



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

by **B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/25/3361462

60 Shortlands Road, Sittingbourne, Kent ME10 3JT

- 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 Mr. J Tatler against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/504437/FULL.
 - The development proposed is Roof alterations, including rear dormer (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I observed at my site visit that the extension appears to have been constructed in accordance with the plans before me, therefore I have considered the appeal on the basis that the development has already taken place.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace property with a pitched roof, and a rear projection, referred to by the main parties as an outshot projection. Immediately to the rear of the appeal site is a short row of bungalows, which have clear views towards the appeal property's rear elevation.
5. The roof alterations including the rear dormer are expansive, spanning the full width of the rear roof, as well as covering the roof of the rear outshot projection. Whilst it is constructed in matching materials, the large, flat roof dormer spans from the eaves to the ridge height, creating a particularly bulky addition which results in an out of proportion, top-heavy and dominant form of development. Overall, due to its size and bulk, it fails to respect the original form and architecture of the host building.
6. The Council refer to its Designing an Extension: A Guide for Householders Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). My attention has been drawn to 5.4 and 5.5 of the SPG which outlines that dormers should be in proportion with the roof and only as large as necessary to allow light into the roof space. They should also be no deeper than half the depth of the roof slope and should normally have pitched roofs with tiles to match the main roof.

7. The dormer cannot be said to be in proportion to the original roof, and it has a large flat roof expanse rather than a pitched roof. It is also significantly deeper than half the depth of the roof slope. Overall, it is a very bulky and disproportionate addition to the appeal property. The appellant indicates that the style of dormer is not uncommon. However, my attention has not been drawn to any other similar dormer extensions within the local area.
8. The rear dormer is not prominent in public views from the front of the appeal property. However, given the densely built up nature of the area, it is clearly visible in views from the bungalows to the rear of the appeal site.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal development harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. I therefore find that it conflicts with Policies CP4, DM14 and DM16 of the Bearing Fruits 2031– The Swale Borough Local Plan (2017). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other aspects, that all new development is of a high standard of design and respects local character.
10. As set out above, the dormer design also conflicts with the SPG in relation to rear dormer design.

Other Matters

11. The proposal does not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Be that as it may, this matter does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. The development harms the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR