

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 18th June 2026**PART 5**

Report of the Head of Planning

PART 5Decisions by County Council and Secretary of State, reported for information

- **Item 5.1 – 25/502388/FULL**

Crockham Farmhouse, Crockham Lane, Hernhill, Kent ME13 9LB**PINS Decision: DISMISSED****Committee or Officer Decision : REFUSED****Observations**

Planning permission was sought, retrospectively, for the change of use of a shepherds hut for use as a holiday let. The Inspector began by commenting that the appeal would be determined in alignment with this description and not having regard to the mobility of the structure and whether it could be lawfully used at the site as such a matter would be for a Certificate of Lawfulness application rather than this appeal.

The first main issue was whether the appeal site would be a suitable location for the proposed development, with particular regard to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector found that vehicle movements and the keeping of paraphernalia at the site, associated with the use, would *“would introduce urban domestic features into a prominent rural setting.”* The elevation of the site and its prominence led the Inspector to find that the development could not be *“sufficiently screened or softened to avoid harm”*. The Inspector noted elements of the case that had been made by the appellant but found that this does not *“constitute an assessment of need for tourist facilities and overall, the appellant has provided no substantive evidence regarding the need for additional tourist facilities and the degree to which existing facilities are addressing this need.”* Therefore, the requirements of the development plan policies had not been met and the proposal was found to be contrary to policies ST1, ST3 and DM3 and paragraphs 88 and 89 of the NPPF.

The second main issue related to the SAMMS payment having not been paid. A conventional assessment of the relevant legislation and policy background was undertaken and the Inspector considered that this should not be secured by condition in this case. The Inspector found that *“the absence of any measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the SPA, the proposal would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA and would not be in accordance with the Habitats Regulations, Policies DM 14, DM 28 and ST 1 of the Local Plan or section 15 of the Framework which seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment.”*

Regard was had to the economic benefit of the development but this was considered to be small scale and not quantified in such a way that would enable it to be afforded more than limited weight. The Inspector therefore dismissed the appeal on the basis of the conflict with the development plan and there not being any material considerations that indicate that a different should be taken.

- **Item 5.2 – 23/500931/FULL**

25-25A West Street, Sittingbourne ME10 1AL

PINS Decision: DISMISSED

Committee or Officer Decision : COMMITTEE DECISION

Observations

Planning permission was sought for the extension of the building at the site and its adaptation to create three new flats and alterations to the existing flat.

The main issue was found to be the effect on the character and appearance of the host building and area. The Inspector therefore used two paragraphs to describe the existing site and the surrounding area before going on to describe the development. The Inspector noted that the proposal would involve, amongst other works, significantly raising the eaves with those at the front notably exceeding those of the adjacent property, introducing a shallow crown pitch roof, two dormer windows to the front. The Inspector stated that *“this would make the host property appear far more imposing and unbalanced with its neighbour within the streetscene.”*

The Inspector noted that, to the side, *“the building would be of an imposing three storey stature set in the prominent corner plot appearing of considerably greater bulk and massing than the two storey neighbours in the terrace it forms a part of making it appear overbearing within the streetscene.”*

In combination, the Inspector found that *“the proposed development would be a discordant addition to the host building which would appear imposing and overbearing within the streetscene, and harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and area.”* Other developments were brought to the attention of the Inspector by the appellant, but these were not found to be reason to find this proposal acceptable, particularly as they were not directly comparable. The Inspector therefore stated that the proposal would *“cause considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area”* and conflict with Policies CP4, DM14, and DM16 of the Local Plan. Following an assessment, the Inspector found that these policies were consistent with the NPPF, even noting that the NPPF support for development in the airspace above existing premises is subject to that development being visually acceptable.

The Inspector considered the effect on heritage assets, finding no harm, and noted that the SAMMS payment had been made. The Inspector noted benefits arising from the proposal, including housing supply benefits and a small and time limited economic benefit as a result of construction. The use of previously developed land was found to be a benefit as was the sustainable, central location. However these benefits were found to be small scale and were afforded limited weight. The harm was found to outweigh the benefit and, therefore, the Inspector concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.