
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/V2255/W/25/3365171

22 East Street, Sittingbourne ME10 4RT

- 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 Ranger against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application ref. is 25/500049/FULL.
 - The development proposed is for a rear dormer with cladding to match existing adjacent development.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear dormer with cladding to match existing adjacent development at 22 East Street, Sittingbourne ME10 4RT in accordance with the terms of the application ref. 25/500049/FULL and the plans submitted with it (site location plan, as built elevations, as built first floor plan, as built ground floor plan, as built second floor and roof plans, as built section plan).

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 Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounds, including the Sittingbourne Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site consists of a two-storey building on East Street in urban environs comprising a mix of residential and commercial uses. The street scene is characterised by properties of varying scale, age, design, external materials and detailing.
5. The special architectural and historic interest of the CA derives from the linear High Street that follows the alignment of an early important Medieval route, and which later became known as Watling Street from the Roman period. It was an important 18th century coaching stop en route between London and Canterbury and the coast; there are distinctive long and narrow burgage plots and historic alleyways from coaching inn days on both sides of the High Street. Being situated in the CA, I have applied the statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and paid special attention to the desirability of

preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA by attaching considerable importance and weight to that desirability.

6. My attention is drawn to the property history; I understand that development incorporating a rear dormer was previously approved in 2015, albeit for a smaller element. The submitted plans include the permitted scheme, which is a useful visual tool in comparing the dormer as it was granted against what has now been constructed.
7. Being almost flush with the ridge line, the appeal proposal would be similar to the approved rear dormer in this respect. Whilst somewhat wider, an acceptable amount of the original roof slope remains visible to either side, and similarly at eaves level several rows of tiles are evident between the wall plate and the base of the dormer.
8. Consequently, the dormer is broadly set within the body of the rear roof slope. Taken in the round, I consider that the appeal scheme would visually connect with the general appearance of the building and local environs, without resulting in a dominant or discordant design solution. I am satisfied that views of the development within the vicinity of the site would not be adversely affected, having accounted for the multi-faceted character of the street scene.
9. I therefore conclude that the scheme would integrate with the character and appearance of the surrounds, including the CA. It would comply with Policies CP4, CP8, DM14, DM16 and DM33 of Bearing Fruits 2031: The Swale Borough Local Plan July 2017, which cumulatively require new development to be designed to a high quality and respond to the distinctive local character of the area in which it is situated.

Conditions

10. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the Framework. The development is complete and therefore the standard time limit and plans condition are no longer necessary. I am satisfied that no conditions are required.

Conclusion

11. With respect to the above and all associated factors, the appeal succeeds.

C Hall

INSPECTOR