

A01

F/TH/18/0897

PROPOSAL: Erection of 9No two storey 4 bedroom dwellings with associated parking

LOCATION: Land Adjacent To 150 Monkton Street Monkton Ramsgate Kent CT12 4JJ

WARD: Thanet Villages

AGENT: Miss Rachael Dickson

APPLICANT: Mr Harry Ling

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 The proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted application as amended by the revised drawings numbered 17-0515 - 10 Revision D (received 08/11/18), 17-0515_11A (received 08/11/18), 17-0515_18 (received 08/11/18), 17-0515- 20 Revision B (received 21/09/18), 17-0515 - 21 Revision A (received 21/09/18), 17_0515 - 22 Revision A (received 21/09/18), 17-0515-37 (received 21/09/18), 17-0515-36 (received 21/09/18), 17-0515-35 (received 21/09/18), 17-0515-25 Revision A (received 21/09/18), 17-0515-24 Revision A, 17-0515-23 Revision B (received 21/09/18), 17-0515-42 (received 21/09/18), 17-0515-41 (received 21/09/18), 17_0515-40 (received 21/09/18), 17/0515-27 Revision A (received 21/09/18), 17/0515-26 Revision B (received 21/09/18), 17/0515-28 Revision A (received 21/09/18), 17/0515-29 Revision A (received 21/09/18), 17-0515 -31 (received 22/06/18), 17-0515 -30 (received 22/06/18), 17-0515 -32 (received 22/06/18), 17-0515-33 (received 22/06/18) and 2018_23 001

GROUND;

To secure the proper development of the area.

3 Prior to the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved samples of the materials to be used shall be 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

4 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, full details of both hard and soft landscape works, to include

- o species, size and location of new trees, shrubs, hedges and grassed areas to be planted

- o the treatment proposed for all hard surfaced areas beyond the limits of the highway

- o walls, fences, other means of enclosure proposed

shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

GROUND;

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to adequately integrate the development into the environment in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Thanet Local Plan

5 All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the first occupation; of any part of the development, or in accordance with a programme of works to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species.

GROUND;

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Thanet Local Plan

6 A landscape management plan (including long term design objectives), management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, other than small, privately owned, domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the development or any phase of the development, whichever is the sooner, for its approved use. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.

GROUND;

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to adequately integrate the development into the environment in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Thanet Local Plan

7 Existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows identified for retention within the development site or existing trees growing on an adjacent site, where excavations, changes to land levels or underground works are within the crown spread, shall be protected in accordance with BS 5837 2005 using the following protective fence specification - o Chestnut paling fence 1.2m in height, to BS 1722 part 4, securely mounted on 1.7m x 7cm x 7.5cm timber posts driven firmly into the ground. The fence shall be erected below the outer most limit of the branch spread or at a distance equal to half the height of the tree, whichever is the furthest from the tree, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The protective

fencing shall be erected before the works hereby approved or any site clearance work commences, and shall thereafter be maintained until the development has been completed. At no time during the site works shall building materials, machinery, waste, chemicals, stored or piled soil, fires or vehicles be allowed within the protective fenced area. Nothing shall be attached or fixed to any part of a retained tree and it should not be used as an anchor point. There shall be no change in the original soil level, nor trenches excavated within the protective fenced area.

GROUND;

To Protect existing trees and to adequately integrate the development into the environment, in accordance with Thanet Local Plan Policies D1 and D2.

8 Prior to the commencement of any development on site details to include the following shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and should be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- (a) Routing of construction and delivery vehicles to / from site
- (b) Parking and turning areas for construction and delivery vehicles and site personnel
- (c) Timing of deliveries
- (d) Provision of wheel washing facilities
- (e) Temporary traffic management / signage

GROUND;

In the interests of highway safety and neighbouring amenity, in accordance with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

9 The construction of the development hereby permitted shall incorporate measures to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the highway.

GROUND;

In the interests of highway safety.

10 The area shown on the approved plan numbered 17-0515 - 10 Revision D for vehicle parking and manoeuvring areas, shall be kept available for such use at all times and such land and access thereto shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted.

GROUND;

Development without adequate provision for the parking or turning of vehicles is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and detrimental to amenity and in pursuance of policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan.

11 The development hereby approved shall incorporate a bound surface material for the first 5 metres of the access from the edge of the highway.

GROUND;

In the interests of highway safety.

12 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted details of the cycle parking, which shall be in the form of a covered and secure enclosure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

GROUND;

In the interests of promoting increased cycling in accordance with policy TR12 of the Thanet Local Plan

13 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the proposed footway improvements shown on plan numbered 17-0515-10 Rev D or amended as agreed with the Local Planning Authority shall be completed and operational.

GROUND;

In the interests of highway safety.

14 Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling hereby approved visibility splays of 1 metre by 1 metre behind the footway on both sides of the vehicular accesses with no obstructions over 0.6m above footway level shall be provided and thereafter maintained.

GROUND;

In the interest of highway safety.

15 Prior to the first occupation of plots 1 and 2 fencing shall be provided along the frontage of plots 1 and 2 until the proposed boundary hedge is established.

GROUND;

In the interests of highway safety.

16 Where infiltration is to be used to manage the surface water from the development hereby permitted, it will only be allowed within those parts of the site where information is submitted to demonstrate to the Local Planning Authority's satisfaction that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters and/or ground stability. The development shall only then be carried out in accordance with the approved details

GROUND;

To protect vulnerable groundwater resources and ensure compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

17 If, during development, significant contamination is suspected or found to be present at the site, then works shall cease, and this contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme agreed with the Local Planning Authority. The approved works shall be implemented within a timetable agreed by the Local Planning Authority and shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end use of the site and surrounding environment, including controlled waters. Prior to first occupation/use and following completion of approved measures, a verification report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval.

GROUND;

To ensure that the proposed development will not cause harm to human health or pollution of the environment, in accordance with DEFRA and Environment Agency document Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination (Contamination Report 11) and National Planning Policy Framework.

18 Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

GROUND;

The site is underlain by a principal aquifer.

19 Prior to the installation of any external lighting, a "lighting design strategy for biodiversity" for the site boundaries has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The lighting strategy shall

- a) Identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for badgers and bats and that are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory;
- b) Show how and where external lighting will be installed so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory.

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy and these shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy.

GROUND;

In order to limit the impact upon protected species that may be present, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

20 Prior to the first occupation of the development a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The content of the LEMP shall include the following.

- a) Description and evaluation of ecological enhancement features to be managed;
- b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;
- c) Aims and objectives of management;
- d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
- e) Prescriptions for management actions;
- f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period);
- g) Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan;
- h) Details of annual habitat and species monitoring;
- i) Details of how the monitoring will inform updates of the management plan.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management

body(ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

GROUND;

In order to limit the impact upon protected species that may be present, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

21 No development shall take place until a detailed sustainable surface water drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to (and approved in writing by) the local planning authority. The detailed drainage scheme shall demonstrate that the surface water generated by this development (for all rainfall durations and intensities up to and including the climate change adjusted critical 100 year storm) can be accommodated and disposed of within the curtilage of the site without increase to flood risk on or off-site. The drainage scheme shall also demonstrate that silt and pollutants resulting from the site use and construction can be adequately managed to ensure there is no pollution risk to receiving waters.

GROUND;

To ensure the development is served by satisfactory arrangements for the disposal of surface water and to ensure that the development does not exacerbate the risk of on/off site flooding, in accordance with the NPPF

22 No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until an operation and maintenance manual for the proposed sustainable drainage scheme is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The manual shall include the following details:

A description of the drainage system and its key components

A general arrangement plan with the location of drainage measures and critical features clearly marked

An approximate timetable for the implementation of the drainage system

Details of the future maintenance requirements of each drainage or SuDS component, and the frequency of such inspections and maintenance activities

Details of who will undertake inspections and maintenance activities, including the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operations of the sustainable drainage system throughout its lifetime.

The drainage scheme as approved shall subsequently be maintained in accordance with these details.

GROUND;

To ensure that any measures to mitigate flood risk and protect water quality on/off the site are fully implemented and maintained (both during and after construction) as per the requirements of the NPPF.

23 No building of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a Verification Report pertaining to the surface water drainage system, carried out by a suitably qualified professional, has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority which demonstrates the suitable operation of the drainage system such that flood risk is appropriately managed, as approved by the Lead Local Flood Authority. The Report shall contain information and evidence (including photographs) of earthworks; details and locations of inlets, outlets and control structures; extent of planting; details of materials utilised in construction including subsoil, topsoil, aggregate and membrane liners; full as built drawings; and topographical survey of 'as constructed' features.

GROUND;

To ensure that flood risks from development to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development as constructed is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework.

24 No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written specification and timetable which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

GROUND;

To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded.

INFORMATIVES

Please be aware that obtaining planning permission and complying with building regulations are separate matters - please contact building control on 01843 577522 for advice on building regulations

Planning permission does not convey any approval for construction of the required vehicular crossing, or any other works within the highway for which a statutory licence must be obtained. Applicants should contact Kent County Council - Highways and Transportation (web: www.kent.gov.uk/roads_and_transport.aspx or telephone: 03000418181) in order to obtain the necessary Application Pack.

It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure, before the development hereby approved is commenced, that all necessary highway approvals and consents where required are obtained and that the limits of highway boundary are clearly established in order to avoid any enforcement action being taken by the Highway Authority.

Across the county there are pieces of land next to private homes and gardens that do not look like roads or pavements but are actually part of the road. This is called 'highway land'. Some of this land is owned by The Kent County Council (KCC) whilst some are owned by third party owners. Irrespective of the ownership, this land may have 'highway rights' over the topsoil. Information about how to clarify the highway boundary can be found at

<https://www.kent.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/what-we-look-after/highway-land/highway-boundary-enquiries>

The applicant must also ensure that the details shown on the approved plans agree in every aspect with those approved under such legislation and common law. It is therefore important for the applicant to contact KCC Highways and Transportation to progress this aspect of the works prior to commencement on site.

The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (section 1), it is an offence to remove, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act. Trees and scrub are likely to contain nesting birds between 1st March and 31st August inclusive. Trees and scrub are present on the application site and are to be assumed to contain nesting birds between the above dates, unless a recent survey has been undertaken by a competent ecologist to assess the nesting bird activity on site during this period and has shown it is absolutely certain that nesting birds are not present.

A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development. Please contact Southern Water, Southern House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk.

SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The application site is currently in use as a paddock with menage, accessed from Monkton Road, and there are also stable buildings on the land. Whilst the site is bounded by other residential properties to either side, although there is access track to the eastern side, the site lies outside the village confines of Monkton and is considered to lie within the countryside for planning purposes.

The application site is a rectangular shaped parcel of land fronting on to Monkton Street, at the western side of the main area of Monkton. The site is some 0.6ha in size.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

F/TH/01/0015 Change of use of land and conversion of barn for the keeping of horses.
Granted 08/03/01

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This is a full application for the development of 9 dwellings. The layout plans shows two vehicular access points either side of the proposed open space which is located centrally and within the front portion of the site. The dwellings are positioned around the perimeter of the site. There are four dwelling types:

Dwelling types 1 & 2 are positioned on plots 3 and 6. A type 1 & 2 dwelling is detached and residential accommodation is over two floors. The upper floor has four bedrooms. The dwelling has a gable feature to the front elevation and gable projections within the rear elevation.

Dwelling types 1a & 2a is a handed version of types 1 and 2 these dwellings are located on plots 4 and 5.

Dwelling type 3 is positioned on plot 7 on the western side of the site and again is a four bedroom detached property. This has a barn hip to the southern elevation and a gable end to the northern side.

Dwelling type 4 is located on plots 1, 2, 8 and 9 and are semi-detached dwellings and again is a four bedroom dwelling and incorporates a barn hip.

Garage accommodation is provided for all the detached dwellings and off street parking is provided for the semi-detached - two spaces per dwelling and a visitor space.

During the application process Plots 1 and 2 have been sent further back into the application site.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

THANET LOCAL PLAN 2006 - SAVED POLICIES

H1 Residential Development Sites

H4 Windfall Sites

CC1 Development in the Countryside

CC2 Landscape Character Areas

D1 Design Principles

D2 Landscaping

R1 General Levels of Development

R2 Village Gaps

EP13 Groundwater Protection Zones

TR12 Cycling

TR16 Car Parking Provision

SR5 Doorstep Playspace

SR11 Private Open Space

NOTIFICATIONS

30 Letters of representations have been received, including 1 letter of support. The concerns can be summarised as follows:

- * Loss of wildlife
- * Loss of view over the marshes
- * Potential danger of the large pond to vulnerable persons
- * Lack of footpaths in the area could be dangerous and would adversely affect the children's walking bus
- * Concern about surface water drainage and the site being an old flood plain
- * Concern about damage to the trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order in an adjoining site
- * Concern that applicants may undertake the demolition themselves
- * Loss of a village gap
- * The site is outside the village confines and would represent an intrusion into countryside
- * The proposal is not in keeping with the old, listed properties and would adversely affect their setting
- * Monkton has no village facilities
- * Insufficient parking in the village
- * Increase amount of traffic on Monkton Street
- * No economic benefits
- * Effect on ecology
- * No change since the previous refusal in 1990
- * Overlooking to neighbours garden
- * Overdevelopment of the site
- * Loss of outlook
- * Increase in noise and disturbance for occupiers of new residential properties

A petition signed by 208 villagers against the scheme.

The letter of support states the proposal will enhance this side of the village; at present it is a real eyesore. If a major developer brought the site forward that there would be double the development proposed.

Monkton C.E. Primary School Concerns about the future operation of the Walking Bus should the development get approval. If the build goes ahead and the sight lines for the volunteers operating the Walking Bus are not acceptable to KCC Assessors, the bus will be disbanded and as far as the objector is aware there is no appeal process.

Monkton Residents Association Concern raised are:

- Highway safety issues- knock on impact of walking bus due to limited sight lines. The children would have to cross the road to use the proposed footpath. Monkton Street is a well-used road, which is narrow and vehicles park upon it. Additional development will put pressure on the road.
- On site drainage issues
- Effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the area - loss of the village gap, there is no economic benefit of the development
- Intrusion into the countryside- together with impact upon listed buildings and wildlife.

Monkton Parish Council: Object to the development on the following grounds:

"1. The site is identified in TDC planning policy as a "Village Gap" which is important in defining the linear village character & retaining open views. As such the site is afforded 'protection' against development.

2. This also affords protection against development. It is understood intrusion development into open countryside, on Village Gaps and outside Village Confines are all subject to saved policies under the Local Plan.

3. Planning policy indicates that consent for development on this site will only be given where there is a demonstrable and justified need for development. Monkton PC (MPC) is of the opinion a need has neither been justified or demonstrated in this case.

4. The responses from the Environment Agency & Southern Water both express serious concerns about drainage & surface water proposals on this site.

Both Agencies highlight many complex problems related to the site -both in terms of environmental sensitivity, and the difficulty in future regulation of what would have to be a site specific drainage system, managed "in perpetuity" by the site owners. It would appear neither Agency is really supportive of development.

5. There is a history of declined (including refusal on appeal) and withdrawn applications relating to this site. In all cases, the status of the site - i.e. that it is a Village Gap, and development would be outside the village confines, this has been key to refusal in previous applications.

6. The applicant is reliant, in the Planning Statement, on the fact that TDC does not have a 5 year housing land supply. It is noted, under the proposed Local Plan, sufficient sites have been identified to cater for local housing need up to 2031 (but not including this site although it was submitted for inclusion). The Local Plan does include 2 large sites in Monkton. NB other minor sites have also recently been approved for development in Monkton, though not as part of the Local Plan. Arguably, therefore, Monkton has contributed proportionately and sufficiently to housing land supply.

Based on the above, MPC draw the conclusion that this application is speculative in nature, and not based on a reasoned and identified housing need.

8. It is noted KCC Highways have given consent to the proposals.

Monkton Parish Council are concerned that sufficient concern may not have been given to the inevitable on street parking that will occur where minimum guidelines are applied. (The recent Monocstone Mews development is a clear example of the negative effects of on street parking resulting from insufficient parking facilities in a new development). On street parking (which already exists from adjacent cottages) will compromise site lines. Monkton School have also expressed concerns over the potential loss of their 'walking bus' which could occur if road safety is compromised in front of this site. The school have made an extensive representation regarding the negative impact of the development on the school, independently.

9. This development, in combination with other development schemes, will create additional strain on infrastructure & services, including Minster Surgery.

TPO's on trees bordering the west side of the site have not been identified on the plans, and appropriate provisions put in place.

The case that the development brings economic and social benefit to the village is questionable. Monkton has very few facilities anyway, most of which would not benefit from this application.

Consideration should be given with regard to the wildlife that inhabits the location and the loss of valuable habitat for a number of species, including bats, adders, rabbits, newts to name but a few.

There would be a severe impact on the neighbouring properties both in terms of loss of 'protected outlook' and noise intrusion.

Inevitably there will be a visual and heritage impact on neighbouring listed buildings.

Consideration should also be given regarding the enforcement of construction vehicle provisions should the development be granted permission.

MPC called a public meeting to discuss this application. At this meeting, 53 villagers attended, of which 51 voted against development on the basis that the impact of this development vastly outweighs its benefit. MPC therefore ask that this application is refused on the grounds outlined as above."

CONSULTATIONS

TDC Conservation Officer: *Final comments following receipt of revised plans:* In my view, although there would still be some degree of harm in terms of the revised plans, whereby the siting of the building on Plots 01 and 02 have been set further back from the road, it would reduce the impact of the development on the setting of the listed buildings Field Cottages and Vicarage House.

Initial Comments: There are several grade II listed buildings in close proximity to the proposed development site including Field House and No. 148 and Field Cottages located on south side of Monkton Street. Field House is located almost adjacent to the east boundary of the site. Parsonage House, Lantern Cottage and No. 153 and The Vicarage House located on the opposite side of Monkton Road to the site. The Vicarage House is directly opposite and overlooking the site.

Although the proposal site itself is not covered by any special designation, the open, undeveloped nature of the site, together with its location within the village precinct means that it contributes to the rural character of the area. Its discernible open countryside aspect offers visual relief and a sense of openness and rurality. In this respect the open vista contributes to the visual amenity and character of the area, including the setting of the listed buildings mostly The Vicarage House. The site is also one of a few such remaining

undeveloped gaps within the village core that separate the linear development from areas of built development along Monkton Street on the south.

Given the nature of the site, it is inevitable that development on the site would result in a change to the character of the area and in some way affecting the setting of the heritage assets. The proposed development would constitute a very high magnitude of change to the character of the site. Its landscape would change from that of an undeveloped field to a built development. Irrespective of the potential to introduce new landscape features in association with the proposed development, the open and undeveloped rural landscape experienced within the site's setting would be lost permanently.

I therefore consider that the proposed development would in particular harm the setting of the Vicarage House. The undeveloped and strongly rural character attributes of the site can be appreciated within the site's immediate setting, in particular the viewpoint into and beyond the site from the Vicarage House. The open and rural nature of the site enables the setting of the Vicarage House to be experienced through the open countryside and contributes to the asset's immediate historic setting and its architectural significance. The proposed development would be highly visible from the Vicarage House and along Monkton Street at this point and would also significantly change the view of this part of the village, by reducing the openness provided by the gap into the countryside.

The amount of built development that is proposed would also materially reduce the site's contribution to the setting of the Vicarage House. Given the importance of the view concerned, and noting that the open and rural nature of the site would be permanently affected, I consider that the significance of the heritage asset would be harmed. In my view, the harm would be 'less than substantial harm' in the terms of the Framework.

The new development would also affect the setting of Field Cottages and Field House. From the information available historically the proposal site was an orchard related to Field House and could be viewed in the context of an informal rural landscape which in turn reflected the agricultural past of the building. I also have concerns with the siting of the building at Plots 01 and 02 in relation to Field Cottages. Due to the siting of this building close to the road, it would appear too prominent within the street scene and visually compete with the listed building. Bringing all of the above together, I find that the contribution the site currently makes to the setting of Field House would be diminished to some degree. Nevertheless, views would be filtered by the vegetation between Field Cottages and the site boundary of the proposed development. In my view, the harm would lie towards the high end of 'less than substantial harm' in the terms of the Framework.

With regard to the setting of The Parsonage, Lantern Cottage and No. 153, I consider that the effect of the proposed development would be peripheral. Given the orientation and location of these buildings they have limited visual links to the site. Whilst there are views from the site to The Parsonage I don't consider this being of concern.

TDC Waste and Recycling: No objection provided that the proposed bin collection point is large enough to house all the bins - and residents understand that we will not be collecting from the doorsteps.

Kent County Council Highways and Transportation: "I have no objection in respect of highway matters. Adequate visibility is achievable from the proposed site accesses. Whilst I would prefer to see a footway connection to the existing footway network near the junction of Monkton Street with Seamark Close, this does not appear to be achievable. The amount of additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic likely to be generated by the proposals is not significant. The section of Monkton Street having no footway between the site and the existing footway network near Seamark Close is relatively short, within a low speed environment, and has no recorded personal injury crashes in the 5 years to the end of September 2017. The proposals include a 1.8 metre-wide footway for a length of approximately 90 metres along the site frontage, providing an improved pedestrian route for both residents of the development and existing pedestrians.

Adequate parking facilities are proposed within the site. The routing of the private pathways to plots 1 and 2, and the use of boundary treatments to prevent direct access to the highway for these plots means that unacceptable on-street parking is unlikely to occur, although I suggest some form of fencing will need to be in place until the hedging is established.

The proposals are unlikely to have a severe impact that would warrant a recommendation for refusal on highway grounds, subject to conditions relating to a Construction Management Plan, measures to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the highway, provision and retention of vehicle parking spaces, turning areas and cycle parking, bound surface for the first 5 metres, completion of footway improvements, visibility splays and fencing along the frontage of plots 1 and 2 until the proposed boundary hedge is established."

Kent County Council Ecological Advice Service: "We are satisfied with the conclusions of the ecological report which state that none of the trees and buildings present on site offered potential for roosting bats and thus no further survey work is recommended with regard to bats.

However, and as discussed within the report, lighting can be detrimental to roosting, foraging and commuting bats. We advise that the Bat Conservation Trust's Bats and Lighting in the UK guidance is adhered to in the lighting design for the works undertaken and the new dwellings built. A condition is suggested relating to a lighting strategy.

The site consists of a managed short sward horse paddock and therefore there is currently limited potential for reptiles to be present. However, to avoid suitable reptile habitat to establish on site until construction, we advise that a precautionary approach is implemented until works commencing. Measures, including the grass area and paddock to be kept short and managed through grazing management until construction works commence, should be secured as a condition of planning permission if granted.

An informative is requested in relation to breeding and nesting birds if permission is granted.

There is some potential for hedgehogs to be present on site. Therefore, any areas where mammals could be sheltering should be hand searched prior to disturbance. Excavations should not be left open for animals to fall into, or planks of wood should be placed to enable any animals which may fall into such a hole to escape.

We advise that all hedgerows and trees to be retained within the proposed development shall be protected during construction in line with standard arboriculture best practice (BS5837:2012) and in line with the submitted tree report.

We recommend incorporating the protection of the retained habitats in to the Construction Management Plan and to secure this as a condition of planning permission if granted.

The development includes proposals for new dwellings within 4.3km of the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA, Ramsar and Thanet Coast SSSI. Thanet DC will need to ensure that the proposals fully adhere to the agreed approach within the North Kent Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy (SAMM) to mitigate for additional recreational impacts on the designated sites and to ensure that adequate means are in place to secure the mitigation before first occupation.

However, a recent decision from the Court of Justice of the European Union means that an Appropriate Assessment is required to be carried out by Thanet DC. The ruling has detailed that mitigation measures cannot be taken into account when carrying out a screening assessment to decide whether a full 'appropriate assessment' is needed under the Habitats Directive.

Therefore, we advise that there is a need for an appropriate assessment to be carried out as part of this application.

The application provides opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as native species planting or the installation of bat/bird nest boxes. This is in accordance with Paragraph 175 of the NPPF "opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged".

Ecological enhancements recommendations have been made within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and we advise that we are very supportive of the proposed numbers of bat and bird boxes/tubes to be integrated within the proposed development, as well as the green spaces/pond area within the Landscape Proposals."

Kent County Council Archaeology: The site lies in an archaeologically sensitive area overlooking the former Wantsum Sea Channel which has been a focus for settlement and activities from early times. The fields north of the village are known to be rich in buried archaeological landscapes as seen from aerial photographs while finds of Iron Age and Saxon date have been made to the south west of the present site. A condition is recommended in relation to a programme of archaeological works to be attached should permission be granted.

Kent County Council Flood and Water Management: The principles proposed for dealing with surface water will not increase the risk of flooding.

Conditions are recommended relating sustainable surface water drainage, operation and maintenance manual for the proposed sustainable drainage scheme, verification report relating to surface water drainage system and where infiltration can be used.

Environment Agency: No objection. The previous use of the proposed development site as stables could present a medium/low risk of contamination that could be mobilised by surface water infiltration from any proposed sustainable drainage system (SuDS) leading to pollution of controlled waters. Controlled waters are particularly sensitive in this location because the proposed development site is within Source Protection Zone 3, is located upon Principal aquifer, and has shallow surface drainage adjacent.

In light of the above, we believe that the use of infiltration SuDS may not be appropriate in this location. We therefore request a condition is included in any permission granted. Without these conditions we would object to the proposal in line with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework because it cannot be guaranteed that the development will not be put at unacceptable risk from, or be adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution.

River Stour Internal Drainage Board: Please also note that adjacent watercourse, located in the south-western corner of the site, is believed to be spring fed and has contributed to drainage and flooding problems in this area in recent years. I am therefore pleased to note that the applicant does not propose to discharge surface water into this watercourse, but proposes to dispose of it by infiltration. Details of the proposed SuDS and its future maintenance should be designed and implemented in agreement with KCC's SuDS team to ensure that existing levels of local flood risk are not exacerbated.

Southern Water: The exact position of the public sewers must be determined on site by the applicant before the layout of the proposed development is finalised.

No development or new tree planting should be located within 3 metres either side of the external edge of the public sewer and all existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction works.

No new soakaways should be located within 5 metres of a public sewer.

A formal application for a connection to the public sewer will be required.

An informative is recommendation about connection to the public sewerage system.

COMMENTS

The application has been brought before members as a departure to Saved Policies H1 and R2 of the Thanet Local Plan as the site is located within the open countryside, inside a village gap.

Principle

In line with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2014, planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the 'development plan' unless material

considerations indicate otherwise. The requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are a significant material consideration in this regard.

The 'development plan' for Thanet is the 2006 'adopted' Local Plan. Paragraph 213 of the NPPF allows local planning authorities to give due weight to adopted albeit outdated policies according to their degree of consistency with the policies in the NPPF. Paragraph 48 of the NPPF also allows weight to be given to policies in emerging plans according to their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies and the degree of consistency with national policy.

The site constitutes non-previously developed land, which is currently in use as a land for keeping horses and which lies outside any defined settlement. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to the aims of Saved 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. However this policy no longer accords with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, as the Council no longer has a 5 year supply for housing, and as such this policy has little weight at this time. Saved Policy R1 of the Thanet Local Plan also limits development at rural settlements to minor development within the confines and under Saved Policy R2 of the Thanet Local Plan the site is considered to be an important gap in the built area of the village which contributes to the character and amenity of the village and as such will not be considered suitable for development.

Saved Policy CC1 of the Thanet Local Plan states that new development will not be permitted unless there is a need for the development that overrides the need to protect the countryside. The site is also covered by the Former Wantsum North Shore Character Area under Saved Thanet Local Plan Policy CC2.

There is a current need for housing within Thanet, which is being reviewed through the Local Plan process. The emerging Local Plan, recently submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, cannot be afforded much weight in terms of housing land supply due to the stage in the process.

On this basis the NPPF states in Paragraph 11 states that where there are no relevant development plan policies, of the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date granting permission unless:

- i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
- ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the [policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

In determining whether housing on the site would be acceptable, the need for housing in the district will therefore need to be balanced against other issues such as the impact on the countryside, sustainability of the site, character and appearance of the proposed development and highway safety.

The proposal provides nine houses, the proposal would have a modest economic benefit and would result in an additional nine families residing in a small village, supporting the local community facility and vibrancy of the village community.

The development of this site for housing could, therefore, be acceptable subject to the detailed consideration of all material considerations including the impact upon the countryside, and character and appearance of the area, the impact on the living conditions of neighbouring property occupiers and highway safety.

Impact on Countryside

The site falls outside of the village confines and within a Landscape Character Area. Saved Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Thanet Local Plan look to protect the open landscape, and the wide, long views of the Former Wantsum Channel Area and Pegwell Bay.

The site lies outside of the urban confines, within the Former Wantsum North Shore Landscape Character Area and is identified within the Thanet Local Plan as an important gap in the built area of Monkton village which contributes to the character and amenity of the village and as a result is not considered suitable for development.

Paragraphs 78 and 79 of the NPPF promotes sustainable development in rural areas stating that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and new isolated homes within the countryside should be avoided. The site is bounded by residential properties to either side and as such the proposed development would not result in isolated dwellings within the countryside but would be seen in the context of residential development. The proposed housing development would be well located within the village and the infant school and recreation ground (community facility) would be accessible by foot.

NPPF paragraph 170 stipulates that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.

The site does not contain any protected trees. The applicant has submitted a full Tree Survey which identifies that two (T1- hawthorn and T3- cherry) will be removed, these however will be replaced. T1 is identified as high quality and value and the cherry as low quality and value. It would of course be desirable if these trees were to be retained but as the trees are not protected this is not considered essential. The report also contains a Tree Protection Plan which identifies the location ground and root protection areas this also identifies the protection measures for trees along the boundary in the neighbouring site, No.164 covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TH/TPO/(1999)).

The application site is private land in use for the keeping of horses, and therefore given that it does not provide any active recreational opportunities, development of the space is permitted by Saved Policy SR11 of the Thanet Local Plan unless the site has intrinsically beneficial qualities and makes a contribution to the character of the area either by itself or by virtue of the longer distance views it affords. Paragraph 170b) of the NPPF protects and

recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supports thriving communities within it.

The site is identified within the Local Plan as a village gap (saved policy R1). The pre-ambles to the policy describes these sites as road frontage sites which provide outlook into open countryside or onto other open spaces, or form an important break in the built environment of those villages. The site is open to the rear presently and as such long views within the Landscape Character Area are appreciated from within the site. The application proposes native hedge planting along this rear boundary, to provide a soft rural edge to the development.

The layout of the dwellings is formed around a central open space, from Monkton Road it is considered that this space would be perceived as a gap between built development. It is appreciated that it would not extend the full depth of the site, which would allow full interrupted views into open countryside. The proposed two storey development, however, is separated by both visual spaces and single storey development in the form of gardens and garaging to offer more relief. The central area of the site has been kept devoid of built development through the proposed layout, although it is appreciated that built development has been set further back into the site along the rear perimeter. From the public highway the 'gap' would still be appreciated albeit to a lesser degree and would still provide an important break in the built environment, although it is appreciated that there would be some degree of loss of outlook to the wider countryside.

The application site comprises relatively flat land, with existing development to the east and west boundaries, the locality is therefore already partly residential in character. Quite clearly, the proposed development would see a permanent change of land use (and therefore character) to residential use, and would inevitably result in a permanent effect upon the landscape, but views of the development would be localised. In terms of the environmental impacts of the scheme, the proposal seeks to retain a green space within the development and retain trees with the exception of two; additional planting is also proposed within the site and to the perimeter. Due to the location of the site, which is bound to both sides by existing residential development, the proposal would appear as a logical in-fill rather than extending into open countryside. It is considered; on balance the site would retain the sense of openness as a 'gap' in built development from public vantage points. The proposed additional landscaping would reduce the visual impact of the proposed development.

Based on the views of the site from the north, the layout, density and scale of development proposed, it is considered that there would be minimal environmental harm from the development of part of the village gap with loss of the full views to the countryside that the site currently affords, including the Landscape Character Area.

Character and Appearance

Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Development in Monkton Street is predominantly linear in form, although there are small enclaves of development that extends back in depth into the plot, including Vicarage Garden (opposite the site), Monkton Manor and Parsonage Fields, although the latter is on a more comprehensive scale. The layout would therefore not be dissimilar to other development in the immediate locality.

The density of the scheme equates to 15 dwellings per hectare, which is relatively low, however given the sensitive nature of the site, being a village gap and its proximity to listed buildings this is considered to be appropriate.

There is no discernible building form or architectural theme along Monkton Street with a mix of ages, scale styles of property creating an interesting and diverse street scene.

Scale of development & materials proposed

Plot 9 (at the western end of the site and fronting Monkton Street) presents its side elevation to the road. The side elevation contains two windows; one at ground and one at first floor level rather than having a blank gable end to the road. The elevation also utilises different materials to add interest. Whilst it normally it would be preferable for the front elevation to front the road, however, there are other examples in the street - corner of Monkton Street and Seamark Close. Therefore the development will not appear out of character in the locality.

Overall It is considered that the scheme would respond positively to local character, provide dwellings which exhibit individual architectural quality and house-types with well-defined public and private spaces. The public realm proposed in the development through additional planting and distinctive features - water feature would also assist in creating a sense of place, and provide space that is overlooked and active, promoting natural surveillance and inclusive access, as well as including parking facilities that are well integrated as part of the overall design. In totality it is considered that the scale, layout, density, height and massing of buildings and overall elevation design would harmonise with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Impact on listed buildings

Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possess.

The Framework defines Listed Buildings as a designated heritage asset and defines the setting of a heritage asset as 'the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve.

Paragraph 193 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight

should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance and any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

Paragraph 196 advises that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

The NPPG also advises that a thorough assessment of the impact on the setting needs to take into account, and be proportionate to, the significance of the heritage asset under consideration and the degree to which the proposed changes enhance or detract from that significance and the ability to appreciate it. Whilst setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations it can include other factors such as the historic relationship between places.

Near to the site is Grade II listed buildings Nos. 163 (Vicarage House), 155, 153a, 153, 148 and 150 (Field Cottages) and 146 (Field House) Monkton Street. In terms of impact to the listed buildings the accompanying Heritage Report notes that this section of Monkton has been excluded from the Conservation Area which they consider is due to the modern mix of development. They also consider that the setting of The Vicarage has already been compromised by the development of Vicarage Gardens. In terms of the submitted scheme the report contends:

"The creation of an open space with soft landscape and pond retains the rural feel and the openness that the site currently offers and is considered to improve the current outlook from The Vicarage. This is further enhanced by the use of hedges as boundary treatment and to break up any perceived mass of building elevations."

It is recognised this identified village gap contributes to the general character of this part of the village together with the setting of the listed building particularly Vicarage House. Vicarage House is a striking two storey dwelling with attic constructed in brown brick with a plain tile roof opposite the site.

The setting of a heritage asset is not a fixed concept; it is concerned with the way the heritage asset is experienced. Vicarage House is viewed with the contact of residential development with pockets of open space along Monkton Street. At the western side of the application site and in a setback position there are utilitarian buildings. It is therefore considered that the setting of the listed building would be semi-rural.

The proposal would introduce built form opposite Vicarage House and the Conservation Officer has commented that the proposal would harm the setting of the property given the current relationship with the openness on the application site and the listed building. The scheme creates an area of open space through the front and mid-section of the site between plots 2 and 9. Given an open space at the front of the site would be maintained albeit at a lesser scale, it is considered that the harm would be 'less than substantial harm' in terms of the NPPF. The cumulative effect of the works would be that the listed building would remain

a dominant feature of the street scene. It is considered the area to the front would retain a significant level of openness and would preserve the semi-rural setting of the listed building, thereby resulting in minimal harm to the setting of no. 163.

In terms of Field Cottages (no. 148 & 150) and Field House (no.146) Monkton Street these properties are located to the eastern side of the application site, separated by a field access and garden land. The Conservation Officer initially considered that plots 1 and 2 would appear prominent within the street scene and compete with the listed buildings. These listed dwellings front the road with only a small strip of land approximately 1m before the highway. Due to these concerns raised the applicant agreed to move plots 1 and 2 two metres back into the application site, providing a greater area of soft landscaping. This changes means that angled views of the proposed development would be limited when travelling particularly from east to west, and that the listed buildings would still give a strong presence to the street scene. Whilst I accept the setting to this group of listed buildings would be changed I consider the separation distance to the side as well as vegetation and the set-back position of the dwellings would result in harm that is 'less than substantial harm'.

The Conservation Officer has fully considered the amended scheme and has confirmed that the harm is less than substantial. The applicant has submitted at section/streetscene showing the listed buildings (Field Cottages and Field House) and proposed plots 1 and 2, which adjoin these listed building and front Monkton Street. Field Cottages whilst containing two floors of accommodation are modest in their scale and height and these dwellings are attached to Field Cottage which is a full two storey dwelling. The submitted street scene identify the proposed dwellings will be of a lesser height than Field House. Furthermore rather than directly abutting Field Cottages there is visual gap; provided by the garden area of 150 Field Cottages and an access track, retaining a separation gap. This gap combined with the amendments to the siting of the dwellings at plots 1 and 2 means that the dwellings will not dominate the listed buildings, as the public views where both new and existing buildings are seen together will be minimised.

Therefore whilst the proposed development will affect the setting of the designated heritage assets, the layout, height and siting of the dwellings proposed would minimise the harm caused and not dominate the listed buildings. Having special regard to Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 a balancing exercise needs to be carried out against the harm identified against the public benefits (as required by NPPF para 196). This will be considered in the conclusion of the report.

With regard to archaeology it is recommended that a condition is attached relating to a programme of archaeological works.

Living Conditions

Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.

The distances between the new dwellings fronting Monkton Road and those boundaries behind are approximately 11m. There would be no overbearing or overshadowing issues experienced by virtue of the ability to achieve a separation distance

With regard to adjoining existing development, I do not consider that harm will occur to dwellings to the east of the application site from plot 1 as the proposal is separated by a field access and garden in terms of overbearing or overshadowing (the distance is a minimum of 15.6 metres. A first floor window is proposed to a bedroom to plot 1. It is recommended that this is fitted with obscure glazing to safeguard residential amenity.

Plot 3 has first floor windows/French doors with the east (rear) elevation. These openings serve bedroom 1 and bedroom 2, there is a distance of approximately 10 metres to the plots boundary to the access track and approximately 14 metres to the boundary with 150 Field Cottage. These bedroom windows would look onto the very rear section of 150 Field Cottage. It is therefore considered that this relationship is acceptable.

No. 164 Monkton Street is located approximately 14m from the application site boundary. This property has a first floor window within the side elevation and the proposed dwelling is approximately a distance of 10 metres to the boundary of the development site (a total separation of approximately 24 metres). Given the distance I do not consider material harm will occur to the outlook of occupiers of that property nor in terms of any sense of enclosure or loss of light occurring from the proposed development. In terms of overlooking plot 8 and 9 would overlook into the front garden area; given that it is the front garden which is not private; this is considered to be an acceptable relationship. Plot 7 faces the side elevation of no. 164 but also has views into their rear garden, as previously mentioned there is a 10 metre distance between the rear of plot 7 and the site boundary. In addition there is an existing tree (within the curtilage of no. 164 and hedge planting which would limit views, particularly during the summer months. The first rear French doors/window serving bedroom 4 has the potential for views out across no. 164. Given the existing vegetation coverage along this boundary and the distance of separation it is considered that harm would not result.

The proposed dwellings should provide a high standard of accommodation to meet the expectations of future occupiers, including the provision of safe doorstep play space, and good sized rooms with outlook and ventilation which are fit for purpose.

Officers consider that the layout and dwellings has been designed in a manner which achieves an appropriate relationship with the existing dwellings whilst being sympathetic to the character of the surrounding area and the wider landscape. All in all it is considered that the living conditions of existing and future residents would be protected from any materially detrimental impacts.

Transportation

Where concerning the promotion of sustainable transport, the NPPF in para. 103 states that the Government recognises that different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas.

Paragraph 102 of the NPPF requires Councils, when making decision should ensure:

- a) Appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be - or have been - taken up, given the type of development and its location;
- b) Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and
- c) Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion) or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

It is acknowledged that some local residents have objected to the proposal with concerns about the development's impact upon highway safety issues including the Walking Bus. In its capacity Kent County Council as the Local Highways Authority, has considered the proposal and concluded that it would be acceptable from a highways perspective subject to a number of conditions including visibility splays and completion of footpath improvements.

The Council's adopted parking standards state that a maximum of two independently accessible spaces per unit should be provided for four bedroom dwellings. Also 0.2 space per dwelling is required for visitor parking. Parking spaces in front of garages should measure 5.5 metres by 2.5 metres and open sided spaces should measure 5 metres x 2.5 metres. The proposed development has been laid out in a manner that adheres to these standards and pays regard to the need to plan for sustainable access for all.

The transport impacts of the development are not considered to be severe and, from this prospective, refusal of planning permission on such grounds would not be justified. Therefore it is considered that the proposal, during either construction or when developed would not have a detrimental effect upon the highway network or the general accessibility of the surrounding area.

Ecology

One aim of sustainable development should be to conserve and enhance the habitats and species on site. This is reflected in NPPF paragraph 170 which recognises that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things: protecting and enhancing sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan); recognising the wider benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland; and minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.

By way of mitigation the submitted report recommends any trenches be covered over with wooden sheeting at night and fencing off the demolition and construction zone and associated compounds would be advisable during the construction/demolition phase, the grass paddock is maintained and grazed up until the point of construction, low level lighting scheme, if works to buildings/vegetation are proposed during the bird breeding season (March-September) a check should be made for nests prior to works commencing, if nests are present, they should be left intact and undisturbed until the young fledge, bird boxes

installed, habitat box on tree and boundaries remain relatively open, such that wildlife can continue to radiate in the area.

A number of reasonable and necessary conditions are recommended to ensure that any ecological harm from the development is mitigated.

Therefore in conclusion on this issue, it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to significant adverse effects upon ecology and nature conservation subject to mitigation measures proposed which can be secured by condition.

Trees

No. 164 Monkton Street, to the east of the site has two trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TH/TPO/10(1999), with the trees closely located to the application site boundary. It is confirmed that the proposed dwellings are outside the root protection area of these trees with rear and side walls of the dwellings approximately a minimum of 2 metres away. The proposed dwellings are therefore located a sufficient distance away not to result in undue pressure for their removal.

Archaeology

Paragraph 184 of the NPPF states that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations. In determining planning applications, NPPF paragraph 189 states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. Furthermore, para 192 of the NPPF states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness

Although the site is not identified as an area of Archaeological importance, Thanet District as a whole is rich in archaeological potential. As the site comprises mainly non previously developed land, it is considered appropriate, to condition that the development is subject to an archaeological watching brief. Subject to this safeguarding condition the impact upon archaeology is considered to be acceptable.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Part 14 of the NPPF sets out the Government's stance on climate change, flooding and coastal changes, recognising that planning plays a key role in, amongst other things,

providing resilience to the impacts of climate change. Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided.

The site is currently undeveloped with only low level buildings in situ and is located in Flood Zone 1; it is therefore at low risk from tidal/fluviat flooding.

Southern Water does not raise any concerns regarding the proposal. The Environment Agency also do not raise an objection to the proposal but seek a number of safeguarding conditions to protect the Source Protection Zone 3, Principal aquifer and shall surface drainage adjacent.

Other matters

Third party representations have been received in relation to the walking bus for residents and also the village primary school. It is confirmed that KCC Highways and Transportation has approved the visibility splays with the knowledge of the schools proximity to the site. It is also recognised that at present that the area to the front of the site does not have a footpath, as part of the scheme a footpath is proposed along the site frontage, which will bring benefits to pedestrians within the village. Therefore it is considered that there is no conflict with the walking bus and that the proposal would result in benefits to pedestrian safety from the new footpath.

Conclusion

This is an application for full planning permission for 9 dwellings on Monkton Street.

NPPF paragraph 10 stipulates that at its heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking (NPPF para 11) this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; but where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless; any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

It has been acknowledged that the site is currently situated outside a defined settlement boundary, and therefore for all intents and purposes rural policies of restraint apply. The site, however in officers opinion represents a logical in-fill development within the village, despite being allocated as a village gap that would not compromise the established form and character of the locality.

In terms of the economic dimension of sustainable development, the provision of 9 dwellings would give rise to employment during the construction phase of the development, and is likely to result in an increase in the use of local services and facilities, both of which will be of benefit, albeit modest, to the local economy.

In terms of the social dimension to sustainable development, Paragraph 59 of the NPPF 2018 refers to 'the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes'. The NPPF points out that 'small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution

to meeting the housing requirement of an area , and are often built-out relatively quickly' and that 'development in one village may support services in a village nearby'

The scheme brings forward modest benefits with 9 additional market dwellings, a small contribution to market housing in the area, it is likely to support shops and services in Monkton and further afield and it would allow increased social interaction between residents existing and new, and employment personnel albeit in a modest way. The scheme is considered to be well designed and safe as sought by paragraph 8.b) of the NPPF.

In terms of the environmental dimension of sustainable development, the environmental issues are assessed in earlier sections of this report but to summarise, the proposal would result in some harm to the setting of adjacent listed buildings and would result in a loss of outlook to the countryside and a reduction in the size of the village gap, however, these harms are minimised by the gaps between the proposal and the listed buildings, the scale and layout of the development.

The development of nine dwellings, in a sustainable location is considered to satisfy economic and social objectives as required by the NPPF, with harm to the environmental objectives alleviated through the design and layout of the scheme. Therefore the adverse effects of the proposed development on this site in the countryside and the harm to the significance of designated heritage assets are not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the public benefits from the development.

In addition, officers are content that subject to the imposition of reasonable planning conditions that the development of this site is acceptable and in keeping with both the site's location on the village gap site. The development would take into account any ecology and the retention of most existing planting and new landscaping would add to the biodiversity in the area. Furthermore, the proposal would ensure that the living conditions of existing and future residents would be protected from any materially detrimental impacts whilst providing much needed housing. Therefore the application is recommended for approval.

Case Officer

Gill Richardson

TITLE: F/TH/18/0897

Project Land Adjacent To 150 Monkton Street Monkton Ramsgate Kent CT12 4JJ

