



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 14 August 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2025

Appeal A: APP/X2220/W/24/3358209

Sheerwater Farm, Sheerwater Road, Ash, Kent CT3 2LJ

- 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 Ms Kate McConnell against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application reference is 24/00450.
 - The development proposed is erection of structural glass link. Relocation of existing internal door, replacement of window with door, removal of internal partitions, replacement glazing in existing kitchen door, new stud wall and door to form utility room and shower room. Repaving of external courtyard. Removal of glazed screen to external porch.
-

Appeal B: APP/X2220/Y/24/3358213

Sheerwater Farm, Sheerwater Road, Ash, Kent CT3 2LJ

- 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 Ms Kate McConnell against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application reference is 24/00451.
 - The works proposed relate to the erection of structural glass link. Relocation of existing internal door, replacement of window with door, removal of internal partitions, replacement glazing in existing kitchen door, New stud wall and door to form utility room and shower room. Repaving of external courtyard. Removal of glazed screen to external porch.
-

Decisions

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

Preliminary Matters

3. As the appeals relate 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. The Council's reasons for refusal relate to the proposed link extension only. Both main parties confirm that the other works have been consented under application 19/01252. The Council raises no objections to the other works. Based on the information before me and my site visit, I find no reason to reach a contrary conclusion to the Council on the other works and consider that they would preserve the special interest of the listed building.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building, known as ‘Sheerwater Farmhouse’ (Ref: 1363232) and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

6. Sheerwater Farmhouse is a timber-framed, Grade II listed building, which dates back to the early-18th century. The appeal property is two storeys high with accommodation in the roof. It has a rear wing, which was added in the mid-18th century. The appeal property is constructed of red brick and has a plain tiled roof.
7. 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 18th century domestic architecture. The building’s relatively compact planform; the use of traditional materials, including traditional fenestration; its low ceilings, with exposed beams; and, its pleasing architectural style and design make important contributions in these regards.
8. The proposal seeks to construct a glazed link to connect the listed building with the adjacent outbuilding. The outbuilding has recently been converted into ancillary accommodation and includes a large, open plan living space. The outbuilding has a contemporary appearance and is finished with timber cladding and features large metal windows. The outbuilding is of no historic interest and does not contribute positively to the setting of the listed building.
9. There is currently a gap between the listed building and outbuilding, which provides both physical and functional separation. The proposal seeks to construct a glazed link between these two buildings. Of itself, the proposed glazed link would occupy a modest footprint and be of a scale that would appear subservient in relation to the listed building and the outbuilding. The lightweight design and glazed form would maintain some sense of visual separation between the two buildings. However, the proposal would physically and functionally connect the listed building to the outbuilding.
10. The large expanse of glass would harmfully contrast with the more domestic style and traditional fenestration on the listed building. The glazed link, in combination with the existing outbuilding would significantly elongate and overwhelm the listed building. The proposal would result in a large, modern and contemporary addition that would appear incongruous attached to this listed building and would erode its relatively compact planform and traditional farmhouse character.
11. Given the siting and modest size of the glazed link, it would not be visible from the public realm. Nevertheless, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the building can be gained. I also appreciate that the proposal would not harm any historic fabric; however, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would fail to preserve the listed building or the features of special architectural or historic interest, which it possesses. In finding harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given the nature and extent of the development

proposed, I find the harm to the significance of the listed building to be ‘less than substantial’ and at the lower end of the scale. However, this should not be equated with a less than substantial planning objection and is of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

13. The appellant argues that the ancillary accommodation within the outbuilding would be better used if it were physically attached to the dwelling. However, this would solely be a private benefit.
14. The proposal would result in investment into the property, and there would be economic benefits relative to the construction phase, which I give limited weight as a public benefit. There is no substantive evidence before me that the proposal is necessary in order to secure the optimum viable use of the asset. In this case, the public benefits of the proposal would be limited and not sufficient to outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset and the great weight this carries.
15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II listed building. The proposal would fail to accord with the requirements of the Act and the historic environment policies of the Framework. The proposal would conflict with Policies HE1 and PM1 of the Dover District Local Plan to 2040, adopted October 2024 and Policy ANP6 of the Ash Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018-2037, adopted September 2021. These policies among other things require that proposals conserve or enhance the heritage assets of the District, sustaining and enhancing their significance.

Conclusion

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

A James

INSPECTOR