



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2017

by **David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/W/17/3174440

14 Station Road, Faversham ME13 8EB

- 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 Trevor Dudney against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/507963/FULL, dated 15 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2-storey, 2-bed detached house on land to the eastern flank wall of the existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Faversham Conservation Area (CA) and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 67 Newton Road in relation to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 14 comprises a two-storey property which both fronts onto Station Road and turns the corner into Newton Road. The proposal is for a modern style two-storey house fronting Station Road on the open yard between the existing property and Nos 15/16, a pair of traditionally designed houses. These are similar to the many Victorian style terraced properties which are characteristic of this part of the Faversham CA. However, the site faces Faversham railway station, a listed building, and beyond Nos 15/16 there is a distinctive railway water tower, also listed, now converted to residential use.
4. The new property would be built of yellow stock brick like many nearby but in other respects the house would appear markedly different from the distinctive and consistent terraced properties which characterise the immediate area. It is appreciated that Faversham as a whole contains a wide variety of building styles, but on this particular site the horizontal window openings of the house would be a jarring feature between the traditional vertical shaped windows of the existing building on one side and Nos 15/16 on the other. In contrast, The Workshop in St John's Road, claimed as a precedent, is a standalone detached dwelling where the contemporary fenestration and weatherboarding does not clash with immediately adjoining buildings.

<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate>

Appeal Decision APP/V2255/W/17/3174440

5. In addition, the roof form would not relate satisfactorily to the simple pitched roofs on either side. Although when approached from the east or west there would be the appearance of a pitched roof gable end, this would fail to disguise a roof unprecedented in the area¹. At one end an open amenity area with vertical balcony guard would create an incongruous void overlooking the street whilst at the other a zinc covered 'tank' over the stairs would sit at second floor level. The presence of a high level tank as part of the railway architecture of the town along the road does not justify this being 'picked up' in a nearby domestic building. Sitting forward of the sloping pitched roof of Nos 15/16, which are also set back from the footway, the tank feature would be intrusive and disconcerting in the street scene, not idiosyncratic and interesting.
6. Whilst not requiring a particular architectural style, for these design reasons the new house would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the Faversham CA in conflict with the statutory duty to preserve or enhance it. The proposal would also conflict with Policies CP4, CP8 and DM33 of the Swale Borough Local Plan 2017 which require development to be of high quality design that is appropriate to its surroundings, to respond to the integrity, form and character of settlements, and to preserve or enhance the features that contribute positively to the CA.

Living conditions

7. The proposal would include a catslide roof running alongside the full length of the rear garden of No 67 Newton Road, the adjacent terraced property. Only high-level windows are proposed on this roofslope to protect privacy and the appellant has demonstrated that the effect on daylight and sunlight would meet appropriate BRE standards². However, the combined height and length of the new house along the whole of the rear garden would be unduly overbearing in the outlook from the house and garden of No 67 and result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the occupiers. The situation would not be comparable to that in St John's Road or the opposite corner of Newton Road.
8. For this reason the proposal would significantly harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 67 contrary to paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires a good standard of amenity for all occupants of land and buildings.

Conclusion

9. In an area of predominantly terraced housing the proposal would not appear cramped in the street scene. The scheme would provide an additional dwelling in a sustainable location with social and economic benefits. However, the environmental dimension of sustainable development would not be met and the presumption in favour of such development does not therefore apply.
10. Having regard to the above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR

¹ The 'gable end' would also appear awkward alongside the hipped roof of No 14.

² 'Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice'