



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V2255/D/25/3365682

10 Hustlings Drive, Eastchurch, Kent ME12 4JX

- 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 and Mrs Butters against the decision of Swale Borough Council.
 - The application ref. is 25/500235/FULL.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounds.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a two-storey detached house, prominently located on Hustlings Drive opposite the junction with Hunsdon Close. The street scene is characterised by buildings of varying design, external materials and detailing in a wider residential estate. A number of local dwellings have large, single storey, double garages that project fairly substantially from the front elevations of the host property.
 4. The proposal would extend over the entirety of the ground floor garage element, with its ridgeline at a height that would broadly match that of the main house. As a result it would lack any sense of subservience, appearing as a dominant element of significant mass and bulk in a conspicuous position within the context of the neighbourhood.
 5. The imposing nature of the scheme would be exacerbated by the design of the front elevation, which is bland and utilitarian with small first floor windows, large areas of brickwork and no features of interest to articulate the facade.
 6. I observed the scale and appearance of other properties in the estate, including those highlighted by the appellant. However, many of these are not directly comparable to the development before me, as the garages and accommodation over have a different relationship with the main building, or they do not project as far forward as the appeal scheme. They might also contain features to reduce bulk such as hipped roofs, or bay windows to provide interest. In any event, the design of other houses elsewhere would be a neutral consideration in the balance against planning harm, and I am mindful that each case must be assessed on its own merits.
 7. I sympathise with the appellants' personal circumstances and appreciate that the accommodation would provide further living space. Moreover, that no objections have been raised by local residents or the Parish Council. Nevertheless, the development remains unacceptable for the reasons outlined above.
-

8. I therefore conclude that the scheme would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounds. It would contravene Policies CP4, 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.

Conclusion

9. With respect to the above and all associated factors, the appeal fails.

C Hall

INSPECTOR