

A06

F/TH/17/0746

PROPOSAL: Erection of 2no. detached dwellings, with associated off-street parking.

LOCATION: Land Adjacent 35 Victoria Parade RAMSGATE Kent

WARD: Sir Moses Montefiore

AGENT: Mr Daniel Bragg

APPLICANT: Mr Graham Kinnear

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 development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with amended drawings numbered 16/1702/PL/10, 16/1702/PL/11, 16/1702/PL/12, 16/1702/PL/13, 16/1702/PL/14 and 16/1702/PL/15 received 18 January 2019.

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 samples.

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

- species, size and location of new trees, shrubs, hedges and grassed areas to be planted.
- the treatment proposed for all hard surfaced areas beyond the limits of the highway.

- walls, fences, other means of enclosure proposed.
- ecological enhancement measures as identified within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated 21st July 2017.

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 and safeguard protected species, in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Thanet Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 Prior to the first occupation of the dwellings hereby approved, the areas shown for the parking of vehicles shall be operational. The areas approved shall thereafter be maintained for that purpose.

GROUND:

In the interests of highway safety.

7 The vehicular hardstanding within 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.

8 Prior to the first use of the vehicular hardstandings for each dwelling hereby approved visibility splays of 2 metres by 2 metres behind the footway on both sides of the vehicular access access with no obstructions over 0.6m above footway level shall be provided and thereafter maintained.

GROUND;

In the interest of highway safety.

9 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

It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure, prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, 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 by the Highway Authority. 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 Highway and Transportation to progress this aspect of the works prior to commencement on site

The applicant is advised that separate prior approval is required from Kent Highway Services for the new vehicle crossing/removal of the existing vehicle crossing/works within the highway and in this regard they should contact KHS on 08458 247800

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

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 a vacant parcel of land located between Nos 35 and 37 fronting Victoria Parade. The site has been vacant and overgrown with vegetation for a considerable number of years and has recently been tidied up in order to reveal the extent of the site. The site is located within the urban confines of Ramsgate in a wholly residential area. Properties along this section of Victoria Parade, between the Winterstoke Crescent junctions, are substantial sized dwellings with a variety of architectural styles and are set in fairly generous plots. The properties are set back from the highway with low level boundary walls to the front boundary.

The boundary for the Ramsgate Conservation Area runs along the centre of Victoria Parade and extends across the public open space known as Winterstoke Gardens and the East Cliff Chine to the south east. The site is therefore adjacent to but not inside the conservation area.

PLANNING HISTORY

The site has never been developed and there is no planning history.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposed development is for the erection of two detached dwellings and includes off-street parking for several vehicles to the front of the property. Dwelling 36a would be 2½ storeys and 36b two storeys, both providing 4 bedrooms. A 1 metre high boundary wall is shown to the front boundary and the rear gardens, which extend a depth of 22-27m, are shown enclosed by a 1.8 metre high boundary fence.

Amended plans have been received during the application process showing the scale and footprint of the proposed dwellings reduced, increasing the spacing between the proposed dwellings and neighbouring properties.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Thanet Local Plan 2006 (Saved Policies)

D1 - Design Principles

D2 - Landscaping

H1 - Residential Development Sites

H4 - Windfall Sites

SR5 - Play Space

SR11 - Private Open Space

TR12 - Cycle provision

TR16 - Car parking provision

NOTIFICATIONS

The application was initially consulted upon in June 2017. Eight representations have been received in response, commenting on the originally submitted plans:

* The development is out of character with the neighbouring buildings in Victoria Parade - these buildings are all large and have a wide frontage onto Victoria Parade. The frontage for these two buildings would be much narrower.

* A single dwelling would be more in keeping with surrounding properties.

* There is an established family of foxes living in the land that will lose their habitat.

- * No height is given for the boundary at the back of the land - this should be no higher than the existing boundary, approximately 1.8 metres.
- * A number of properties on both sides of Winterstoke Crescent will have views spoilt if the heights involved with the development are not kept within strict bounds.
- * Loss of view
- * The area is entirely made up of single plot and single large dwellings - it is totally out of character to split plots into two.
- * Arthur Sebag Montefiore and Charles Fredrick Grummant introduced restrictive covenants in 1935 to protect and maintain the area's natural beauty and stature and plots should not be broken or split for overdevelopment.
- * The ridge heights are the same as No.35, whilst neighbouring properties have much lower ridge heights.
- * Loss of light
- * No consideration has been given in the drawings to show how the existing property at the rear fits in the context of this housing development.
- * There are no site levels/datum's given that enable us to accurately check and monitor the levels except a visual line comparing No.35s ridge with the new development. This is critical to understanding the level of intrusion.
- * Over development
- * Poor architecture
- * Should be one house built no higher than the current houses.
- * It's unfair that only 7 Winterstoke Crescent would have 2 buildings in front them when everyone else only has one, the proposed height of the dwelling adding to the unfairness.
- * The vacant plot has been untouched for many decades and may have developed a varied and interesting ecosystem. I am concerned that this has not been considered or assessed.
- * If two buildings are built on the site then this will not be in line with the rest of the buildings along the street.
- * Added increase in traffic, pollution, noise and loss of light if more than one house is built should be taken into account.
- * Fears that this would lead to 4 dwellings on the next plot.
- * The land has been overgrown and left to rack and ruin for the last 40 years.

Re-consultation for amended plans took place in January 2019. Four representations have been received making the following comments:

- * Two four bedroomed houses crammed into a single plot of land is not in keeping with other property in the parade. All other plots have onehouse with significant green space surrounding each plot.
- * This development would have a negative impact on the character of this area.
- * Overcrowding of a single plot.
- * Would not improve the quality or character of the area but would be detrimental to the integrity of the parade and surrounding houses.
- * Significant loss of privacy due to size, number of residents, on a plot with no previous history of any building.
- * Six parking spaces on the property on one plot is out of character with other houses and is environmentally unacceptable.
- * The local plan states the council aim to deliver the right number and mix of housing required ... as well as protecting and improving the quality of thanet's existing builds and

natural environment. Existing builds are single houses on individual plots. There is nothing in the local plan which supports over development of any plots.

* The local plan makes a commitment to safeguarding the character and amenity of residential areas. Reducing open green spaces with overcrowded developments contravenes this commitment.

* There is no evidence of demand for two new 4 bedroomed houses in the area. There are presently two such properties for sale in near by roads which have been on the market for many months with no movement.

* The development is situated in a historic part of Ramsgate with the Sun Shelter and Rock Gardens and Winterstoke Gardens being Grade 2 listed by Historic England and part of the history linked to the East Cliff Estate of Sir Moses Montefiore. The council aims to preserve the history and heritage of the town which cannot be achieved through altering the character of the area.

* What measures will be put in place to ensure the building heights will not exceed those described and outlined in this new proposal?

* The 3D images shows how totally out of character two houses crammed into a one house plot will look against the larger spacious properties either side.

* Concerns that there are no levels marked on the application and the roof levels shown may not be achieved.

* Need levels added to the drawing to show roof levels, window ledge levels etc.

* Can we be assured that the spoil from the ground reduction be removed from site and not disposed of by raising the rear garden ground level.

* Can the fox family be humanly moved and not have their lairs bulldozer into the ground.

Ramsgate Town Council - No objection.

CONSULTATIONS

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

All existing infrastructure, including protective coatings and cathodic protection, should be protected during the course of construction works. No excavation, mounding or tree planting should be carried out within 6 metres of the public water main without consent from Southern Water.

Due to changes in legislation that came in to force on 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.

Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to the public sewer to be made by the applicant or developer.

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.

Kent Biodiversity Officer - (Final Comment) The development will result in the loss of suitable hedgehog and breeding bird habitat. I would encourage them to plant a wide hedgerow at the rear of the site to retain some suitable habitat for these species in addition to the recommendations within the report to incorporate bird boxes and hedgehog homes.

(Initial Comment) If the trees / scrub has taken over it often means that while it has good breeding bird interest, optimal habitat for protected species such as reptiles/GCN are no longer present within the site.

However the aerial photos indicate that the site is surrounded by mature gardens so it is possible that protected species present within the adjacent garden do utilise the habitat (for example reptiles may hibernate within it). In addition the site may be used by priority species such as hedgehogs and as detailed within paragraph 84, Government Circular ODPM 06/2005 which states: "Impacts to species of principal importance "Capable of being a material consideration in the...making of planning decisions."

As the presence of protected/notable species cannot be ruled out we recommend that there is a need for an ecological scoping survey to be carried out.

The results of the ecological scoping survey, any recommended specific species surveys and details of any mitigation must be submitted prior to determination of the planning application.

TDC Conservation Officer - (Final Comments) The application site lies on the west of Victoria Parade. The site fall within the setting of the Ramsgate Conservation Area with its boundary on the east side of the street. As indicated on my previous comments I consider this part of Victoria Parade, (the north side of the street) as a well established residential street characterised by mostly detached properties on generous plots with generous gaps between buildings. Whilst the design of the buildings vary considerably, they are generously proportioned and I consider the siting and layout of these buildings have a sense of spaciousness about them, aided significantly by the consistent and reasonably generous spacing between them.

I accept that the height and size of the proposed buildings have been reduced and would respect that of adjoining properties. However, while I have no objection in principle to the design of the proposed buildings, I find that there are elements of the proposal which would not reflect and respond to some of the distinctive attributes of the area to the detriment of its character and appearance and that of the setting of the CA. The proposed development of two dwellings within the site would reduce the characteristic gaps between the buildings and would have an unduly cramped appearance materially diminishing the spacious character and prevailing pattern of development on this particular part of Harbour Parade. There would therefore be an awkward relationship between the 2 dwellings at this point and in the context of the dwellings in the street. I realise there are a few instances in the locality where the gaps have been closed down, but to my mind this underlines the harm to the character of the area and the street scene.

(Initial Comments) This part of Victoria Parade sits adjacent the Conservation Area. The dwellings along the Parade apart from having individual character they are characterised by

spacious plots and generous gardens and levels of landscaping which softens the built form. There is also a consistency and cohesion in the form, scale, layout and use of materials in buildings in this locality. In this respect the form of and appearance of buildings provide harmony between buildings and landscaping which creates a pleasing built environment and discernible townscape. In my view, the design of the proposed buildings would have little affinity with their surroundings and would detract on the setting of the conservation area.

I am also concerned with the proposed erection of two buildings on the plot. In my view this will result in a cramped over developed appearance of the site and represent a discordant addition to the street in this prominent location.

KCC Archaeological Officer - The site is presently undeveloped and having checked historic maps and photographs I note that the site was previously allotment with surrounding development emerging in the mid-20th century. The HER does not have any records that illustrate archaeology in the immediate vicinity though given the topographical setting would be similar to that of the park to the north where a potential prehistoric ring ditch has been recorded within 200m of the site I would expect the site to retain similar potential. There are also Roman findings to the south.

The development involves the construction of two dwellings on what is rare undeveloped land in this area and could potentially affect archaeology if present. I would recommend that in any forthcoming consent that provision is made for a programme of archaeological works.

COMMENTS

This application is brought before members as a departure to the saved Local Plan Policy H1 as the proposal would represent development on non-previously developed land.

Principle

This proposal would represent development on non-previously developed land which would be contrary to Policy H1 of the Thanet Local Plan; however this needs to be considered having regard to the fact that there is a current need for housing in Thanet and, on this basis, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that applications for housing should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The site is located on an undeveloped parcel of land between dwellings fronting Victoria Parade, the site is close to local shops and within walking distance of bus and rail connections, and is considered to be sustainably located. The principle of developing the site is therefore considered to be acceptable and consistent with the principles of the NPPF, subject to the consideration of other material considerations, such as the impact on the character and appearance of an area, the living conditions of neighbours and impacts on the highway network, being considered acceptable.

Character and Appearance

This part of Victoria Parade is characterised by large detached properties, set back from the highway within fairly large plots. Properties along this section of Victoria Parade, between the Winterstoke Crescent junctions, are substantial sized dwellings with a variety of

architectural styles. The application site has been vacant and overgrown with trees and shrubs for a considerable number of years and would appear to be the last remaining undeveloped plot in the area bounded by Winterstoke Crescent and Victoria Parade. The site has previously had an unruly appearance with its overgrown vegetation but recently this has been cleared by the applicant in order to better reveal the depth and width of the plot.

Thanet Local Plan Policy D1 requires that new development should respect or enhance the character or appearance of the surrounding area and that open spaces, gaps in development and features that contribute to the quality of the local environment should be retained.

The site is considered to be undeveloped private open space and therefore must be assessed under the Local Plan policy for Private Open Space (Policy SR11). There are no other specific policies restricting the use of this land. Policy SR11 states that development will not be permitted on undeveloped private open space or a gap in the settlement pattern, if the site (a) provides active recreation opportunities, the loss of which would put additional pressure on remaining recreational areas; or (b) meets a deficiency in recreational facilities; or (c) has intrinsically beneficial qualities and makes a contribution to the character of the area either in itself or by virtue of the longer distance views it affords; unless adequate provision has previously been made in a suitable location for replacement open space, of at least equal recreational, community and amenity value.

In this instance the site does not provide active recreational opportunities or meet a deficiency in recreational facilities. The site is not visible from longer distance views along Victoria Parade, with views of the site only really possible when directly alongside the site. The site also lies opposite Winterstoke Gardens, which is widely open in character, and which positively contributes to the conservation area, and as such, the loss of the application site as a small area of private open space would not in itself be significantly detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal is for the erection of two dwellings within the site, and consideration needs to be given as to whether two dwellings within this plot would be in keeping with the pattern of surrounding development.. Representations have been received arguing the plot should be for a single dwelling to remain in keeping with adjacent properties and the overall character of the area. It is noted, however, that the width of the vacant plot is the widest in this group of properties with only the corner property, No.41 (Winterstoke lodge), matching its width (measuring approximately 25.7 metres).

Lengthy discussion has taken place with the applicant regarding the size of the plot and the scale and design of the proposed dwellings and the scheme has been reduced in scale since its initial submission. An important consideration regarding the character and appearance of this particular part of Victoria Parade is the size of each property and the spaciousness between them. This spaciousness undoubtedly adds to the overall character of the area. The Conservation Officer refers to the character of the street comprising detached properties on generous plots with generous gaps between buildings and the spaciousness that their siting and layout brings to the street. He raises concerns that two dwellings on the site would reduce the characteristic gaps between the buildings and would have an unduly cramped appearance materially diminishing the spacious character and

prevailing pattern of development and resulting in harm to the character of the area. Whilst he raises no objection in principle to the design of the proposed buildings, he argues there are elements of the proposal which would not reflect and respond to some of the distinctive attributes of the area to the detriment of its character and appearance and that of the setting of the Conservation Area.

A single dwelling, or block of flats with the appearance of one large single dwelling, could be comfortably located within the site but the resulting gaps either side could result in the development appearing at odds with its neighbours, in particular No.35, which has a much smaller plot width of approximately 17.2 metre compared to the 25.7 metres of the application site. The amended scheme by contrast has sought to address the spacing between properties and the footprint of the dwellings, with the street scene elevation showing a 3 metre gap to the boundary with No.35, a similar gap between the new dwellings, a gap of approximately 1 metre to the side boundary with No.38, and a gap of more than 6 metres between the side boundary and the side elevation of no.38. The overall spacing between the dwellings within the street scene, along with the reductions in the scale of the proposed dwellings, is considered to result in a development that does not significantly detract from the character and appearance of the area, whilst enabling the optimum use of the land to be achieved. It is therefore considered that whilst concern has been raised by the Conservation Officer, in officer view the amended plans as submitted reduce the footprint and scale of the development to an acceptable degree so to limit any impact upon the setting of the Conservation Area.

With regards to the height of the dwellings, the ridge heights have been reduced from that initially proposed and the amended scheme shows No.36a with a ridge lower than the ridge of No.35, and No.36b reduced further to transition closer to the ridge height of the slightly lower ridge of No.37. Concerns have been raised that the finished height of the development might transgress from that shown on the drawings, but the 'Site Plan - As Existing' (Drawing No. 16/1702/PL/01 Revision A) clearly identifies the land levels across the site from which the proposed streetscene has been created. There is sufficient information, therefore, to ensure that the level of the proposed development in relation to the land level and the level of neighbouring development is clearly understood, and enforceable should the situation arise.

Concern has been raised through the notification process about about the potential harm to the Grade II Listed structures that are located within the conservation area, in the Winterstoke Gardens to the east (comprising fountain pools, a sunshelter and rock gardens); however, these features are set more than 45 metres from the front elevations of the proposed dwellings, and are visually separated by a wide public highway which during good weather is often heavily parked on both sides of the highway. As such, the impact upon the significance of the listed structures is considered to be acceptable.

The design of the properties, to the front elevation, has taken account of design features of neighbouring dwellings, with No.36a being 2½ storeys, rendered with large sections of glazing, similar to the design of No.35. Whereas, No.36b would be two storeys in height and includes architectural design features of No.37. Overall, it is considered that the proposed new dwellings, in their revised form, would sit comfortably within the site and complete the street frontage.

Precise details of the materials to be used have not been stated other than reference to the use of render and the submission of street scene perspective drawings. Given the prominence of the proposed dwellings and the need to ensure both dwellings relate sympathetically to the neighbouring dwellings it is essential that, if approved, details and samples are provided of all materials and their finishes, including window and door detail and samples of roof tiles to be used. Details of the front boundary wall would also need to be submitted to ensure a satisfactory finish to the front boundary. The 1.8 metre high timber fencing dividing the plots is considered an acceptable form of enclosure and details of this would also need to be submitted to ensure a satisfactory finish to the development.

Given the wide variation in architectural styles of dwellings within the immediate area and consideration of the separation distances to the neighbouring properties and boundaries mentioned above it is considered that the proposed dwellings would not appear out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area, and would not significantly impact upon the setting of the conservation area. It is, therefore, considered that the proposal is compatible with the aims and objectives of Thanet Local Plan Policy D1 and the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Living Conditions

There would be two small windows at ground floor within the side elevation of Dwelling 36a, facing No.35, and these would serve a secondary window to the kitchen and a utility room. At first floor level the two small windows would serve a bathroom and en suite. Dwelling 36b would have no side windows facing No.38 and have a small secondary window serving the kitchen at ground floor, facing the side elevation of Dwelling 36a, with one en suite window at first floor level. The main windows would face towards the front and rear of the dwellings. The front elevation faces the public highway where there is mutual overlooking and the windows within the rear elevation would face into the rear garden. The properties to the rear, in Winterstoke Crescent, are at a higher level than the site and set more than 40 metres away. The upper floors would comprise bedrooms and a bathroom with the main habitable living room being on the ground floor. Given the distances between properties and level difference the window relationship of the proposed dwellings would be unlikely to result in unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers.

Representations have been received regarding loss of light. Given the distances between properties it is considered there would not be an unacceptable loss of light to neighbouring residential occupiers or loss of outlook. Loss of views is not a material planning consideration, but it could be argued that two separate dwellings, as opposed to one larger dwelling, would afford more opportunities of views to be retained between the development.

With regards to the living conditions of future occupiers, the dwellings provide a good standing of living accommodation. All rooms are well laid out with natural light, ventilation and outlook. The dwellings have ample amenity space within the front and rear gardens and the site would be capable of providing ample space for clothes drying and refuse storage.

Local Plan policy SR5 requires new dwellings with two bedrooms or more to provide safe doorstep play space for young children. The rear gardens provided meets the requirements for safe play space.

It is considered that the proposed development complies with Policy D1 and SR5 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Transportation

Kent Highways have not commented specifically on this application as it is classed as non-protocol, but KCC Residential Parking requirements for a 4 bedroomed house is two spaces. A large area of hardstanding has been shown provided to the front of the property that would provide parking for several vehicles with the low level front boundary wall achieving adequate pedestrian visibility splays, allowing for safe access onto the highway. Cycle storage can easily be provided within the site. In addition the site is located fairly close to local shops and within walking distance of public transport connections, and is considered to be sustainably located in highway terms. The proposal therefore accords with the aims of Thanet Local Plan Policies TR12 and TR16.

Biodiversity

Concern has been raised by neighbouring residents over potential harm to biodiversity, including the presence of a family of foxes. The site is undeveloped and Kent County Council's Biodiversity Officer has been consulted regarding the development of the site. The Officer advises that whilst the trees and scrub would offer good breeding bird interest, optimal habitat for protected species such as reptiles/GCN are no longer present within the site. The applicant was advised that the presence of protected/notable species could not be ruled out and recommended the need for an ecological scoping survey to be carried out.

An ecological assessment has been submitted, and reviewed by KCC, who conclude that the development would result in the loss of suitable hedgehog and breeding bird habitat. The applicant has been advised to plant a wide hedgerow to the rear of the site to retain some suitable habitat for these species, in addition to the recommendations contained within the report to incorporate bird boxes and hedgehog homes within the development.

With regards to the presence of foxes, no advice has been given by KCC, as they are not considered as protected species. However, the applicant has been made aware of concerns from residents.

The impact upon biodiversity is therefore considered to be acceptable, and in accordance with the NPPF, subject to safeguarding conditions.

Archaeology

The Kent County Archaeological Officer comments that the site has the potential for undisturbed archaeology and recommends the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written specification and timetable which is to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. It is considered that the

proposed safeguarding condition would be acceptable to address any archaeological concerns.

Other Matters

Representations have been received regarding the presence of a covenant on the area which includes this land. Covenants are a civil matter and are not material planning considerations for this application.

Conclusion

In conclusion it is considered that whilst the proposed development would be on non-previously developed land, it would not have a significant impact upon the character and appearance of the area or the setting of the adjacent conservation area, and no concerns are raised regarding the impact upon neighbouring amenity or highway safety. The proposal therefore accords with Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, and is considered to be an acceptable departure to Policy H1 of the Thanet Local Plan. It is therefore recommended that members approve the application, subject to safeguarding conditions.

Case Officer

Rosemary Bullivant

TITLE:

F/TH/17/0746

Project

Land Adjacent 35 Victoria Parade RAMSGATE Kent

