola would not result in the creation of any additional disturbance significantly above that which may already exist locally.
10. I recognise that noise complaints have been received by the Environmental Health Department, and I saw at my visit that the pergola contains televisions. Nonetheless, whilst there is the potential for disturbance to neighbouring properties, particularly into the evening, I consider that suitable mitigation of any adverse environmental impacts could be sought. Had the appeal been successful I am satisfied that appropriate conditions, for example in relation to hours of operation, could be imposed to protect local amenity.
11. Consequently, I find that there would be no material detriment upon the living conditions of the occupants of surrounding properties with regard to noise and disturbance. The scheme would adhere to Policy QD03 of the LP and the Framework, insofar as they pertain to safe and healthy living conditions.

Conclusion

12. Having regard to the above and all associated issues, I dismiss the appeal.

C Hall

INSPECTOR