

R05

F/TH/21/0312

PROPOSAL: Erection of 1No. two storey 2 bed dwelling with associated landscaping and erection of 1.5m high cycle store to rear

LOCATION: 14 St Johns Avenue RAMSGATE Kent CT12 6HE

WARD: Newington

AGENT: Mr Doug Brown

APPLICANT: Mrs Lane

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse Permission

For the following reasons:

1 The proposed development by virtue of its location, siting, layout, form, and relationship with numbers 13 and 14 St Johns Avenue, would be out of keeping with the predominant pattern and rhythm of development in this location, failing to relate to surrounding development and built form or to strengthen links to adjacent areas. It would have no active relationship with the primary street frontage, and fails to incorporate appropriate soft landscaping. Cumulatively these changes would result in inappropriate development, significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and contrary to the aims of policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraphs 127 and 130 of the NPPF.

2 The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its two storey built form and relationship with the adjacent dwelling at No. 14 St Johns Avenue, would result in unacceptable changes to the window arrangement of the first floor front bedroom, adjacent to the area for development, reducing light and outlook. This is considered to be harmful to the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers thereof, contrary to the aims of policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraphs 117 and 127 of the NPPF.

3 The overall internal floorspace would be below the standards set out in policy QD04 of the Thanet Local Plan and the Nationally Described Space Standards. This would result in a poor standard of accommodation, contrary to the aims of the above and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

4 The proposed development would result in increased recreational pressure on the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area (SPA), and Sandwich Bay and Hacklinge Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and in the absence of an acceptable form of mitigation to relieve the pressure, the proposed development would be contrary to paragraphs 170, 176 and 177 of the NPPF and the Habitats Directive.S

SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

St John's Avenue is a long residential street running through the middle of a housing estate in an area of Ramsgate known as Newington. It connects the estate with New Haine Road to the west and Newington Road (via Bush Avenue) to the east, and runs through an area known locally as 'The Centre' where local buses stop and a convenience shop is located.

The area comprises a well-designed housing estate constructed around the 1950s, with public open space across various parts, play parks, a school and nursery, two convenience stores, and formerly a public house and other shops.

The estate is characterised by three or four different housing types, being largely two storey properties with an open and spacious feel between them. Houses vary between semi-detached pairs, either in groups of rendered hipped roof dwellings set at angles to the highway with a flat roof side projection set back, or hipped roof pairs with a front flat roof projection mirroring the neighbouring property. Other properties further southwest were designed in small clusters of four, terraced or link detached with a flat roof front projection. To the east along St Johns Avenue a small number of other properties are set in a cluster of four terraces with brick frontages set under a pitched roof.

The Centre and the areas to the immediate north and some parts of the south and west of St Johns Avenue have been developed over the last 10 years to provide new housing. This new housing is largely a mix of two and two and half storey dwellings, with either red or sandy brick appearances and slate pitched roofs for the most part. Some of the properties have render and cladding as features, and the larger properties along St Johns Avenue appear with a central flat roof element (and dormer above). This new residential development is largely arranged in a terraced form and provides space between the old and new dwelling types to allow their distinctive styles and forms to be clearly understood and appreciated.

The application site comprises the majority of the side garden of No. 14 St Johns Avenue. Number 14 St Johns Avenue is a two storey semi-detached property set within a large, wide plot close to The Centre. It has a rendered finish with a hipped roof, matching the neighbouring pair, and a flat roof side projection set back. To the west of this is No. 49 St Johns Crescent, the first property heading westwards to form part of the newer redevelopment of the area. This is a semi-detached two and a half storey red brick property with front facing gable and a bay projection. Owing to the large gap between Nos. 14 St Johns Avenue and 49 St Johns Crescent, and the location of No. 14 on the curve of the street heading into Kimberley Road, there is a good transition between the old and new building types in this location.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Planning permission was previously sought (reference F/TH/19/1743) for the erection of 1No. two storey, three bedroom detached dwelling on this site. The application was considered by the Council and refused on 13 February 2020 for the following reasons:

The proposed development by virtue of the location, scale, design, form, siting and layout of the proposed dwelling would result in a cramped and discordant form of development within the street scene, which would result in the loss of the separation and transition space the application site currently provides between the original built environment to the east and the comprehensive modern re-development to the west. The proposal would be out of keeping with the spacious character and pattern of development to the east and would fail to relate or integrate with the design, character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding built environment. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its two storey built form and proximity to and relationship with the adjacent dwelling to the east (14 St Johns Avenue) would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure to, and corresponding loss of light and outlook from the adjacent property, significantly harmful to the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers thereof, contrary to Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed development will result in increased recreational pressure on the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area (SPA), and Sandwich Bay and Hacklinge Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and in the absence of an acceptable form of mitigation to relieve the pressure, the proposed development would be contrary to paragraph 176 and 177 of the NPPF and the Habitats Directive.

A further application was submitted in respect of another three bed dwelling (reference F/TH/20/0296) and was also refused on 27 April 2020 for the following reasons:

The proposed development by virtue of the location, scale, design, form, siting and layout of the proposed dwelling would result in a cramped and discordant form of development within the street scene, which would result in the loss of the separation and transition space the application site currently provides between the original built environment to the east and the comprehensive modern re-development to the west. The proposal would be out of keeping with the spacious character and pattern of development to the east and would fail to relate or integrate with the design, character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding built environment. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to saved policies D1 and D2 of the Thanet Local Plan, draft policy QD02 of the Draft Local Plan, and paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its two storey built form and proximity to, and relationship with, the adjacent dwelling at No. 14 St Johns Avenue, would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure to the neighbouring occupiers in this location, harmful to the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers thereof, contrary to the aims of saved policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan, draft policy QD03 of the Draft Local Plan and paragraphs 117 and 127 of the NPPF.

The proposed development will result in increased recreational pressure on the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area (SPA), and Sandwich Bay and Hacklinge Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and in the absence of an acceptable form

of mitigation to relieve the pressure, the proposed development would be contrary to paragraphs 170, 176 and 177 of the NPPF and the Habitats Directive.

Both decisions were appealed, combined, and dismissed (references APP/Z2260/W/20/3247840 and APP/Z2260/W/20/3251852 refer - Annex 1). This application follows the Council's refusal to grant planning permission previously by reducing the number of bedrooms proposed in the dwelling and making the new dwelling attached to the existing properties rather than detached.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposal is for the erection of a two storey 2 bed dwelling with associated landscaping and cycle store.

The proposed dwelling would be rendered with a plain tile roof and upvc fenestration. It would have an entrance hall, WC, kitchen/diner and living room and two bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor level. It would be served by a garden and off street parking.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Thanet Local Plan

SP01 - Spatial Strategy - Housing
SP11 - Ramsgate
SP22 - Type and Size of Dwellings
SP28 - Protection of International and European Designated Sites
SP29 - Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Plan (SAMM)
SP30 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assets
SP35 - Quality Development
SP43 - Safe and Sustainable Travel
HO1 - Housing Development
GI01 - Protection of Nationally Designated Sites and Marine Conservation Zones
GI04 - Amenity Green Space and Equipped Play Space
CC02 - Surface Water Management
QD01 - Sustainable Development
QD02 - General Design Principles
QD03 - Living Conditions
QD04 - Technical Standards
TP02 - Walking
TP03 - Cycling
TP06 - Car Parking
SE04 - Groundwater Protection Zones

NOTIFICATIONS

Letters were sent to neighbouring property occupiers and a site notice was posted close to the site. No letters of representation have been received.

Ramsgate Town Council: No comment.

CONSULTATIONS

The Environment Agency: "We have reviewed the information submitted and due to the scale, nature and setting of this proposal and the supporting information submitted, we do not object to the proposal in principle providing the following conditions are placed on any permitted development.

Condition

If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reasons

To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework."

Southern Water: Southern Water requires a formal application for a connection to be made to the public foul sewer. The Council's Building Control Officers should be asked to comment on the adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water. The site is within a groundwater protection zone and the Environment Agency should be consulted.

COMMENTS

This application was called to Planning Committee at the request of Cllr Everitt for Members to consider the merits of the provision of an additional dwelling against the impact on the appearance of the area.

The main considerations are the impact on the character and appearance of the area, living conditions of neighbouring and future property occupiers, flood risk and drainage, highway safety and planning obligations.

Principle

Policies SP01 and HO1 of the Thanet Local Plan state that the primary focus for new housing development for Thanet is in the urban area. The site lies within the defined settlement of Ramsgate and there would be no in-principle conflict with the above policies. Policy QD02 sets out that residential development on garden land will be permitted where not judged harmful to the local area. Again, there is no in-principle objection to the provision of new housing here, subject to a detailed assessment below.

Character and Appearance

Paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning decisions should promote the effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Paragraph 127 states decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping, sympathetic to local character and history, establish or maintain a strong sense of place, and optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible. Paragraph 130 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan outlines that the primary planning aim of new development is to promote or reinforce local character and provide high quality and inclusive design that is sustainable in all other respects. Proposals should therefore relate to surrounding development, form and layout, be well designed, pay particular attention to context and identity of location, scale, massing, rhythm, density, layout and materials, and be compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces. Any external spaces and landscape features should be designed as an integral part of the scheme. It also outlines that for residential development on garden land works should not be harmful to the local area in terms of character residential amenity, and the intrinsic value of the site as an open space where this is not worthy of retention.

The covering letter for the application states that this proposal overcomes the reasons for refusal on the previous applications by designing a dwelling that would appear as an extension to the donor dwelling at No. 14 St Johns Avenue. The scheme proposes a dwelling set back around 1.7m from the front building line of No. 14 and extending around 5.8m from its flank wall across the frontage. It would be set down from No. 14 with a hipped roof to match, and be finished in white render. The entrance door would be located to the side of the property, along with a relocated entrance for No. 14, which would see the loss of its existing porch and front door and a new entrance in the street-facing facade of the proposed dwelling. The rear would have a narrower appearance with a hipped roof.

This new dwelling would be out of keeping with the predominant pattern and rhythm of development in this location, being neither semi-detached nor forming part of a terrace that respects the typical layout and clustered design seen elsewhere in the area, having a significant setback and wide roof proportion compared to other dwellings. The design has tried to create a false impression of an extension and this creates a confusing overall development. The entrance arrangement would be unconventional for visitors or members of the public, with the 'front door' appearing to serve a single dwelling but serving No. 14 and a side door serving the proposed dwelling. This is more like the type of arrangement found for flatted accommodation and not independent dwellings. The proposed dwelling would, therefore, have no active entrance and relationship with St Johns Avenue as would usually be expected. It would fail to relate to surrounding development and built form in terms of the layout arrangement and would fail to strengthen links to adjacent areas, contrary to the aims of policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan and the guidance contained in the NPPF. There would be no soft landscaping, and little consideration has been given to the finish and introduction of the property from St Johns Avenue in terms of the external space. The

pattern of fenestration would be irregular for a new dwelling linked to the type at No. 14 with no visual consistency.

Number 14 is a semi-detached dwelling at around 6.6m in width. The proposed 'extension' would be some 5.7m in width across the frontage, and whilst it has been set down and set back, this would still visually compete with the donor dwelling. The proposed plans indicate a white render finish at odds with the grey painted finish of No. 14, and whilst this could be overcome by condition, it would still be a development that is too large for the intended use. Separate parking, arrangements, garden space, bin facilities and other domestic paraphernalia will visually separate the two sites, along with suspected future house numbers for identification and boundary treatments (which have already been erected on site segregating the two properties and are likely to require changing to accommodate the new entrance exposition, creating an odd proportion and visual appreciation of the front of the building). Changes to Number 14 would also mean an odd relationship between the entrance and the living room window, with the new built form cutting into the existing opening.

It has already been determined previously in the previous appeal (Annex 1) that the space to the side of No. 14 is an important gap providing a transition between the older and newer housing types within The Centre and on the outskirts of it. It is likely that a new dwelling within this gap will not be able to overcome the design concerns inherent in a constrained space like this, and despite the current application seeking to come away from the boundary with No. 49 St Johns Crescent (the newer style development), there is still considered to be a conflict with local and national policy objectives.

Overall the works are considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and contrary to the aims of policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraphs 127 and 130 of the NPPF.

Living Conditions

Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Paragraph 127 states that decisions should ensure development creates, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for future users. Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan outlines that new development should be compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces, and should be inclusive in its design for all users. It should improve people's quality of life by creating safe and accessible environments and promote public safety and security. Policy QD03 outlines that new development must not lead to unacceptable living conditions through overlooking, noise, vibrations, light pollution, overshadowing, loss of natural light or a sense of enclosure. New development should be of an appropriate size and layout to facilitate comfortable living conditions in accordance with policy QD04 and should provide for clothes drying facilities and waste disposal. Policy GI04 outlines that new residential development will make provision for appropriate amenity green space and equipped play areas. Family dwellings will be expected to incorporate garden space in order to provide safe doorstep play areas for young children. Family dwellings are considered to be those with two or more bedrooms.

The Nationally Described Space Standards break down the technical requirements that must be met for new dwellings. They require that a 2 bed 4 person dwelling have an internal floor area of no less than 79 sq.m and a 2 bed 3 person dwelling would have an area of no less than 70 sq. m. Double rooms are required to have a minimum floor area of 11.5 sq.m and a minimum width of 2.75m and single rooms 7.5 sq.m with a width of 2.15m.

The overall internal floorspace would be around 66 sq. m, below the standard expected regardless of whether the proposed bedrooms were intended to be singles or doubles and the works would therefore create a standard of accommodation below the expected level. All habitable rooms would benefit from light, outlook and ventilation.

A garden area is proposed to the rear, with cycle storage facilities, bin storage and washing facilities. Whilst the proposed bin storage areas would be more than 15m from the collection vehicle passing point, there is considered to be sufficient space to the front of the site as to prevent harm to the aims of policy QD03(4).

In terms of the changes to No. 14 St Johns Avenue, it appears that development would come approximately 1.6m further forward than the existing two storey side projection. The existing ground floor window would be retained but the majority of this would be covered over by the proposed new entrance and frontage of the new dwelling. Given that this is a secondary window this is not considered to be a harmful change of neighbouring living conditions, but again demonstrates that overall the proposal would result in a diminished quality here. The first floor window serving the front bedroom would also be dramatically covered / reduced in size and there are inconsistencies between the floorplans for the existing and proposed dwelling as to whether a landing window would be created at No. 14 which would cut into this bedroom opening further. The submitted floor plans for the existing dwelling at No. 14 indicate that the footprint of the proposed dwelling would leave only a 0.3m wide opening to serve this bedroom which is not considered to be sufficient to serve a habitable room and would create an awkward and contrived relationship between spaces and dwellings.

To the rear development would extend around 2.7m beyond the neighbouring rear wall, at a two storey height. Given the lack of habitable rooms adjacent to this area, and the orientation of sunlight, the works are not considered significantly harmful enough as to warrant refusal of the application by themselves. There would be some late afternoon shading likely to rooms in this location but given the current layout and uses, the works are considered to have an acceptable impact.

A cycle store is proposed on the side boundary to the rear of the site. No elevations have been provided but it has been indicated that the works would involve a 1.5m high structure. Given the height and permitted boundary treatment heights up to 2m for rear gardens, these works are unlikely to result in any harm.

To the west with No. 49 St Johns Crescent, the proposed dwelling would be set some 3.8m back from the neighbouring front building line and 5.6m from the flank wall. Development would extend around 1.2m beyond the neighbouring rear wall and would have a gap of between 1.2m and 1.4m to the common boundary in this location. There is a single ground

floor flank window at No. 49 that would not be impacted by the new built form given the setback proposed. This window appears to serve the same room as the front bay and any new associated domestic paraphernalia that might be placed in this location or vehicles would be unlikely to result in any new overshadowing, overlooking, loss of outlook or sense of enclosure in this location.

To the rear, development would sit approximately 17.4m from the boundary and away from the neighbouring properties in Colombo Square, and would therefore be unlikely to result in any new sense of enclosure, overbearing, loss of light or loss of outlook.

Overall the works are considered to have some harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 14 St Johns Avenue whilst not providing a suitable standard of accommodation as a new dwelling, and would therefore be contrary to the Policies QD03 and QD04 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from those areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Reference to the Environment Agency's flood map suggests that the site is within Flood Zone 1, and is thus at a low risk of flooding.

Although there would be additional built form in this location, it is unlikely that a single dwelling would lead to a large increase in flood risk in this low risk area, and drainage could have been dealt with by condition and would therefore not need to form a reason for refusal.

The site lies within a groundwater protection zone. Policy SE04 relates to groundwater protection and states that in these areas development will only be permitted where there is no risk of contamination. The submitted application form states that the method for the disposal of foul sewage is unknown. Southern Water state that a formal application would be required for a connection to the mains sewer and should the application have been recommended for approval a condition or informative could have addressed measures for the provision of appropriate disposal of foul sewage and would therefore not need to form a reason for refusal of the application. The Environment Agency requested a condition surrounding unsuspected contamination in the event of approval which again, could have been dealt with if the application were recommended for such.

Highways

Paragraph 102 of the NPPF requires that transport issues be considered at the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals. Paragraph 110 states that development should give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, facilitate access to public transport, address the needs of people with disabilities and allow for efficient delivery of goods or access by service and emergency vehicles. Paragraph 109 of the NPPF sets out that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Policy TP03 of the Thanet Local Plan states that new development will be expected to consider the need for the safety of cyclists and incorporate facilities for cyclists into the design of new and improved roads. New residential development will be expected to provide secure facilities for the parking and storage of cycles which are proposed to the rear of the site.

Policy QD02 outlines that new development proposals should incorporate a high degree of permeability for pedestrians and cyclists and provide safe and satisfactory access for pedestrians, public transport and other vehicles. Policy TP06 outlines that proposals for development will be expected to make satisfactory provision for the parking of vehicles. Suitable levels of provision are considered in relation to individual proposals, taking into account the type of development proposed, the location, accessibility, availability of opportunities for public transport, likely accumulation of parking and design considerations.

The proposal incorporates a hard surface to the front of the dwelling and space for two vehicles. There is an existing dropped kerb in this location which could serve the site, however this would remove the designated off-street parking provision for No. 14 St Johns Avenue. It is possible that the intention may be for the parking area to serve both properties, which again would lead to confusion about the type and amount of accommodation here, however on balance the site is suitably located, in close proximity to bus services and Ramsgate Train station. There is unrestricted off-street parking and the loss of parking at No. 14 is not considered harmful enough as to result in a reason for refusal.

Given the large amount of space to the front of the site there would be sufficient visibility splays and turning space for vehicles and as a result the works are not considered to result in any new harm to parking pressure in the area or to highway safety.

Cycle storage is proposed to the rear of the site in accordance with policy TP03.

Planning Obligations

Natural England has previously advised that the level of population increase predicted in Thanet should be considered likely to have a significant effect on the interest features for which the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area (SPA) and RAMSAR have been identified. Thanet District Council produced the 'The Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Plan (SAMM)' to deal with these matters, which focuses on the impacts of recreational activities on the Thanet section of the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area (SPA). The studies indicate that recreational disturbance is a potential cause of the decline in bird numbers in the SPA. To enable the Council to be satisfied that proposed residential development will avoid a likely significant effect on the designated sites (due to an increase in recreation) policy SP29 of the Thanet Local Plan requires a financial contribution for all housing developments to contribute to the district wide mitigation strategy. This mitigation has meant that the Council accords with the Habitat Regulations.

To enable the Council to be satisfied that the proposed development will avoid a likely significant effect on the designated sites (due to an increase in recreational activities) and to comply with the Habitat Regulations a financial contribution is required to contribute to the

district wide mitigation strategy. This is currently in the form of £320 per 2 bedroom dwelling which is usually secured by an undertaking from the applicant to pay the required contribution.

An undertaking has been sought but has not been received. In the absence of an acceptable form of securing the mitigation to relieve the impact of the recreational pressure, the proposed development would be contrary to paragraphs 170, 176 and 177 of the NPPF and the Habitats Directive.

Conclusion

Overall there is no in-principle objection to the provision of a new dwelling on garden land within the urban area, however this is a small plot with an important function providing a transition between old and new parts of the Newington estate area, and this space has an intrinsic value worthy of retention from the amount of built form proposed.

The overall design put forward in this application is discordant and at odds with the pattern of development in the area, whilst infilling an important gap in the streetscene as identified by the Planning Inspector in the previous appeal decision (at Annex 1). The changes would be likely to cause some limited harm to the living conditions of future occupiers of No. 14 St Johns Avenue by virtue of the changes to windows and mutual arrangement of openings between dwellings, whilst it would not meet the standard for new accommodation in terms of size.

No mitigation has been provided to address the likely impact of the development on the SPA, despite this being sought, and there would be identifiable harm to the nature conservation interests of the District if the development were approved.

Paragraph 11 of the NPPF requires a presumption in favour of sustainable development which applies to applications involving the provision of housing, unless any adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so. In this case it is recognised that the Council has recently failed the Housing Delivery Test, however the proposed development would provide one additional dwelling towards the housing supply that would give rise to a modest economic benefit through the construction process and future occupiers' contribution to the local economy. The scale of the harm to the character and appearance of the area, the harm to the living conditions of future occupiers, along with the lack of suitable mitigation for the additional recreational pressure upon the Special Protection Area is considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the modest benefits of the additional single dwelling in this location. It is therefore concluded that the proposal would not represent sustainable development when assessed against the policies of the NPPF as a whole. As a result the application is recommended for refusal.

Case Officer

Victoria Kendall

TITLE:

F/TH/21/0312

Project

14 St Johns Avenue RAMSGATE Kent CT12 6HE

