

A05

F/TH/16/0718

PROPOSAL: Erection of 1no. detached dwelling with detached garage

LOCATION: Cliff Cottage Coastguard Cottages Pegwell Road RAMSGATE
Kent

WARD: Cliffsend And Pegwell

AGENT: Mr Doug Brown

APPLICANT: Mr Stan Allen

RECOMMENDATION: Approve

Subject to the following conditions:

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

GROUND:

In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Purchase Act 2004).

2 No development shall take place until samples of the stonework and colour samples of the render to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

GROUND:

In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan

3 Details of the materials and design of the roofing system, to include fascias; and the materials and design of the balustrading, to include the method of fixing, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any works.

GROUND:

In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan

4 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, shall secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

GROUND:

To ensure that the archaeological history of the site is recorded in accordance with the advice contained within National Planning Policy Framework.

5 No further alterations to the building, or the erection of garden buildings, whether approved by Classes A, B, or E of Part One of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), shall be carried out without the prior permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

GROUND:

To ensure a satisfactory external treatment and in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan

6 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted drawing numbered SA/06/156/04 Rev A, received 23 April 2015.

GROUND:

To secure the proper development of the area

7 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of the proposed curtilage boundary treatments shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The agreed boundary treatment (to be erected along the red line boundary of the site) shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be permanently maintained.

GROUND:

To protect the future occupiers of the development from the health and safety risks associated with nearby coastal erosion, and limit the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, in accordance with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan and the guidelines contained within the NPPF.

SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The site is located within the countryside and the conservation area, and is adjacent to a Site of Special Scientific Interest. It is located at the end of a small access road, leading from Pegwell Road, and is close to the cliff edge. Whilst the area surrounding the site is mainly open, there are a few neighbouring cottages close to the application site, all of which do not exceed 2-storey in height. The application itself was previously occupied by a dwelling, which has been demolished following fire damage. The site at present is overgrown, although there is some evidence of the previous building on site.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

F/TH/15/0347 - Erection of dwelling. Refused 25th September 2015. Appeal dismissed 16th May 2016.

F/TH/14/0353 - Erection of a three storey dwelling together with detached double garage. Refused 28th January 2015

C/TH/13/028 - Application for conservation area consent for the demolition of building. Granted 17th May 2013

F/TH/13/0227 - Erection of two semi detached dwellings and detached garage, together with landscaping, following demolition of the existing building. Refused 17th May 2013

F/TH/06/0757 - Erection of a detached dwelling, with associated parking and access leading off the coastal footpath and excavations of 1.2m. Approved 11th May 2007

F/TH/06/0757 - Erection of two detached dwellings with integral garages. Refused 29th September 2005

F/TH/04/0476- Erection of a replacement two storey detached six bed dwellinghouse following demolition of existing fire damaged property. Approved 15th September 2004

F/TH/03/1390 - Erection of a detached two storey six bedroom dwellinghouse following demolition of existing fire damaged dwelling house together with associated landscaping. Refused 29th January 2004

F/TH/03/1071 - Erection of a detached two storey six bedroom dwellinghouse following demolition of existing fire damaged dwelling house. Refused 13th November 2003

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a detached dwelling with a detached double garage.

The application seeks to address the reason for refusal identified by the Inspector when dismissing the appeal on the previous application (F/TH/15/0347).

The dwelling would sit centrally within the site with the garage located to the south east of the site. The dwelling appears to be art deco inspired in terms of design and due to the levels within the site would largely be seen in the wider area as a single storey dwelling.

The proposed dwelling would have a kitchen/diner, WC, playroom, nursery and a bedroom (with ensuite and dressing area) at the lower ground level, a sitting room, WC, and three additional bedrooms (2 with ensuite bathrooms) on the ground floor and a further bedroom with ensuite at first floor levels.

The application is supported by a Planning and Heritage Statement and a Desk Study Report on Coastal Erosion.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Thanet Local Plan 2006 Saved Policies

D1 - Design Principles

D2 - Landscaping

H1 - Housing Provision

CC1 - Development in the Countryside

CC2 - Landscape Character Areas

TR12 - Cycling

TR16 - Car Parking Provision

NOTIFICATIONS

A site notice has been posted and neighbouring occupiers notified. Two letters of objection have been received. They raise the following summarised concerns.

- o Little has changed since the previous application with regard to the proposed dwelling which is still too large and out of character with the immediate area;
- o The eastern wing of the development is directly in front of nos. 1 and 2 Coastguard Cottages and will significantly impair their outlook;
- o The proposal may result in overlooking and loss of light issues;
- o The disposal of foul sewerage raises concerns as connection to mains drainage is not possible and sewage tankers are not able to gain access to the site;
- o Stability issues if further digging takes place;
- o Increased traffic will lead to safety issues for walkers on the coastal path as there are no passing places in the access lane;
- o The current volume of traffic causes dust and noise without the addition of builders vehicles;
- o The postcode of the application site is incorrectly shown on the drawings, but is correct on the application forms. This could result in confusion over the application site location;
- o Do not object in principle to the rebuilding of the former Cliff Cottage. The problem has always been with the size and design of the various planning applications over the years, taking into consideration its unique location within a conservation area and the only access via a well-used public footpath;
- o Would dominate, overpower and have a detrimental impact on the small community of single storey dwellings of modest dimensions that already exist at this location;
- o The area benefits from a lack of street lighting. The proposal incorporates a lot of glass and windows positioned such that more light would be visible resulting in unnecessary light pollution;

- o Not clear from the plans where refuse storage and collection is intended to be located;
- o The proposals show 3 parking spaces, but where will visitors park?
- o Interested as to what the area outlined in blue will become. Is this now two separate plots?

Ramsgate Town Council - The application is inappropriate development as per the previous application which was refused by the Council.

Pegwell and District Association - The Association believes that the conclusion of the Planning inspector's report on the appeal at this site that the risk to the proposed development from coastal erosion remains wholly pertinent. This stretch of chalk coastline is as vulnerable to erosion as it ever was. Indeed, given recent spectacular falls further along the coast towards Dover, it would appear that, for whatever reason, the east Kent coastline is in a period of tremendous geological and physical change.

Whether changing the boundary of the development would reduce the potential impact of erosion on the property itself, as claimed, is a moot point. However the proposed development and the thread of coastal erosion should be considered in a broader context.

There is a limited amount of land between the Cliff Cottage site and the cliff top, and any loss through erosion would diminish this further, reducing the viability of the footpath and effectively bringing the property dangerously close to the cliff edge.

The association believes that the issue of coastal erosion alone is sufficient to rule out this application, but it is also concerned by its nature.

The art deco style envisaged is drastically out of keeping with the Pegwell Conservation Area in which it is situated and would have a negative impact on the Wantsum Channel North Shore Landscape Character Area.

The iconic Pegwell landscape has been treasured for years and, while the association is vehemently not against any or all change, a building such as the one envisaged pays no respect or sensitivity to the that landscape.

Further the association is keen that that any replacement building does not exceed the footprint of what was present before. Again a larger building would be out of context with the surrounding area, while larger buildings almost invariably mean more vehicles.

The above factors, combined with the limited capacity of the cliff top track, would, of course, impact on access for emergency vehicles to nearby properties should it be needed.

To finish, Pegwell and District Association is of the firm opinion that this most recent application for this site is not acceptable. There are a number of reasons for this conclusion, the strongest being the continuing and very real threat of coastal erosion, a factor that weighed so heavily in the Inspector's decision to dismiss the appeal and uphold the council's reason for refusal of permission as set out in his letter (May 2016).

Ramsgate Society - can see no reason why the recent decision of the Planning inspector to uphold the Council's decision to refuse consent for a single dwelling on this exposed and cliff top site should be overturned. Therefore oppose the application.

Conservation Area Advisory Group - No further comments

CONSULTATIONS

Conservation Officer - No objections

Southern Water - The applicant is advised to consult the Environment Agency directly regarding the use of a septic tank drainage which disposes of effluent to sub soil irrigation. The owner of the premises will need to maintain the septic tank to ensure its long term effectiveness.

The Council's Building Control officers or technical staff should be asked to comment on the adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water from the proposed development.

Due to changes in the legislation that came into force in 1st October 2011 regarding the future ownership of sewers it is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the above property. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access before any further works commence on site. The applicant is advised to discuss the matter further with Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (tel 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk

KCC Rights of Way - Public Footpath TR15 and England's Coastal Access Path run along the northern boundary of the proposed development. There is no specific information as to how the access will be gained to the new development.

Technical Services Manager - It appears that no new erosion study report has been produced. My comments made in 2014 are therefore still relevant as follows:

I have read the letter from Fairhurst on the subject of coastal erosion. I do not fully agree with the argument made in the letter which disputes the predicted erosion rates in the report of Dr Brian D'Olier (2007). This is because the writer has not made mention of the nature of coastal chalk cliff erosion which does not produce linear losses. Chalk cliffs which are subject to wave action erode through multiple mechanisms including undercutting by wave action, the propagation of caves along geological joints and faults and the actions of aerial erosion, groundwater and frost attack. This complex combination of mechanisms does not produce a linear rate of erosion and is characterised by large falls (which relieve the stress of heavy undercut cliff faces) intersperse with times of relatively little change. From previous inspection of the cliff I have noticed that the primary joint direction adjacent to the property is approx. NW/SE. This would indicate that the existing caves on the site which are likely to be the focus of most concentrated erosion may not directly impact the proposed dwelling but may still affect the land around it. The cave feature on the cliff in the adjacent property 'Driftwood' is more likely in time to affect the Cliff Cottages site as the joint travels in that

direction however the cave is currently approx. 47m from the old dwelling footprint so impact from that will probably be beyond the 100 year time frame.

The location plan submitted does not indicate the distance between the current top of cliff and the closest point of the red line. However by scaling the plan this appears to be in the region of 17m from cliff top to the boundary and 22m from the cliff top to the dwelling. Based upon an assessment of TDC's erosion study work dating back to 1983 and the D'Olier study work on predicted rates I think it is unlikely that the dwelling itself will be compromised by coastal erosion in the next 100 years. I have a slightly lower level of confidence for the boundary itself although this could also remain unaffected if the future rate of erosion remains in the low to mid-range of the predicted D'Olier rates which given the observed erosion behaviour through local monitoring is quite conceivable.

This does however leave the blue edged area to the seaward side of the red outlined site which will be the subject of significant erosion in the 100 year timeframe although it is understood that this is no longer part of the site and will remain permanently beyond the site boundary.

COMMENTS

The application is reported to planning committee as it is considered to be a departure from Policy H1 of the Local Plan as the site lies outside of the urban confines.

The main considerations with regard to the planning application are the principle of development; the impact upon the character and appearance of the local area, the impact upon living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling, highway safety, coastal erosion and archaeology

Principle

In considering the planning application under section 38(6) of the Planning Act, any determination must be made in accordance with the development plan (in this case the Thanet Local Plan) unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF sets out at paragraph 215 that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to the degree of consistency with the policies within the NPPF.

The site lies outside of a defined settlement boundary , and therefore the proposal is contrary to Policy H1 of the Thanet Local Plan, which states that residential development on non-allocated sites will be permitted on previously developed land within the existing built up confines unless specified by other Local Plan Policies. This policy constraint, however, needs to be balanced with the fact that there is a current need for housing in Thanet, and on this basis the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) indicates that applications for housing should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The Council refused the previous application on two grounds, one being that the proposed dwelling would represent an unsustainable and inappropriate form of development within the

countryside contrary to Policies H1 and CC1 of the Thanet Plan and paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework."

The Inspector concluded that the application site is previously developed land, and that development would provide one dwelling, and in a small way help with the District's requirement for additional housing. The application site is located within the immediate context of a small cluster of dwellings and within walking distance of a number of services and facilities along Pegwell Road as well as nearby bus stops which provide a service (albeit) limited to Ramsgate town centre, Sandwich, Eastry and Dover. The Inspector concluded that the appeal site is not isolated to a significant degree, either physically or in terms of its accessibility to services or facilities, and as such does not conflict with paragraph 55 of the Framework.

Given the Inspector's findings it is considered that the development of this site for a dwelling and garage can therefore be accepted in principle subject to the detailed consideration of all other material considerations.

Character and Appearance

The building is identical to that which was approved as a single dwelling under application number F/TH/06/0757. Whilst this permission has expired, it was assessed under the policies of the Thanet Local Plan. It is considered that it would be unreasonable to reach a different conclusion on the visual impact of this identical scheme. Whilst regard must be had for any changes to policy (in this case, the changes in national policy, through the NPPF), it is not considered that this change would materially alter the assessment of the scheme in this respect.

As set out above, the application site lies within the Pegwell Conservation Area. Given the special architectural and historic interest of conservation areas it is council policy to preserve or enhance them. The proposal is supported by a Planning and Heritage Statement which concludes (on heritage issues) that the design of the proposed dwelling is the same as the previous application considered at appeal and that the Inspector concluded that the proposal would be an appropriate form of development within the conservation area. On this basis, it is not considered that the proposed development would adversely affect the character or appearance of the conservation area.

The site is within the Wantsum Channel North Shore Landscape Character Area, where special regard must be had for the setting of, amongst other things, long views of Pegwell Bay and the sea. However, in line with the previous decision, it is not considered that the development would harm this landscape character area.

Living Conditions

As set out above, the proposed dwelling in terms of design, location and scale are the same as that previously granted approval and that which was considered at the appeal against the recent refusal. Concerns have been raised by local residents to the size of the proposed dwelling, that it would dominate the existing community of single storey dwellings and that it has the potential to result in overlooking and loss of light to nearby properties. Given the changes in level of the site, the dwelling would appear as a single storey dwelling to the

wider area outwith the site and looking at the separation distances between the proposed dwelling and the surrounding properties it is not considered that there would be any impacts in terms of loss of light or overlooking. It is not considered that the development would harm the residential amenities of neighbours and it is noted that the Inspector did not identify any such issues in his decision.

The property would be of a reasonable size and would provide external amenity space with room for refuse storage and doorstep play space. It is considered that the living conditions of future occupants would be acceptable.

Transportation

The development, as with the previously approved scheme, would utilise an existing vehicular access. Whilst the access is acknowledged as not ideal as there is no dedicated footpath and unlit, there are no known safety problems with the access and there are regular, convenient, passing places. On balance, it is not considered that the access would be unsafe. Furthermore, I do not consider that it would unduly harm the free flow of traffic, or safety, in the wider road network.

Four car parking spaces would be provided, two of which would be in the form of garages. Informal parking opportunities may also exist within the site. It is considered that this level of parking is acceptable. The property would have a private garden capable of providing cycle storage.

Whilst the construction of the dwelling would require large vehicles to access the site, I do not consider that these movements would be significantly harmful, due to the limited scale of the proposed development.

Coastal Erosion

The site is located in a cliff top location that is an actively eroding section of undefended coastline. At its closest point, the building would be approximately 25m from the cliff face. It is not proposed to actively manage this part of the cliff.

In such a location the key issues are the conservation of the natural environment, the risks of erosion and land instability and improving the environment of the coastline. The National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Planning Authorities should reduce the risk from coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development in vulnerable areas. In assessing applications, particular regard must be for: whether a development will be safe over its planned lifetime; whether the character of the coast would be compromised; whether any wider sustainability objectives exist; and whether the development would hinder managed routes around the coast.

It is considered necessary that development along the coast be set back a sufficient distance from the edge of the cliff top as to avoid the possibility that the buildings could be undermined by future coastal erosion for the lifetime of the building, resulting in danger to the occupiers of the proposed dwellings.

The Council's second reason for refusal on the previous application related to this issue of instability and advised that the "proposed development would be located on land considered to be vulnerable to coastal erosion. In the absence of evidence to demonstrate that the development would be safe over its planned lifetime, the proposal is contrary to paragraph 106 of the National Planning Policy Framework."

The current application is supported by the same Desk Study report on cliff erosion as the previous application. This concludes that

"A viable mechanism for retreat has been established and is directly attributable to the nature of the chalk, the presence of distinct faulting, the effects of faulting on the chalk structure, relict chalk structure disturbance and the effects of storm events from particular directions.

It has been established that retreat is most evident along the line of the faults with lesser retreat on other cliff sections. The measured retreat from the site specific crest and toe survey over the return period between 1988-2007 is noted to be appreciably less than that advocated by D O'lier in his 2007 report: Erosion Rate Study - Isle of Thanet Coastline over the 3 epochs that classify this area as being likely to be one of the most rapidly retreating cliff sections in the Thanet area. It is suggested that the coastline may retreat in this area by 12.5 -35m in the 50 -100 year timeframe.

The basis for a large scale retreat advocated by D O'lier is related to surveys undertaken on another coastal sections, with the inclusions of other factors (i.e. climate change), but even with consideration of the worst case values from quantitative measurements, this does not provide a satisfactory explanation of the high rate of retreat that are being forecast.

Significant additional data would be required to confirm that the predictions are, or not a valid model. It is recommended that in order to more fully understand the longer term trends that historical air photos be given consideration which has not been possible in the timescales for producing this report. In addition a more detailed consideration of the predicted future erosion rates must also be investigated, which would include consideration of historical meteorological data.

It should be noted that the wording of the planning refusal provided does not consider that the wording of the planning refusal does not consider that the rates or result of the existing predictions in retreat would preclude the positioning of a dwelling in the proposed position, which are noted in the text provided to be within accepted tolerances. The refusal would be based on the ... the fact that a landslide can be reasonably foreseen. The consideration of whether the landslide will impair the stability appears to be omitted."

In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector stated that whilst the proposed dwelling itself may not be at significant risk over its lifetime from coastal erosion, subject to appropriate positioning within the appeal site, the likely potential for coastal erosion and sudden landfalls within the area of land between the proposed dwelling and the cliff top, that would likely include the associated garden, would pose a significant risk. This would give rise to considerable health and safety issues for the future occupiers of the proposal". He concluded that "the proposal

would be at risk of coastal erosion over its lifetime and would therefore conflict with the objectives of paragraph 106 of the framework."

The current application differs from the previous one dismissed at appeal in that previously the red line application site ran from Pegwell Road to the cliff edge. The red line application site has been amended and covers a smaller site adjacent to Pegwell Road set in some 35m (at its furthest point) from the cliff edge with remainder of the land outlined in blue as land within the applicant's ownership but not forming part of the application site.

In reviewing the amended plans, the Council's Technical Officer concludes that "the location plan submitted does not indicate the distance between the current top of cliff and the closest point of the red line. However by scaling the plan this appears to be in the region of 17m from cliff top to the boundary and 22m from the cliff top to the dwelling. Based upon an assessment of TDC's erosion study work dating back to 1983 and the D'Olier study work on predicted rates I think it is unlikely that the dwelling itself will be compromised by coastal erosion in the next 100 years. I have a slightly lower level of confidence for the boundary itself although this could also remain unaffected if the future rate of erosion remains in the low to mid-range of the predicted D'Olier rates which given the observed erosion behaviour through local monitoring is quite conceivable.

This does however leave the blue edged area to the seaward side of the red outlined site which will be the subject of significant erosion in the 100 year timeframe although it is understood that this is no longer part of the site and will remain permanently beyond the site boundary."

On balance, it is concluded that as the current application site could be separated from the blue land nearer to the cliff edge by means of a wall or other boundary treatment, allowing this land to become a buffer to the application site from coastal erosions, that the proposal would not now give rise to health and safety issues for the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling during its lifetime. As such, subject to attaching a condition to ensure that an appropriate boundary is established between the application site and the land outlined in blue, it is now considered that the proposal is no longer contrary to paragraph 106 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Archaeology

The application site lies at the place of some previous coastal buildings and the main Coastguard Station complex of the mid-19th century. To the west of the site is the site of some medieval building remains and an area known as "Great Gun practice platform". These elements are considered to be of local heritage interest and remains associated with these may survive on the site. It is, therefore considered appropriate to attach a condition requiring a programme of archaeological work.

Other Matters

Concerns have been raised regarding the impacts on views from this scheme, drainage issues, issues of stability of neighbouring properties during construction, the incorrect

postcode shown on the application drawings, unnecessary light pollution and what the area in blue will become. Each of these points will be considered in turn.

The planning system does not protect the individual's right to a view and only becomes a matter when a development is considered to result in an overbearing development or a loss of outlook. In this particular instance, due to the separation distances between neighbouring properties and the proposed development the scheme would not result in a detrimental impact on outlook.

In terms of drainage it is noted that there is no mains connection available to serve the proposed dwelling. No details have been provided as to the drainage arrangements for the proposed dwelling, but given that there was a previous dwelling on the site and the small cluster of existing dwellings close to the site it is considered that appropriate drainage could be secured.

The stability of neighbouring properties during construction has been raised. It is not, however, clear as to the reason this issue has been raised. It is appreciated that construction works may cause some disturbance, but these are generally more general issues such as noise and dust. This would not normally be seen as a reason for withholding planning permission. Building works should not normally have an adverse effect on the stability of neighbouring properties. The concern may be more of a general one in terms of stability issues being caused by coastal erosion. If that is the case, it is noted that the application site would not be affected by erosion during its lifetime and there is no reason to suggest that construction works on this site would have any adverse effect in terms of accelerating the erosion process.

Concerns have also been raised on the basis that the postcode of the application site is incorrect on the drawings, although correct on the application, which may lead to confusion. In terms of planning application documentation, it is usual where there are discrepancies between items submitted, for the application form to take precedence. It is not considered that the incorrect postcode on the drawings would prejudice the determination of this application.

Issues of unnecessary light pollution has also been raised by residents. The proposed dwelling would replace a dwelling which, although now demolished after fire damage, had been located on the site for a number of years. It is not considered that the single proposed dwelling would generate significant amounts of light and would not lead to light pollution.

It is also noted that the Inspector in his decision considered third part representations and concluded

"I acknowledge a number of third party concerns, including in respect of highway safety, damage to the public footpath, living condition matters, refuse, light pollution and waste water. However, these matters did not form part of the Council's reasons for refusal and based on the evidence before me and my own observations, I have no substantive reasons to conclude that these matters weigh against the proposal."

Conclusion

The site is previously developed land in the countryside, and is therefore considered contrary to the aims of saved policy H1. This policy constraint, however, needs to be balanced with the fact that there is a current need for housing in Thanet, and on this basis the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) indicates that applications for housing should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Given the findings of the Planning Inspector in his decision letter, the site is considered sustainable in its location. On balance the need for housing in sustainable locations such as this site outweighs the need set out in saved Policy H1 of protecting land outside of the urban confines.

The proposal can be delivered in a manner that would not cause adverse impacts in terms of living conditions, character and appearance, highways or archaeology.

In terms of coastal erosion, it is considered that whilst the overall site (outlined in blue) may be subject to coastal erosion, the amended smaller application site would not give rise to health and safety issues for the future occupiers of the development during the lifetime of the proposed dwelling.

It is therefore recommended that Members approve this application subject to safeguarding conditions.

Case Officer
Emma Fibbens

TITLE:

F/TH/16/0718

Project

Cliff Cottage Coastguard Cottages Pegwell Road RAMSGATE Kent

Scale:

