

**A01**

**R/TH/19/1780**

PROPOSAL: Application for the reserved matters pursuant to outline permission OL/TH/17/0151 'Outline application for the erection of up to 41no. dwellings including access' for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale

LOCATION: Land North Of Cottington Road And East Of Lavender Lane RAMSGATE Kent

WARD: Cliffsend And Pegwell

AGENT: Mr Tracey Kisbee

APPLICANT: Orbit Homes (2020) Ltd

RECOMMENDATION: Approve

Subject to the following conditions:

1 The proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:

Highway plans and details received 18 June 2018, and numbered:

- 1322-82-FAH-00-ZZ-DR-C-0013 rev P7
- 1322-82-FAH-00-ZZ-DR-C-0015 rev P6
- 1322-82-FAH-00-ZZ-DR-C-0115 rev P1
- Construction Management Plan (with Appendix 02 rev 1 Traffic Management Plan and Appendix 03 rev 2 Site Logistics Plan)
- 1322-82-FAH-00-ZZ-DR-C-0001 rev P8

Street lighting plan received 22 July 2020, and numbered:

- 132282-1001 rev C Street Lighting Layout
- 14125 Lighting Design Strategy for Biodiversity

Electric vehicle charging plan received 22 July 2020, and numbered:

- 19-0741-77 P3 Electric Vehicle Charging Plan

Amended site, landscaping and affordable housing plans received 18 June 2020, and numbered:

- 19-0741-71 P3, 19-0741-72 P8, 19-0741-73 P3, 19-0741-74 P2, 19-0741-75 P2, 19-0741-76 P2

Amended elevation and floor plans received 18 June 2020, and numbered:

- 19-0741-150 P1, 19-0741-151 P1, 19-0741-300 P2, 19-0741-301 P2, 19-0741-302 P2, 19-0741-303 P2, 19-0741-304 P2, 19-0741-305 P2, 19-0741-306 P1, 19-0741-307 P1, 19-0741-310 P2, 19-0741-311 P2, 19-0741-312 P2, 19-0741-313 P2, 19-0741-314 P2, 19-0741-315 P2, 19-0741-316 P2, 19-0741-317 P3, 19-0741-318 P2, 19-0741-319 P2, 19-0741-320 P2, 19-0741-321 P2, 19-0741-322 P2, 19-0741-324 P2, 19-0741-325 P2, 19-0741-326 P2, 19-0741-327 P2, 19-0741-328 P2, 19-0741-329 P2, 19-0741-330 P2, 19-0741-331 P2, 19-0741-332, 19-0741-333, 19-0741-335 P3, 19-0741-336 P2, 19-0741-337 P3, 19-0741-338 P2, 19-0741-340 P3, 19-0741-341 P2, 19-0741-342 P2, 19-0741-343 P2, 19-0741-344 P1, 19-0741-345 P1, 19-0741-346 P1, 19-0741-347 P1

Site section plans received 18 June 2020, and numbered:

- 19-0741-90 C Site Sections 1 of 2
- 19-0741-91 C Site Sections 2 of 2
- 1322-82-FAH-00-ZZ-DR-C-0005 rev P5

**GROUND;**

To secure the proper development of the area.

2 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the biodiversity enhancements as identified on plan numbered 19/0741-74 Rev P2 shall be provided, and thereafter maintained.

**GROUND:**

In the interests of biodiversity, in accordance with Policies QD02 and SP30 of the Thanet Local Plan, and the advice as contained within the NPPF.

3 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, a detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping plan shall include:

- the landscaping buffer (min 5m depth) to the southern boundary of the site, which should contain both deciduous and evergreen native trees and hedgerow;
- hedgerows and scattered trees along the northern, eastern and western boundaries of the site,
- a 2m high boundary treatment along the eastern and western boundaries of the site, in locations where a boundary of this height does not currently exist,
- landscaping to be provided within the attenuation ponds to achieve a multi-functional design,
- block paving to all parking spaces and permeable paving to parking courts.

**GROUND:**

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to adequately integrate the development into the environment in accordance with Policies QD02 and GI04 of the Thanet Local Plan

4 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 and to adequately integrate the development into the environment in accordance with Policies QD02 and GI04 of the Thanet Local Plan

5 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 amenity areas shall be managed in accordance with the approved landscape management plan in perpetuity.

**GROUND:**

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to adequately integrate the development into the environment in accordance with Policies QD02 and GI04 of the Thanet Local Plan

6 The electric vehicle charging points as shown on the approved plan numbered 19-0741-77 Rev P3 shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and thereafter maintained; with details of the design to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter implemented.

**GROUND:**

To protect air quality, in accordance with Policy SP14 of the Thanet Local Plan and the advice as contained within the NPPF

7 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of the cycle parking, which shall be in the form of one space per affordable rented flat, and one space per bedroom within each affordable rent house, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be implemented as approved.

**GROUND:**

To promote cycling as an alternative form of transport, in accordance with Policy TP03 and SP43 of the Thanet Local Plan

8 The development hereby permitted shall be constructed to a high standard of energy efficiency to the equivalent of Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

**GROUND:**

All new buildings and conversions of existing buildings must be designed to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and have resilience to function in a changing climate, in accordance with Policy QD01 of the Thanet Local Plan.

9 Prior the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved, samples of the materials to be used, which shall include red brick, black cladding, slate, clay tiles and render, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**GROUND:**

In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan

10 All new window and door openings shall be set within a reveal of not less than 75mm.

**GROUND:**

In the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan

11 Prior to the installation of the attenuation drainage basin, details of the preventative measures intended to be used to avoid a breeding ground for mosquitos shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The design of the drainage basin shall incorporate the approved preventative measures.

**GROUND:**

In the interests of human health, in accordance with the strategic objectives of the Thanet Local Plan.

12 The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in order to meet the required technical standard for water efficiency of 110litres/person/day, thereby Part G2 Part 36 (2b) of Schedule 1 Regulation 36 to the Building Regulations 2010, as amended, applies.

**GROUND:**

Thanet is within a water stress area as identified by the Environment Agency, and therefore new developments will be expected to meet the water efficiency optional requirement of 110litre.

SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The site consists of 1.47 hectares located within the southern half of Cliffsend Village, on an area of land currently in agricultural use. The site is to the north of Cottington Road, with existing residential development to west and east of the site, and agricultural land to the north and south of the site. Residential development to either side of the site is predominantly detached, and either single storey or 2-storey in height.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

OL/TH/17/0151 - Outline application for the erection of up to 41no. dwellings including access with all other matters reserved - GRANTED - 17th August 2018

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The application is in reserved matters form, with the principle of development and the proposed access to the development having previously been approved. This application is for the consideration of the appearance, scale, layout, and landscaping only.

The proposal is for the erection of 41no. units, including flats, terraced, semi-detached, and detached units. The units are served by a single access point onto Cottington Road. The units are 2-storey in height, and provide a range of unit sizes, including 2no. 1-bed flats, 12no. 2-bed, 25no. 3-bed, and 2no. 4-bed units.

In terms of design, the units are of a traditional design with pitched roofs, and are to be constructed using brickwork, weatherboarding, render, clay tiles and slate, along with UPVC windows, and composite doors.

## DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

### **Thanet Local Plan 2020**

SP01 - Spatial Strategy - Housing  
SP24 - Development in the Countryside  
SP26 - Landscape Character Areas  
SP29 - Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Plan (SAMM)  
SP30 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assets  
SP35 - Quality Development  
H01 - Housing Development  
QD01 - Sustainable Design  
QD02 - General Design Principles  
QD03 - Living Conditions  
QD04 - Technical Standards  
QD05 - Accessible and Adaptable Accommodation  
CC02 - Flood Risk  
GI04 - Amenity Space  
TP02 - Walking  
TP03 - Cycling  
TP06 - Car Parking

## NOTIFICATIONS

Neighbouring occupiers have been notified and a site notice posted. Eleven letters of objection have been received raising the following concerns:

- Terraced properties and higher density development are out of keeping with the area,
- 100% affordable units will be out of character,
- Loss of agricultural land,
- St. Augustine's Cross should be protected,
- Lack of infrastructure and facilities within the village to support the housing,
- Highway impact from increased traffic,
- Impact on privacy to properties in Beech Grove, should be a minimum of 21m away,

- Impact on property values,
- Reduction in the off-site contributions to mitigate the impact of the development,
- Affordable homes should be exclusively for Cliffsend residents,
- No details provided on mitigation strategy for mosquitos, electric vehicle charging points per dwelling, road widening,
- Incorrect information within statement relating to village facilities,
- Poor quality design,
- Light and noise pollution,
- Noise resulting from construction work.

## CONSULTATIONS

### **KCC Highways** - *(final comment)*

I refer to the amended plans submitted for the above on 9th, 14th, 15th and 22nd July and confirm the proposals are now acceptable. The site layout provides suitable access and sufficient parking to ensure that unacceptable on-street parking on the highway is unlikely to occur. The streets coloured pink on the plans are intended to be offered for adoption by the Highway Authority. The amended Construction Management Plan is also acceptable. Access arrangements from Cottington Road and the associated highway improvements were approved in the outline application, and will be implemented by the developer through a s.278 agreement with the Highway Authority (it should be noted that the widening shown on the latest plans is likely to need amending but this can be resolved through the s.278 process). I therefore now have no objections in respect of highway matters.

I also note that cycle parking details are yet to be resolved.

### *(Interim comment)*

I refer to the amended plans received for the above on 29th April and would comment as follows:

1. 18 metre forward visibility envelopes are required around the bends adjacent to plots 10 and 17 as previously requested. These should be included in the adoptable areas shown.
2. A 1 metre-wide adoptable service margin is required on the northern side of the road opposite plots 9/10 and 17/41, and between plots 24/25.
3. The 18 metre x 2 metre x 18 metre driver splays shown at the shared private parking courts are incorrect - the 2 metres 'x' distance should be measured from the edge of carriageway. The same splays are required at all private accesses. Pedestrian visibility splays of 1 metre x 1 metre are also required behind the footway on each side of each private access with no obstructions over 0.6 metres above footway level. These all appear achievable and can therefore be confirmed with suitable notes on the site plan rather than each splay being individually shown.
4. There does not appear to have been any consultation by the applicant with the refuse collection authority in relation to the potential need for a larger vehicle to be accommodated, and this may have a bearing on the road layout.
5. The information previously requested on gradients does not appear to have been submitted.
6. Whilst the total number of parking spaces proposed is in accordance with Kent Design Interim Guidance Note 3 for a village/rural situation, the following matters need resolving in

order to prevent unacceptable parking on the adoptable highway:

The parking for plots 3-6, 9, 10, 17, 32-34, 37, 39, 40 and 41 is too remote from the dwellings it serves;

Plots 8, 30 and 31 should each have two independently accessible spaces. Some tandem parking arrangements may be acceptable if an additional 1 unallocated space is provided per two dwellings;

The limited distribution of visitor parking means there is a lack of such parking for plots 22/23 and 28-31.

The parking arrangements for plots 34 and 37 require drivers to reverse unacceptably excessive distances.

7. As previously advised condition 24 requires the provision of 1 electric vehicle charging point for each property with dedicated parking. The proposals include only a suitable consumer unit and ducting to allow future provision of a charging point.

8. I note the reluctance to show cycle storage, however such storage is shown on the highway adoption plan. Clarification is therefore required on the applicant's proposals in this regard. The revised Construction Traffic Management and Logistics plans are acceptable subject to the caveat that HGV's should use the route to/from the west whenever possible. A requirement should also be added that, before and after construction of the development, highway condition surveys for highway access routes should be undertaken and a commitment provided to fund the repair of any damage caused by vehicles related to the development. This should also be added to the CMP submitted under R/TH/19/1781.

I wish to place a holding objection until the above matters have been satisfactorily resolved.

With regard to street lighting, the details for the existing and proposed highways can be resolved through the s.38/s.278 highway adoption process. However, I note the specific condition requiring a lighting design strategy for biodiversity and it is not clear if this can be accommodated within the highway lighting requirements. The following comments from our Street Lighting Team are therefore included to enable the applicant to consider these requirements against the strategy for biodiversity:

The documents provided are not reflective of KCC approved equipment as we do not have any aluminium columns on our approved list. I also note there is a 'street lighting feeder pillar' showing which suggest the lighting is all fed via private cable network. I would expect either direct UK Power Networks or IDNO (Independent Distribution Network Operator) connection.

PCN should only be used where a DNO / IDNO connection is not feasible. There is also spec in the notes for purple ducting which I am not familiar with as this is neither KCC PCN or UKPN ducting specification.

The lighting levels are too high for the specified design class if the SP ratio is applied to the calculations, which it should be as a high CRI light source is being utilised.

I am not happy with the proposed lighting at the junctions as neither junction arrangement tie in with the existing lighting or constitute a system of lighting as far as I can make out from the information provided. Lighting either needs to be provided as a continuation of the existing lighting scheme along the frontage of the development(S) as indicated in the email previously sent to the highways consultant (provided there is adequate footway area for it), or confined within the S38 internal areas. The junctions should be sufficiently illuminated via the internal lighting anyway as there are no lighting columns along this stretch of the road.

*(Initial comment)*

I refer to the above planning application and would comment as follows:

1. The widening of Cottington Road at the site access, as agreed through the outline permission, does not appear to have been accounted for in the site plan submitted. This would potentially impact on the proposed site layout and should therefore be shown and dimensioned on the plans.
2. The extent of adoption could include the road serving plots 11-16 which could be laid out as a lane with passing places, in accordance with Kent Design. This would remove the need for refuse vehicles to turn round in two separate culs-de-sac. 18-metre forward visibility would be required around the bends into the lane and the initial sections would need to be wider to accommodate two cars passing and a refuse vehicle turning. A passing place would also be required midway along the lane.
3. There is a lack of speed restraint in the streets serving plots 1-10 and 23-4, where measures should be provided at maximum 60 metre spacing. If the layout cannot be significantly altered from that shown, I suggest raised tables are provided mid-way along these streets. There is no need for ramps up to the turning heads as currently shown.
4. The adoptable footway should continue around the radius outside plots 9 and 41. A 1 metre-wide grass-only service margin (or paved where necessary) should be provided around the rest of the turning heads.
5. The adoptable footway should continue between plots 10-27, plots 26-25, and plots 18-20.  
A 1 metre-wide, grass-only service margin should be provided along the road edge between plots 24 and 25.
6. The accesses to plots 1 and 28 are too close to the junction with Cottington Road, and should be a minimum of 10 metres from the junction.
7. One cul-de-sac should have priority over the other at the point where they split, to provide clarity for drivers as to who should give way. I suggest priority is given to the eastern cul-de-sac.
8. The width of the culs-de-sac could be reduced to 4.8 metres subject to vehicle tracking.
9. Indicative gradients of carriageway, footways and private drives/parking spaces should also be provided.
10. Driver visibility splays of 18 metres x 2 metres x 18 metres are required at each private access off the adoptable roads, with no obstructions over 1 metre above carriageway level. Pedestrian visibility splays of 1 metre x 1 metre are required behind the footway on each side of each private access with no obstructions over 0.6 metres above footway level. These all appear achievable and can therefore be confirmed with suitable notes on the site plan rather than each splay being individually shown.
11. Vehicle swept paths should be submitted to demonstrate that a large refuse vehicle can suitably negotiate the site access to/from Cottington Road and the internal access road. We require checking for an 11.4 metre refuse vehicle, however the applicant should consult with the refuse collection authority as they may require access for a larger vehicle. Based on the swept paths currently shown, it appears the arms of the turning heads will need extending.
12. Swept paths should also be submitted to show that two cars can pass each other at the Cottington Road access .
13. Whilst the total number of parking spaces proposed is in accordance with Kent Design Interim Guidance Note 3 for a village/rural situation, the following matters need resolving in order to prevent unacceptable parking on the adoptable highway:  
The parking for plots 1, 3-7, 9, 10, 17, 32-34, 37, 39 and 40 is too remote from the dwellings it serves;  
Plots 8, 10, 11, 13-17, 24-27, 30, 31 and 36 should each have two independently

accessible spaces. Some tandem parking arrangements may be acceptable if an additional 1 unallocated space is provided per two dwellings;

The limited distribution of visitor parking means there is a lack of such parking for plots 1/2, 20-26 and 28-36.

The parking arrangements for plots 5, 34, 37, 40 and the visitor spaces adjacent to plot 2 require drivers to reverse unacceptably excessive distances.

Parking spaces should be a minimum of 5 metres long x 2.5 metres wide, increased to 2.7 metres where bounded by walls/fences/landscaping on one side, 2.9 metres where bounded by such obstructions on both sides, and 3.2 metres where the space also serves as the pedestrian route to/from a front door. A note should be added to the site plan confirming these dimensions are to be provided.

14. Condition 24 requires the provision of 1 electric vehicle charging point for each property with dedicated parking. The proposals include only a suitable consumer unit and ducting to allow future provision of a charging point.

15. Secure, covered cycle parking should be provided at a minimum of 1 space per bedroom.

16. Bearing in mind the lighting strategy indicated, the applicant is strongly advised to discuss

street lighting requirements for the adoptable streets with our Street Lighting Team.

17. The Construction Management Plan is noted however, we would wish to see as many HGV's as possible routed to/from the west rather than through the village, although it is accepted that there is a height restriction at the railway bridge in Cottington Road. The CMP is therefore not agreed at this time and the applicant is advised to contact Paul Valek in our Network Operations Team to arrange a meeting in order to discuss and agree the details of the CMP.

I wish to place a holding objection until the above matters have been satisfactorily resolved.

#### **KCC Biodiversity - (final comment)**

We advise that sufficient information has been provided to determine the planning application.

When we previously commented we highlighted that the submitted Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Precautionary Mitigation Strategy (ecus; December 2019) had made a number of recommendations to enhance the site for biodiversity but they had not been reflected on the site plan.

An updated biodiversity enhancement plan and site plan have been submitted and they have confirmed the following:

- o Native species planting proposed within the site
- o 5 Integrated bat boxes
- o 10 integrated/tree bird boxes
- o 5 log piles
- o hedgehog holes in all fences.

We are satisfied that the enhancements detailed within Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Precautionary Mitigation Strategy will be incorporated in to the site.

We advise that we will provide more detailed comments on the Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Precautionary Mitigation Strategy when we comment on the discharge of condition 8 of planning application OL/TH/17/0151

*(Initial comment)*

We advise that additional information is required prior to the determination of this reserve matters application.

An Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Precautionary Mitigation Strategy (ecus; December 2019) has been submitted with the planning application and it has made a number of recommendations to enhance the site for biodiversity.

We advise that the landscaping plan is updated to reflect the recommendations of the Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Precautionary Mitigation Strategy.

We advise that we will provide more detailed comments on the Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Precautionary Mitigation Strategy when we comment on the discharge of condition 8 of planning application OL/TH/17/0151

**Historic England** - On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

**KCC Archaeology** - I can confirm that I have no objection to the amendments. For information archaeological excavation works are presently under way on this site and the proposed layout is being taken account of in discussions with the contractors regarding the scope of works. My previous advice with respect to the archaeological condition and the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation remains relevant.

**KCC SUDs** - Thank you for the clarification with respect to the Drainage Strategy submitted. Our previous response referred to a later appendix which reflects the drainage strategy submitted at outline. We provided an updated response as follows:

The current application is supported by a Drainage Strategy report prepared by Fairhurst Consulting Engineers (December 2019). The Drainage Strategy Sheets 1 through 4 (Drawing 132282-FAH-00-ZZ-DR-C-0007, 0008, 0009, 0010 Rev P3) which covers both applications 19/1780 and 19/1781, are generally consistent with the outline drainage strategy prepared by R J Fillingham Associates submitted in July 2017 for the outline application. The drainage strategy drawing relies upon limited extents of permeable paving, with attenuation and controlled discharge to a public sewer at a rate of 7.4 l/s.

Kent County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority have the following comments:

a) The Drainage Construction Details (Drawing 132282-FAH-00-ZZ-DR-C-0115 Rev P1) indicates the inclusion of a liner. The soakage results returned infiltration rates of the order of 10-6 m/s which though poor may provide for some loss to the ground and may be workable

with permeable pavement. We would therefore strongly recommend that a membrane is not included within the drainage design, unless other reasons are provided for the inclusion.

b) The proposed landscaping plan prepared by OSG Architecture (Drawing 19/0741-84, December 2019) prepared for the south side of Cottington Road does not include the surface water drainage features. It indicates that parking areas will be block paved but does not include permeable pavement as a surface Finish.

c) The Drainage Strategy Appendix A.2 includes Microdrainage calculations for the proposed drainage design for the entire of the drainage system which serves both proposed developments within applications 19/1780 and 19/1781. These calculations are consistent with KCC policy. A flood volume is shown to occur at one of the last manholes on the drainage system for the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change event.

From a surface water drainage perspective there is sufficient space provided within the layout as proposed to manage surface water generated by the development, though there are matters which will need to be confirmed at detailed design and with further submissions for discharge of the surface water drainage condition required under the outline approval.

We would recommend that full consideration is given to the landscaping of the basins and promotion of multi-functional design. We would reiterate our previous comments that the attenuation ponds proposed do not promote a multi-functional feature as required within the NPPF. We would recommend that information is sought to the landscaping proposed within the attenuation ponds to provide amenity, landscape and biodiversity benefits.

We have no objection to the approval of the layout as proposed in relation to requirements for surface water management but would recommend that further information is sought in relation to landscape matters. It is our expectation that others matters discussed above are addressed prior to submission of information to discharge Condition 10.

This response has been provided using the best knowledge and information submitted as part of the planning application at the time of responding and is reliant on the accuracy of that information.

**Environment Agency** - We have assessed this application as having a low environmental risk. We therefore have no comments to make.

**Southern Water** - No objections. Comments in our response dated 27/02/2017 remain unchanged and valid).

**NHS Clinical Commissioning Group** - I note the original S106 from planning number 17/0151 is still valid for this development and therefore there are no additional comments from Health for this.

**Kent Police** - We have reviewed this Reserved Matters application in regard to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Unfortunately we were not informed or consulted before this. Whilst some areas of the design are appropriate to help design out crime, there are

some significant concerns. Applicants/agents should consult us as local Designing out Crime Officers to address CPTED. We use details of the site, relevant crime levels/type and intelligence information to help design out the opportunity for Crime, Fear of Crime, Anti-Social Behavior (ASB), Nuisance and Conflict. It is a significant concern that there are no references to designing out crime or crime prevention within the DAS (Design and Access Statement). This is of concern as Orbit Homes would be expected to apply for and attain Secured by Design accreditation to help ensure the security of their tenants. As yet, no application of consultation has been made.

Secured by Design (SBD) [www.securedbydesign.com](http://www.securedbydesign.com) is the UK Police flagship initiative combining differing levels of security. To meet SBD physical security requirements, SBD require doorsets and windows to be PAS 24: 2016 certified by an approved independent third-party certification body e.g. (UKAS) in the name of the final manufacturer/fabricator. This requirement exceeds the requirements of Building Reg. ADQ that only requires products to be tested to PAS 24:2012. Products that are independently certificated to recognised security standards have been responsible for consistently high reductions in crime as verified by numerous independent academic research studies.

If this application is to be approved we strongly request a Condition/Informative be included to address the points below and show a clear audit trail for Design for Crime Prevention and Community Safety to meet our and Local Authority statutory duties under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

Having reviewed the application on-line the following issues need to be addressed including:

1. The layout is permeable onto neighbouring areas and this could be a concern for crime and ASB unless suitable boundary treatments are included. The development must ensure that the routes through the site have appropriate vehicle mitigation to avoid Anti-Social cycling, quad or motorbike opportunity must be incorporated. This can also help reduce opportunity for damage to the landscape and ecology.
2. The plans to open the safer, cul-de-sac design to the north of the site is a concern that should be addressed as soon as possible.
3. Unit house type A has no side elevation windows that could provide opportunity for natural surveillance.
4. Perimeter, boundary and divisional treatments to be 1.8m high with lockable gates as far forward to the building line as possible to minimise the opportunity for crime.
5. Corner Properties and ground floor bedroom windows (house type A) that can be reached by passers-by require defensible space.
6. Parking is a significant concern and could help enable crime with the lack of natural surveillance from the residences the parking spaces serve. Parking courts should be avoided and only when absolutely necessary should be sited in small groups, close and adjacent to homes, be within view of active rooms with excellent surveillance opportunity, lit and clearly allocated to individual properties. For 'active' we mean "rooms in building elevations from which there is direct and regular visual connection between the room and the street or parking court. Such visual connection can be expected from rooms such as kitchens and living rooms, but not from more private rooms, such as bedrooms and bathrooms." Rear parking courtyards are discouraged as they introduce access to the

vulnerable rear elevations of dwellings where the majority of burglary is perpetrated. When they are unlit and open (ungated) they can increase the fear of crime and provide areas of concealment which can encourage vehicle crime, ASB and nuisance.

7. There are plans for electric charging points, their siting needs to be considered to provide safe, lit and secure spaces.

8. The lighting plan should be approved by a Member of the ILP or the Society of Light and Lighting. Where developments lack appropriate lighting, homeowners install security lighting that can detrimentally affect a lighting plan and cause light pollution.

9. All external doorsets to be PAS 24: 2016 certified. All windows on the ground floor and any that are potentially vulnerable to climbing must also meet PAS 24: 2016 certified.

10. If approved, site security is required for the construction phase. There is a duty for the principle contractor "to take reasonable steps to prevent access by unauthorised persons to the construction suite" under the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2007. The site security should incorporate plant, machinery, supplies, tools and other vehicles and be site specific to geography and site requirements.

If the points above are not addressed, they can affect the development, the area and local policing. Current levels of reported crime have been taken into account.

**TDC Strategic Housing** - I have spoken with Orbit Housing about this scheme, and Strategic Housing supports the delivery of affordable housing on this site.

**TDC Environmental Health** - I have reviewed the Environmental Noise Assessment; and am satisfied that providing the mitigation measures set out in Table 6.2 are applied to the dwellings they will be adequately safeguarded against environmental noise.

I have also reviewed the proposed site plan ref 19-0741-77 showing Electric Vehicle Charging point provision which satisfies the OL condition in this regard.

**TDC Conservation Officer** - I have no objections to the work proposed due to the existing built form of the area as well as physical distance away from the heritage asset.

## COMMENTS

The application has been called in by Cllr Brenda Rogers, to enable Members to consider the issues of overlooking, affordable housing and the impact upon the surrounding area.

## **Character and Appearance**

### *Layout*

The proposed layout includes a central access point onto Cottington Road (as previously approved), which extends into a link road around the site. All development has road frontage, and corner plots are provided with dual frontages to the access road. A range of units types have been used across the site. Whilst semi-detached and detached units are more characteristic of the area, there is also some evidence of terraced dwellings in nearby Earlsmead Crescent, and therefore such unit types are not completely out of keeping with the area. The proposed terraces are in small groups of 3no. units, with one 4-bed terraced

block also proposed, and this limited number of units within the blocks has limited the visual impact. The use of terraces has meant that large spaces between the units has been achieved, creating a spacious form of development, in keeping with the rural character of the village.

A pair of semi-detached units, set behind communal open space, have been used as the focal point for views through from the access. The location of the open space again provides the appearance of a spacious soft landscaped development. The two units either side of the access point have been amended so that they address the access. The unit types have been mixed throughout the development so that there is no concentration of a particular unit type within any area. All open space is overlooked, providing for natural surveillance.

In terms of parking, detached and semi-detached units tend to have parking provision within their curtilage. For the terraced units there is a mix, with some parking being visible to the fronts of the building, and other parking being located within a parking court area, along with the visitor parking. Amended plans have been sought to limit the parking court provision, which can detract from visual amenities. The proposal now provides for only two parking court areas, one to the west and one to the east. Both parking courts are discreetly located, with the potential to be screened by soft landscaping.

Kent Police have raised concerns with the layout, and provided advice on improving natural surveillance, removing parking courts, and providing boundary treatment. Through the amendments the number of parking courts have been reduced along with rear access paths to gardens. More curtilage parking is achieved allowing residents to see their vehicles from their houses, and more windows have been added to side elevations to allow for natural passive surveillance. The agent has further advised that they have agreed to up the security level of all windows and doors to PAS 2016 rather than PAS 2012, which is the current building regs level, and that they have lodged their Secured by Design application with the Police.

Overall the layout is considered to be in keeping with the surrounding pattern of development, whilst achieving a safe and spacious form of development that is characteristic of its rural setting. The proposed layout is therefore considered to be acceptable, and in accordance with Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan, and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

### *Scale*

The units are all 2-storey in height, as required through condition 22 of the outline consent. Two-storey development is characteristic of and in keeping with the surrounding area, and is therefore considered to be acceptable.

### *Appearance*

The proposal consists of a more traditional pitched roof form of development. A simple design approach has been used with limited detailing within the elevation, although features such as bay windows and porches have been used to achieve variety in the building form and add interest. At least 5no. building types have been used within the development, and within these there are slight variations to the fenestration and materials. There is a mix in

both gabled fronted unit types and those with hipped roofs. Given the simplicity of the design it is quite important that the casement windows are set within a reveal, with 75mm having been agreed by the agent. The application doesn't have a road frontage onto Cottington Road, and is therefore quite self isolated, meaning that the development is not tied into conforming with the design of surrounding development. In terms of materials, the intention is to use brickwork, render weatherboarding, clay tiles and slate, along with UPVC windows, and composite doors. White weatherboarding was originally proposed, but concern was raised that this would appear out of keeping with its countryside location, and could stand out in long views towards the site across the open countryside opposite. The weatherboarding colour has therefore been amended to black. Similarly the light coloured yellow brick has been omitted leaving just the two differing red bricks.

Overall, the variation in unit types and materials has resulted in a good quality development that is well suited to its village location, in accordance with Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan, and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

### *Landscaping*

A visual impact assessment was submitted with the outline application, with the recommendations of the report, (which took into account the recommendations of the Historic Landscape Assessment) being the provision of a landscaped frontage to the southern boundary on Cottington Road, with the development set back from the road. The landscaped frontage was required to include native trees, consisting of a mix of deciduous and evergreen, and a hedgerow within an area of 5m to 6m in depth, which will complement the trees and hedgerows along the eastern boundary and along the Cottington Road to the east. A basic landscaping plan has been submitted with the application, which shows a 5m to 6m depth landscaping strip to the front of the site, as required by condition 26 of the outline consent. The annotations show some tree planting within this space, although specific detail on the number and species of the trees have not been fully provided. As such, whilst the plan is acceptable for the purposes of the layout, a condition requiring full details of this planted area is required, along with a condition enforcing its provision and a landscape management condition.

For the northern boundary, and short sections of the western and eastern boundaries, the visual impact assessment originally submitted recommended hedgerows and scattered trees, with species chosen to complement those within the rest of the landscape. The landscape plan shows the provision of native hedge planting and tree planting along this boundary, in accordance with this requirement, and is therefore again considered to be acceptable in terms of a planting strategy, but with full details of the planting to be submitted via condition.

Policy GI04 of the Thanet Local Plan requires that new residential development make provision for appropriate amenity green space, which for this development equates to 600sqm. An equipped play area is not required on this site as the number of units fall below the threshold to require this within the 2006 Local Plan Policy (used in the determination of the outline application). The submitted plans show the provision of a large open space to the centre/south of the site measuring 345sqm, along with additional casual open space to the north of the site measuring 695sqm. This equates to 1,040sqm, which exceeds the minimum

requirement statement within Policy GI04 of the Thanet Local Plan, and is therefore acceptable.

In terms of hard surfacing, tarmac has been used for all access roads and visitor parking areas, which is unfortunate given the village location of the site; however, block paving has been used for the communal parking areas and all driveways, which will break up the extent of hard surfacing and limited its visual impact.

#### *Impact upon the Designated Heritage Asset*

Condition 21 of the outline consent required that an updated Historic Landscape Assessment be submitted with the reserved matters application, which took into account the impact of the proposed development upon the Grade II Listed St. Augustine's Cross. An updated Historic Landscape Assessment has been submitted, which states that whilst the top of the built form will be perceptible within the landscape from the cross, this would not affect the significance of the asset, or the ability to appreciate that significance. Measures such as the introduction of the landscape buffer at the western edge of the site will reduce the visibility of the development from within the immediate surroundings and wider setting of the asset. As such the assessment concludes that there is expected to be no harm to the significance of the Grade II Listed St. Augustine's Cross.

The Conservation Officer and Historic England both raise no objections to the proposed development, and therefore the impact upon the Grade II Listed St. Augustine's Cross is considered to be acceptable, and in accordance with Policy HE03 of the Thanet Local Plan.

#### **Living Conditions**

##### *Neighbouring occupiers*

Given the distance to neighbouring properties from the proposed development, the impact upon light and outlook is considered to be acceptable, with the main issue being that of overlooking. Concerns have been raised regarding the impact upon neighbouring privacy, given the distance and relationship proposed. Amended plans have since been submitted to address this, with the proposed dwellings moved further from the neighbouring occupiers.

To the west of the site the closest relationship is between plots 8-10, and no.5 Lavender Lane. No. 5 appears to have a side garden that contains a swimming pool. There are no existing trees along the side boundary, although there appears to be a strip of land between the application site and no.5, which offers some soft landscaping that could provide some screening. Whilst the proposed development will clearly result in some overlooking when compared to the current situation, there is a distance of 32m between the rear elevation of the proposed dwellings and the side elevation of no.5, which will substantially limit the extent of overlooking of the neighbouring property. Whilst the neighbouring garden lies adjacent to the garden area of the proposed dwellings, there is a distance of at least 20m between the rear elevation of the proposed dwellings and the boundary of the neighbouring garden (bearing in mind the strip of land in between). For these reasons the impact upon the

privacy of no.5 Lavender Lane is not considered to be significant enough to warrant the refusal of the application on this ground.

To the east of the site there is a consistent distance of approximately 30m between the proposed rear elevation of the proposed dwellings and the rear elevations of the nearest neighbouring properties in Beech Grove. The only properties which may be affected to a greater extent are no. 19 Beech Grove, and the property to the rear of plots 28-32, which accesses onto Cottington Road. When considering no. 19, the neighbouring property is orientated so that there is no direct overlooking between the properties, and there is a distance of 25m between the rear elevation of the proposed dwellings and the closest corner of no.19, with a distance of approximately 30m to the centre of their garden. There is some existing tree screening to the rear boundary, and the possibility for new hedge screening along with the boundary within the application site. A condition will also be applied requiring the provision of 2m high fencing to the rear boundary of the proposed dwellings where the existing boundary treatment height falls below this height. For the neighbouring property fronting Cottington Rd there is a distance of at least 23m between the rear corner of the proposed dwelling and the rear elevation of the neighbouring property. In addition there is thicker tree screening along this particular part of the boundary, which will reduce the perception of overlooking.

On balance, whilst the proposed development will increase overlooking to the existing neighbouring properties in Beech Grove, given the distance, the presence of existing tree screening, and safeguarding conditions that would provide for increased landscaping and boundary treatment along this boundary, the impact upon neighbouring privacy is not considered to be significantly adverse.

Concern has been raised by neighbouring occupiers regarding construction noise, but this would be temporary and is therefore not a ground to refuse the application.

In terms of other noise and disturbance, the residential use of the development is compatible with the adjacent residential use. The only potential noise impact would be from vehicle movements within the site; however, the access road is far enough from neighbours to limit this impact, and the turning court areas are modest in size, and wouldn't cause significant harm.

Light pollution has been raised by neighbouring residents as a potential concern. A lighting strategy has been submitted with the application which considers lighting within the access road. Along the boundary KCC Biodiversity have previously raised concerns with the impact that strong lighting could have on biodiversity, and have advised that a lighting strategy be submitted via a condition on the outline consent for light sensitive areas. The lighting strategy submitted with this application has identified the light sensitive areas as being along the boundaries, and therefore further details will be submitted, which is likely to show reduced lighting levels in these areas, thereby causing limited harm to neighbouring occupiers.

Overall the impact to neighbouring residents is considered to be acceptable, and in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan, and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

### *Future occupiers*

When considering the future occupiers of the development, all of the units meet the nationally described space standards, as required under Policy QD04 of the Thanet Local Plan. Each property is provided with doorstep playspace in accordance with Policy GI04 of the Thanet Local Plan.

A noise assessment has been carried out to determine noise control measures to protect occupants against noise ingress from the local environment. These have been measured from the railway, A256, and Cottington Road. The road traffic along Richborough Way was found to be the dominant noise source, with some additional noise contribution from Cottington Rd and the railway; however, an acceptable acoustic environment is still expected within habitable spaces, and the prediction of noise levels within the rear garden areas are in line with current guidance. As such the impact upon the amenity of future occupants is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan, and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

### **Transportation**

The vehicular access point into the site, along with the highway impact resulting from the additional 41no. units, was assessed through the outline application, with the impact considered to be acceptable, subject to safeguarding conditions and highway improvement works including the widening of Cottington Road, provision of footpath and passing places, and the creation of a safe access into the development site.

This application considers the highway impact from the proposed layout. Amendments have been sought by KCC to achieve speed restraints in the street; the provision of an acceptable adoptable footpath and service margins; the provision of visibility splays of 18m x 2m x 18m to each private access; the provision of vehicle swept paths proving that refuse vehicles can enter and leave the site in a forward gear; increased parking provision of an appropriate size; electric vehicle charging points for each dwelling; and covered cycle parking provision. Details of the lighting strategy for the adoptable roads were also requested bearing in mind the biodiversity comments made within the outline application, where concerns were raised with the potential impact on biodiversity from proposed lighting within sensitive areas.

Amended plans and additional details have since been submitted. KCC Highways has advised that the site layout as amended provides suitable access and sufficient parking to ensure that unacceptable on-street parking on the highway is unlikely to occur. The adoptable highway plan, lighting strategy and amended construction management plan have also been agreed.

The amended plans show the provision of 2no. off-street parking spaces per dwellinghouse, one off-street parking space per flat, and 15no. visitor parking spaces. All of the parking spaces associated with the dwellings will be provided with an electric vehicle charging point, and one of the visitor parking spaces will also be able to serve an electric vehicle. Cycle parking provision is yet to be provided, but this can easily be accommodated within the garden area of each unit.

Following these amendments, and on the basis that highway improvements will be made through a s.278 agreement (as agreed through the outline consent and as highlighted above), the impact upon highway safety is considered to be acceptable, and in accordance with the NPPF.

### **Affordable Housing**

Through the outline application, 30% affordable housing on site was secured. The site has since been purchased by Orbit Housing Provider, who intend to provide the whole site as affordable housing, including 22% rented and 78% shared ownership.

Condition 23 of the outline consent required that details of the location and size of the affordable units be submitted as part of the reserved matters application. A plan has been submitted identifying the location of the rented units. They are pepper potted across the site with 4no. terraced units to the west, 3no. terraced units to the east, and 2no. semi-detached units to the south. The Strategic Housing Officer has no concerns with the location of these units.

Concerns have been raised by residents regarding the use of the whole site for affordable units. Whilst valid concerns can be raised if the number of affordable units do not meet the minimum requirement stated within Local Plan Policy, there are no planning grounds upon which to object to an increased number of affordable units as no maximum limit is set within the policy. The provision of additional affordable units upon a site would normally be encouraged in areas where there would be no significant impact upon the community mix as there is a local need within the district for affordable units. The Council's Housing, Homelessness, and Rough Sleeper Strategy was adopted this month, with information on the current affordable housing need. The strategy advises that as of 30 September 2019, there were 2,354 households on the housing register, and of these, 309 households have an urgent or serious housing need. The number of rented units upon the site only exceed the expected number of rented units through the outline consent by 5no. units, and it is not considered that this increase will detrimentally impact upon the community. Given the lack of policy objection, and the urgent housing need for these affordable units within the district, the affordable provision proposed is considered to be acceptable.

Concern has been raised by neighbouring residents as to the occupation criteria of these affordable units, and query whether the units will be exclusively for Cliffsend residents. Within the S.106 agreement linked to the outline consent there is a requirement that the Council be afforded 100% nomination rights for the units in accordance with the current allocation policy. Whilst this doesn't guarantee that all future occupants will be area linked, there is scope for consideration to be given to the area links.

### **Size and Type of Housing**

The proposal includes a range of unit types, including flats, terraced units, semi-detached and detached units; and a range of unit sizes, including 2no. 1-bed flats, 12no. 2-bed, 25no. 3-bed, and 2no. 4-bed units. Policy SP22 of the Thanet Local Plan requires new development to provide an appropriate mix of market and affordable housing types and sizes that has regard to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2016. The mix of unit sizes

proposed is more typical of the market need than the affordable need, with the largest number of units 3-bed and not 1-bed, the greatest affordable need. However, a higher density development of 1-bed flats would not be characteristic of this rural edged site, and therefore some flexibility is required when balancing the need for the unit sizes with the visual impact. It is intended that 78% of the units would be shared ownership, and therefore it is likely that a higher number of larger units will be needed on the site than that suggested through the policy for affordable units. On balance, the size and type of units proposed is considered to be acceptable given the wide range proposed and the character of the surrounding area.

Policy QD05 of the Thanet Local Plan requires that there is accessibility provision within new developments, with 10% of new build development expected to be built in compliance with building regulation part M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings, and 5% of affordable housing units expected to be built in compliance with building regulations part M4(3) wheelchair user dwellings. The agent has confirmed that 15% of the units would be constructed in compliance with M4(2), and one unit will be constructed as a wheelchair user dwelling, which equates to 5% of the affordable units approved through the outline application. The proposal therefore complies with Policy QD05 of the Thanet Local Plan.

### **Drainage**

Southern Water and the Environment Agency have raised no objections. KCC SUDs has advised that from a surface water drainage perspective they are of the view that there is sufficient space provided within the layout to manage the surface water generated by the development, and that they will comment on the design at the detailed design stage via the condition submission linked to the outline consent.

KCC has recommended that full consideration be given to the landscaping of the basins and the promotion of multi-functional design, and suggest that information is sought on the landscaping proposed within the attenuation ponds in order to achieve amenity, landscape and biodiversity benefits. Further details of the attenuation ponds are therefore sought through the detailed landscaping condition. Subject to this condition, and the details to be considered via the outline conditions, the impact upon flood risk is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy CC02 of the Thanet Local Plan.

### **Biodiversity**

An Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Precautionary Mitigation Strategy (December 2019) has been submitted with this application, which has made a number of recommendations to enhance the site for biodiversity. These include the planting of native species, the provision of eight bat boxes, to be incorporated into the building design, a minimum of ten bird boxes of different designs to be incorporated into the landscape plan, and hedgehog holes within garden fences. KCC Biodiversity were consulted, who advised that the landscaping plan be updated to reflect the recommendations of the Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Precautionary Mitigation Strategy.

An updated biodiversity enhancement plan and site plan have been submitted, which provides new native species planting within the site, 5no. integrated bat boxes, 10no.

integrated/tree bird boxes, 5no. log piles, and hedgehog holes in all fences. KCC Biodiversity have advised that they are satisfied that the enhancements detailed within the Updated Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Precautionary Mitigation Strategy will be incorporated into the site, and therefore raise no objections.

The impact upon biodiversity is therefore considered to be acceptable, and in accordance with Policy SP30 of the Thanet Local Plan.

### **Other Issues**

Issues have been raised in relation to the density of development proposed, the loss of agricultural land, the lack of infrastructure and facilities within the village to support the housing, and the highway impact from increased traffic, however these issues were all covered through the outline application. The impact upon house values has also been raised but this is not a planning issue.

It is noted that within the design and access statement the applicants intention to reduce the previously agreed off-site financial contributions are stated, however this is not a matter for this reserved matters application. If reductions were to be agreed, this would be dealt with separately through a variation of the legal agreement, and would be brought before members for consideration on the basis that members agreed the current financial commitments.

### **Conclusion**

The proposed layout of the development is considered to be in keeping with the surrounding pattern of development, and the proposed scale and appearance of the development is considered to be in keeping with the rural character and appearance of the surrounding area. The general landscaping proposal is considered acceptable, although further details of this will be required at condition stage.

Whilst the proposal includes the provision of 100% affordable housing, this is considered to be a positive element that provides significant social benefits, and for which there is no policy concern.

The proposed development is considered to be an adequate distance from existing neighbouring occupiers, and existing and proposed landscaping will help to provide screening for both visual and amenity purposes.

The impact upon highway safety is considered acceptable, with adequate off-street parking provision; and the impact upon biodiversity and flood risk raise no concerns.

Overall the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the Thanet Local Plan, specifically Policies QD02 and QD03, along with the NPPF, and it is therefore recommended that members approve the application.

### **Case Officer**

Emma Fibbens

TITLE: R/TH/19/1780

Project Land North Of Cottington Road And East Of Lavender Lane RAMSGATE Kent

