

A01

R/TH/22/1393

PROPOSAL: Application for the reserved matters of outline permission
OL/TH/18/1488 "Outline application for the erection of up to
LOCATION: 214no. dwellings, cemetery expansion, and associated access,
with all other matters reserved" for the approval of appearance,
landscaping, layout and scale of development within phase 1
(133no. dwellings)

Land On The West Side Of Tothill Street RAMSGATE Kent

WARD: Thanet Villages

AGENT: Mr Andrew Watson, Savills

APPLICANT: Ms Amy Tamplin, BDW Homes

RECOMMENDATION: Approve

Subject to the following conditions:

1 The proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted application plans and details below:

Site Layout 110222/RM/P1/SL01 Rev U
Storey Heights Plan 110222/RM/P1/SL02 Rev E
Dwelling Types Plan 110222/RM/P1/SL03 Rev E
Tenure Plan 110222/RM/P1/SL04 Rev E
Parking Plan 110222/RM/P1/SL05 Rev E
Refuse Plan 110222/RM/P1/SL06 Rev E
Fire Strategy Plan 110222/RM/P1/SL07 Rev E
Materials Plan 110222/RM/P1/SL08 Rev H
Boundary Treatment Plan 110222/RM/P1/SL09 Rev F
M42(2)/M4(3) Plan 110222/RM/P1/SL10 Rev E
Colour Site Layout 110222/RM/P1/SL11 Rev C
Hard Landscaping Plan 110222/RM/P1/SL12 Rev H
Electric Charging Points Location 110222/RM/P1/SL17 Rev E
Road Hierarchy Plan 110222/RM/P1/SL19 Rev C
Bridleway Extract Plan 110222/RM/P1/SL20 Rev A
Coloured Street Scenes - Sheet 1 110222/RM/P1/SS1 Rev E
Proposed Site Sections 110222/RM/P1/SS3 Rev A
House Type ALD Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/ALD/EP Rev B
House Type BLA (Sheet 1) Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/BLA/1/EP Rev E
House Type BLA (Sheet 2) Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/BLA/2/EP Rev E
House Type CUL (Sheet 1) Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/CUL/1/EP Rev D
House Type CUL (Sheet 2) Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/CUL/2/EP Rev D
House Type EAR Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/EAR/EP Rev B

House Type HAZ Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/HAZ/EP Rev E
House Type HAZ 1 Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/HAZ/1/EP Rev B
House Type LYN Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/LYN/EP Rev B
House Type OLL (Sheet 1) Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/OLL/1/EP Rev E
House Type OLL (Sheet 2) Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/OLL/2/EP Rev E
House Type THO Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/THO/EP Rev C
House Type WIN Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/WIN/EP Rev E
House Type WYC Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/WYC/EP Rev C
House Type SH51 Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/SH51/EP Rev E
House Type SH52 Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/SH52/EP Rev F
House Type WF/N Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/WF-N/EP Rev D
House Type 60/61 Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/60-61/EP Rev A
Single Garage Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/SG/EP Rev A
Double Garage Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/DG/EP Rev A
Twin Garage Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/TG/EP Rev A
Quad Garage Elevations & Floor Plans 110222/QG/EP Rev A

Planting Plan 6142-LLB-EA-E1-DR-L-0006 Rev P05
Planting Plan 6142-LLB-EA-E2-DR-L-0007 Rev P06
Planting Plan 6142-LLB-EA-E3-DR-L-0008 Rev P04
Planting Plan 6142-LLB-EA-E4-DR-L-0009 Rev P04
Planting Plan 6142-LLB-EA-E5-DR-L-0010 Rev P04
Planting Plan 6142-LLB-EA-E5-DR-L-0011 Rev P03
Planting Plan 6142-LLB-EA-E5-DR-L-0012 Rev P04
Planting Plan 6142-LLB-EA-E5-DR-L-0013 Rev P04
Planting Plan 6142-LLB-EA-E5-DR-L-0014 Rev P04
Planting Plan 6142-LLB-EA-E5-DR-L-0015 Rev P02
Planting Plan 6142-LLB-EA-E5-DR-L-0017 Rev P04
Planting Plan 6142-LLB-EA-E5-DR-L-0018 Rev P02
Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report 6142-LLB-RP-Ab-0001 Rev P02
Boundary Treatment Plan 6142-LLB-RP-L-0002 Rev P02
Landscape Management Plan 6142-LLB-RP-L-0005 Rev P03
Landscape Strategy 6142-LLB-RP-L-0006 Rev P01
Tree Protection Plan 6142-LLB-XX-XX-DR-Ab-0005 Rev P02
Tree Protection Plan 6142-LLB-XX-XX-DR-Ab-0006 Rev P02
Tree Protection Plan 6142-LLB-XX-XX-DR-Ab-0007 Rev P02
Tree Protection Plan 6142-LLB-XX-XX-DR-Ab-0008 Rev P02
Landscape Masterplan 6142-LLB-XX-XX-DR-L-0001 Rev P11
Hardworks 6142-LLB-XX-XX-DR-L-0005 Rev 06
Playspace Layout IDV-PD 1872 Rev A

Proposed Levels 1 of 9 6881.024 Rev E
Proposed Levels 2 of 9 6881.025 Rev D
Proposed Levels 3 of 9 6881.026 Rev D
Proposed Levels 4 of 9 6881.027 Rev D
Proposed Levels 5 of 9 6881.028 Rev D
Proposed Levels 6 of 9 6881.029 Rev C
Proposed Levels 7 of 9 6881.030 Rev F

Proposed Levels 8 of 9 6881.031 Rev E
Proposed Levels 9 of 9 6881.032 Rev D

Proposed Drainage 1 of 9 6881.033 Rev D
Proposed Drainage 2 of 9 6881.034 Rev D
Proposed Drainage 3 of 9 6881.035 Rev D
Proposed Drainage 4 of 9 6881.036 Rev D
Proposed Drainage 5 of 9 6881.037 Rev D
Proposed Drainage 6 of 9 6881.038 Rev F
Proposed Drainage 7 of 9 6881.039 Rev D
Proposed Drainage 8 of 9 6881.040 Rev D
Proposed Drainage 9 of 9 6881.041 Rev E

Plot 125 and 131 Cross Sections

SuDS Construction Details 1 of 2 6881.053
SuDS Construction Details 2 of 2 6881.054
Catchment Area Plan Sheet 1 of 2 6881.555 Rev A

Biodiversity Method Statement (Bakewell January 2023 V5)

GROUND;

To secure the proper development of the area.

2 Prior to the first occupation of any dwelling within the development hereby permitted, the vehicle parking spaces/s relating to that dwelling, including the garage, car port and adjacent visitor parking spaces, as shown on the approved plan numbered 110222/RM/P1/SL05 Rev E shall be provided and permanently retained.

GROUND:

In the interests of highway safety in accordance with the advice contained within the NPPF

3 The vehicle turning areas shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbered 110222/RM/P1/SL19 Rev C. The relevant vehicle turning areas will be provided prior to the occupation of the associated dwellings.

GROUND;

In the interests of highway safety in accordance with the advice contained within the NPPF.

4 Visibility and pedestrian visibility splays shall be provided to the access roads and parking areas in accordance with the submitted General Arrangement plans numbered 1-9 6881.015 Rev C, 6881.016 Rev C, 6881.017 Rev C, 6881.018 Rev C, 6881.019 Rev C, 6881.020 Rev C, 6881.021 Rev D, 6881.022 Rev C, 6881.023 Rev C prior to the use of the respective access road/parking. The visibility splays shall thereafter be maintained.

GROUND;

In the interest of highway safety in accordance with the advice contained within the NPPF

5 Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, details of the secure, covered cycle parking facilities to serve each unit, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking facilities shall be provided prior to the first occupation of each associated unit, and in accordance with the approved details, and thereafter maintained.

GROUND:

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

6 The play space as identified on the open space plan numbered 6142-LLB-XX-XX-DR-L-0002 Rev P05 for phase 1 shall be provided in accordance with the playspace layout plan numbered IDV-PD 1872, and made available for use prior to the first occupation of any dwelling within phase 1 hereby permitted.

GROUND

To provide equipped playspace in accordance with Policy GI04 of the Thanet Local Plan

7 No further extensions to unit 108, whether approved by Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), shall be carried out without the prior permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

GROUND

To safeguard the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan.

8 No roof extensions to units 122-133, whether approved by Class B or C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), shall be carried out without the prior permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

GROUND:

To safeguard the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan.

9 The ground and first floor windows in the southern side elevation of unit nos. 108 and 121 shall be non-opening below 1.73m above the finished internal floor level, and provided and maintained with obscured glass to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 4 or equivalent; and shall be installed prior to the first occupation of these units hereby permitted and permanently retained thereafter.

GROUND:

To safeguard the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan.

10 The ground and first floor windows in the southern side elevation of unit nos. 108 and 121 shall be non-opening below 1.73m above the finished internal floor level, and provided and maintained with obscured glass to a minimum level of obscurity to conform to Pilkington Glass level 4 or equivalent; and shall be installed prior to the first occupation of these units hereby permitted and permanently retained thereafter.

GROUND:

To safeguard the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan.

11 Prior to the first occupation of unit nos. 122-133, a 2.4m high rear boundary fence with trellis shall be erected to the rear (southern) boundary of the plot, as shown on plan numbered 110222/RM/P1/SL09 Rev F. The fence shall thereafter be maintained at that height.

GROUND:

To safeguard the residential amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan.

12 Prior to the commencement of the bridleway enhancement works, detailed section and landscaping plans, that respond to on-site survey evidence and show any proposed widening, resurfacing, level changes, and planting, within and adjacent to the bridleway, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The bridleway shall be provided in accordance with the approved details.

GROUND:

To confirm the detailed layout and landscaping for the bridleway, in accordance with Thanet Local Plan Policy QD02.

13 Prior to the installation of the bunds adjacent to the northern boundary of the site, elevation, section and layout plans of the bunds, including gradient details of the intended footpath and the method of landscaping on the bunds, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The bunds and associated footways and landscaping shall be installed in accordance with the details as approved.

GROUND:

To safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan.

SITE, LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The site is located to the north of Minster, and is currently in agricultural use. Through the adoption of the Thanet Local Plan 2020, the rural confines boundary of the village has been amended to enclose all of the application site other than the area proposed for the cemetery expansion, which remains outside of the village confines.

The application site lies adjacent to Tothill Street, and adjoins properties in Fairfield Road, Greenhill Gardens, and Prospect Road/Gardens. These residential areas lie adjacent to the southern and eastern boundaries of the site. To the west of the site is agricultural land. The north of the site borders Minster Cemetery, beyond which is the Holiday Inn; and agricultural land, beyond which is the A299.

The site consists of open countryside, with hedge planting along a number of the boundaries. Adjoining the western boundary of the site is Bridleway TE29, which connects the A299 to the north with Prospect Road to the south, and provides an off-road link to an existing cycle route adjacent to Canterbury Road West.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

OL/TH/18/1488 - Outline application for the erection of up to 214no. dwellings, cemetery expansion, and associated access, with all other matters reserved.

Granted - 3rd September 2021

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The principal of developing the site for 214no. dwellings, and the access into the site, along with all off-site highway works and the securing of the financial contributions and affordable housing, was approved through the previous outline application.

Within the outline application a parameter plan was approved that identified the location of the cemetery extension site, the area of land forming an archaeological exclusion zone safeguarded from development, and the area of land where the development of housing would be restricted to one and a half storeys in height, adjoining the rear boundaries of properties within Greenhill Gardens. Vehicular access onto Tothill Street was approved, along with an emergency access onto Greenhill Gardens, and highway mitigation works were secured for improvements to Tothill Street roundabout. The resurfacing and widening of the bridleway to the western boundary of the site, and up to the A299 was also secured through the legal agreement.

This application is a reserved matters application for the first phase of development on the site, requiring consideration of the layout of development, its scale and appearance, and the landscaping within this phase, for 133no. dwellings.

The layout consists of a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced buildings at 2-storey in height, consisting of 6no. 1-bed flats, 2no. 2-bed flats, 18no. 2-bed houses, 72no. 3-bed houses, and 35no. 4-bed houses.

Parking is provided in the form of two spaces per dwelling, with an additional 40no. no visitor parking spaces. One electric charging point per dwelling has been provided.

The design is traditional, with the use of pitched roofs and the incorporation of gables and bay windows. The palette of materials consists of plain red, multi stock red, and brown brick, rustic red and grey roof tiles, and natural render and dark hardi plank cladding.

This phase of the development incorporates a locally equipped area of play with seven pieces of equipment, along with areas of open amenity space, and a community orchard to the south. The existing Bridleway is to be retained, with pedestrian and cycle connections provided through the site connecting Tothill Street with the bridleway and Green Hill Gardens and Prospect Road to the south.

Sustainable urban drainage features are provided within the soft landscape areas to the north and south of the site.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Thanet Local Plan 2020

HO1 - Housing Development
HO10 - Land at Tothill Street Minster
CC02 - Surface Water Management
GI04 - Amenity Space/Equipped Play
HE01 - Archaeology
QD01 - Sustainable Design
QD02 - Design
QD03 - Living Conditions
QD04 - Technical Standards
QD05 - Accessible Accommodation
SE05 - Air Quality
SP01 - Spatial Strategy Housing
SP14 - General Housing Provision
SP22 - Housing Types
SP23 - Affordable Housing
SP29 - SAMM Plan
SP30 - Biodiversity
SP43 - Safe and Sustainable Travel
TP01 - Transport Assessment
TP02 - Walking
TP03 - Cycling
TP06 - Car Parking

NOTIFICATIONS

Neighbouring occupiers have been notified and a site notice posted. 49 letters of objection have been received. The main concerns are:

- The application has not responded to the comments raised by local residents within the public consultation carried out,
- Presence of a swale to the rear of properties in Greenhill Gardens, and potential impact from flooding,

- Overlooking from proposed dwellings to properties in Fairfield Road, reduction of unit height is not enough,
- Traffic congestion from the number of units proposed,
- More smaller affordable units should be provided,
- Loss of hedge adjacent to Tothill Street,
- Not the correct location for a housing development,
- No clear plan for how the bridleway will be treated or delivered,
- Lack of access to healthcare and schools,
- Buildings and use of red brick not in keeping with the village,
- It will cause noise and disturbance, and pollution,
- Impact on wildlife and habitats,
- Increased flooding,
- Lack of details regarding construction management plan, phasing of off-site highway works, how electricity will be supplied,
- The drains will not be able to cope, there is inadequate capacity,
- Bridleway is an ancient bridleway and should be retained and not resurfaced,
- Lack of crossing facility at junction for pedestrians,
- Existing road infrastructure is inadequate.

Minster Parish Council -

(Final Comment)

Air Quality Assessment - No comment;

Bridleway - Lack of clarity on how the existing bridlepath will be improved to 3m wide without destroying the wildlife habitation. On this basis the Parish Council object until a suitable agreement is reached with Kent PROW officers regarding the improvements to the bridlepath;

Foul and Surface Water Drainage - Concerns regarding the future impact on the village. Site is an Environment Agency Source Protection Zone SPZ1. More detail is required on how the risk of polluting the underlying drinking water will be addressed. Parish Council object until the network reinforcement plan is made and a condition applied not to connect the new properties until the works have been completed. The current system is inadequate, therefore reassurance is needed that any necessary work will be undertaken prior to the new connections;

Design considerations - as a result of previous feedback, some houses have had a change to the shade of red brick. Whilst a wider variety of brick colour has been used, yellow brick should be included as the village enjoys a significant number of houses in that colour, and this would help the development to blend in with existing village homes;

Ecology - Pleased to see that increased efforts have been made, and there are no objections to the latest plans;

Extension of the LEAP path - no comment;

Fairfield Rd and perceived overlooking - the latest plans reduce the elevation by 30cm for plots parallel with Fairfield Road. Despite those efforts many residents are still going to be affected by loss of amenity and we therefore ask that further consideration is given to addressing these concerns. The Parish Council object until a reasonable solution is put forward;

Highways - The entrance to the site will have a significant impact on local residents, including pedestrians, many of whom are elderly. With this in mind a number of measures need to be put in place. The wide access requires a pedestrian island for road safety reasons for pedestrians; improvements to Minster roundabout should be carried out as a first phase prior to construction to mitigate disruption caused by traffic movement during construction; condition 28 only required a bound surface of 5m from the edge of the highway, which is sufficient for cars but not larger vehicles. 35m will be more suitable. The Parish Council objects unless the highway matters are addressed.

(Initial Comment)

No objection in principle, but would like consideration given to the following points:

Houses that back onto Fairfield Rd are 2-storey and there is a 1.5m retaining wall due to the land height levels, this may cause overlooking. Same row of houses has been straightened in this application compared to the original planning application, moving them closer to houses in Fairfield Rd;

Main access to the site is wide, and will require pedestrians to cross to access the cemetery and services at the top of the road. Tactile paving to both sides and a central island with bollards should be included for pedestrian safety;

Minster is a rural area and has previously been used for agricultural purposes with existing hedgerow and significant biodiversity. TDC should review the biodiversity compliance regularly on the site to ensure compliance with planning conditions;

Plans show swales running down the east and west of the site linking to a pond to the south of the site. The Parish Council are concerned how these will be maintained in perpetuity for the site to ensure that they continue to work correctly to make sure there is no future risk of flooding;

The Parish Council are pleased to see affordable units in the centre of the development, but consideration does not appear to have been given to the rural housing needs survey that was carried out. There are only 2no. 1-bed ground floor flats in the application. Housing aimed at "downsizing" older residents are welcomed, particularly if this releases existing family social housing in the village;

A local lettings plan needs to be agreed with the housing association who buy/take on the affordable housing to ensure that the houses are offered initially to those with a connection to Minster and then the surrounding villages.

Monkton Parish Council - With reference to the above planning application, this is a significant development, with associated road and other infrastructure, which borders Monkton Parish. It will have a significant knock-on effect on our Parish and for this reason we wish to make the following comments:

Many of the submitted documents are imprecise – this is clearly highlighted by other statutory consultees.

Of particular concern is:

- The lack of detail regarding the proposed changes to the Tothill roundabout. We consider the impact of the development is one of the key elements of the application. It is imperative to ensure the additional traffic flow is properly and carefully managed.

- The proposed estate junction and its impact on the existing highways system just does not appear to have been fully evaluated. In the proposed form it will simply add to the existing problems of an already seriously congested section of Tothill Street and the dual carriageway roundabout. We feel this whole issue needs to be reconsidered and a better solution found that fully takes into account what is happening now, how this will only worsen when the development is built AND also takes into account the planned additional traffic that will be using the roundabout when the future link road plans come into effect.

- There is no archaeological plan. This area of Thanet is an important archaeological area and should be respected accordingly.

- The Construction Management Plan lacks detail and precision in terms of how villagers will be protected from noise and the many other consequences of building works.

- There is lack of any clarity on the need to mitigate the potential of flood risk given the topography of the site.

Monkton Parish council hope you will take these comments into account when considering this application further.

CONSULTATIONS

KCC Highways and Transportation -

(Final Comment)

Further to recent comments, it has been noted that tracking and visibility splays have been submitted by the applicant.

Comments were made in relation to the corner junction at Units 120/121 and access arrangements. Tracking indicates that there is sufficient space for cars to manoeuvre as the access has been widened, which is acceptable.

Planting has been indicated to be kept below 0.6 metres to enable suitable visibility splays to be maintained. Suitable pedestrian visibility splays have been illustrated at all driveways. Furthermore, visibility splays of 2.4 metres x 25 metres have been illustrated for a 20mph speed environment. It is acknowledged that additional splays of 2.4 metres x 45 metres have also been provided, which is in excess for the proposed speeds.

There is tree planting within the splays of the junction at Units 1/42, 69/21, 49/90 and 73/105. Trees are also within the splay to the west at the southern junction (opposite Unit 1) into Phase 2. I understand the need for tree planting for a creation of place, but these should be moved to not interrupt the junction splays.

The traffic speeds of the development are proposed to be 20mph, whereby traffic calming ramps have been included to the north south road towards the emergency access junction. These should be designed to not preclude suitable access for emergency vehicles.

A footpath link and bollards have been proposed along the emergency access link road, which is acceptable.

(Interim Comment)

Further to previous comments dated 8 March 2023, additional details have been submitted to address these concerns.

The two square junctions are proposed which are now assumed as raised tables, in line with previous comments. The materials and details should be secured by way of a Section 38 Agreement.

The south east corner feature has had some of the planting removed to improve visibility. The layout for Units 120 and 121 remains constrained and vehicles reversing in/out of spaces would create conflicts.

Pedestrian crossing points are proposed at all junctions which link to the segregated footway along the spine road.

In line with previous comments, visibility splays are required at all junctions. In line with Kent Design Guide for major access roads, splays of 2.4 metres x 45 metres is required. Pedestrian visibility splays should be indicated as 2 metres x 2 metres either side of private accesses, with no obstruction above 0.6 metres within the splays.

40 visitor parking spaces have been illustrated, which demonstrates an uplift to offset the amount of tandem parking proposed. For the 133 dwellings in Phase 1, a total of 26 visitor spaces (0.2) are required. There are a number of a tandem parking spaces, whereby an additional 14 visitor spaces are proposed. While it is acknowledged that that this does not provide a full offset to the tandem provision, the applicant seeks to provide the majority of visitor spaces along the spine road and towards the western parameter of the site where the majority of tandem spaces are located. The provision of additional spaces seeks to make be mindful of a balance between creation of space and highway safety.

The shared spaces illustrate a 1 metres wide service margin on either side, which is acceptable.

Tracking illustrates that fire tenders are able to access all dwellings without turning on private driveways, which is acceptable.

(Interim Comment)

Further to previous comments dated 13 December 2022, additional details have been submitted. I have the following comments in relation to the amendments:

The turning areas present some minor degrees of overhang for refuse freighters. However, I am minded to accept this as the areas to the north are landscaped.

A road hierarchy plan has been submitted (110222/RM/P1/SL19 Rev A), which indicates the road widths. The spine road is a 5.5 metres in width, square junctions. These features, while landscaped, do not appear to offer a traffic calming function. I suggest that raised tables are utilised at the two central locations. I would refer the applicant to Kent Design Guide to establish preferred materials and gradients.

The corner square feature has private accesses, which I am concerned create conflict. Planting is proposed around the square which would obstruct visibility where vehicles would be required to reserve in or out of spaces in a constrained space. Units 120/121 are located immediately on the corner with limited space to access the parking spaces.

Clarity is required in relation to pedestrian crossing points at all junctions and intersections. Drawing 220824/SL18 indicates the materials (paving and block paving) proposed at the

corner square feature at Units 119-123 but I am uncertain how the segregated footway will safely navigate pedestrians at the junctions.

Visibility splays are required at all junctions. In line with Kent Design Guide for major access roads, splays of 2.4 metres x 45 metres is required. Pedestrian visibility splays should be indicated as 2 metres x 2 metres either side of private accesses, with no obstruction above 0.6 metres within the splays.

Parking has been outlined by the applicant, where KCC Parking Standards have been evaluated. Garages do not count towards the required parking standards, and they are often utilised for storage as opposed to parking. This is especially prevalent where there is a tandem parking scenario.

The current Phase 1 seeks to provide 133 dwellings, whereby 27 visitor parking spaces have been provided. The applicant has indicated that an additional 6 bays have been included. On the western secondary street (north to south) there are 11 tandem parking spaces, and 1 available visitor space. If parking takes place on the highway, this will obstruct access. I would suggest that this is addressed by the applicant. I accept that tandem parking is utilised to provide a less urbanised environment, but this should be set against highway safety and requirement to create safe places that will not be obstructed.

I wholly appreciate that requesting an exact 0.5 additional spaces per tandem arrangement would significantly alter the planning layout, but seek to request a provision that enhances the layout.

(Initial Comment)

I have the following comments in relation to the submitted details:

Tracking has been submitted to illustrate an 11.2 metre refuse freighter. It should be noted that Thanet require tracking for 13 metre long vehicles. I shall be grateful for a resubmission of tracking on this basis.

The square junction features are indicated as carriageway. It is not clear how these will be maintained. It would suggest that the corners of the feature are redundant and will merely collect debris. The features appear to have a pedestrian footway around the parameter, with no clear indication of how conflicts will be avoided.

There is a lack of pedestrian facilities at some intersections. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving needs to be indicated.

Some vehicle crossings are indicated as footway. The footways along the spine road are segregated where the space between the the road and the footway and footways do not appear to be adoptable. This can be problematical in future when adopted.

Footways are indicated around parking bays on the spine road. However, these do not connect to any further footways or pedestrian links.

A number of dwellings, ie Units 18-20 and 4-5 are located directly onto the street, with very narrow grass verges.

Details of surface materials are required.

The widths of the proposed spine road, secondary road and footways should be indicated on the plans.

The spine road has a segregated footway on either side, while the secondary roads appear to be shared space with a demarked footway to the north of the first property. Full details are required of material surfaces. KCC Highways would not adopt shared space strategies.

Highway trees are indicated, but I am unable to see a lighting strategy. This could be at odds and conflict if not shown in tandem.

Tandem parking requires an additional offset of 0.5 visitor parking bays. The location of the on street visitor parking is not consistent. 27 visitor spaces are proposed, with a high proportion of tandem parking, which needs to be addressed.

Parking restrictions should be provided at all junctions and turning heads.

KCC PROW - Overall, KCC PROW and Access agree the two-option approach, to be decided following formal response on Ecology and Biodiversity, together with agreement on our comments below :

Option A – this to come forward dependent only if supported by KCC Ecology / Biodiversity, with correct and appropriate mitigation guaranteed to be achieved. Despite the scale of works this option would involve, we would expect the character of the Bridleway to be retained. On plans provided, the hedgerow on the Western / field side of TE29 appear not to be shown and we require confirmation that this would not be the case. The Bridleway must remain on existing alignment as previously advised (this is not referenced).

Option B – the “small amount of work” referenced will require further detail. We would expect vegetation clearance as achievable given the ecology constraints, with an all weather hoggin surface as previously requested. This would enable all weather, all year use. The Bridleway will again remain on existing alignment.

Sections Drawing – again the hedgerow on the Western / Field side of TE29 is not shown and we require confirmation as above.

In the event that Option A is progressed, we would request that this is future proofed in terms of maintenance costs, with a contribution made to ensure the quality is upheld.

TDC Waste and Recycling - We have no objections to this

TDC Environmental Health -

(Final Comment)

The updated EMA and statement is accepted; along with EV points and low NOx boilers the proposals are in accordance with our technical guidance and SE05. Further to my comments dated 3 rd November, the plan showing 137 electric vehicle charging points has been submitted as well as an updated Emissions Mitigation Assessment dated 1 st Dec addressing offsetting measures. Both are accepted, although the following condition is required:

Condition: EV Charge Points

Active electric vehicle charging points as shown in drawing: 110222/RM/P1/SL17 Rev C shall be provided prior to the first occupation that they serve and thereafter maintained.

(Initial Comment)

Thank you for consulting Environmental Protection on reserved matters and submission of the Emission Mitigation Statement by Stantec dated Sept 2022.

Please can I seek clarification on the inclusion of electric vehicle charge points and low NOx boilers within the costing as these measures are standard mitigation and the EMA is in addition to this requirement so can not be included within the Statement unless they go beyond that which is required i.e. higher spec / additional number of EV points over minimum.

KCC SUDs -

(Final Comment)

In response to your emails, I can confirm that we remove our earlier objections to the approval of the Reserved Matters application (R/TH/22/1393). The reason for this is because condition 21 (detailed surface water drainage scheme) has since been discharged following the last consultation response. In view of this, we have no further objections to drainage matters pertaining to this development.

In relation to your second query, I can also confirm that the swale to the rear of the properties on Greenhill Gardens is designed for conveyance of surface water through the site from the north (including connections part way through for phase 2) to the attenuation basin in the south. With the feature being for conveyance, there will be flows within the feature following rainfall events. For durations of no rainfall, there should be no volumes contained within the feature.

Looking back through the hydraulic modelling undertaken within the Microdrainage software, the maximum recorded depth of water within the swale (piped numbers S15.023-S15.029) is recorded as 0.321m deep for the 100-year return period, including a 40% allowance for climate change. The output suggests that there is ample capacity within the swale to accommodate all these flows with no exceedances reported.

In terms of benefits for neighbouring properties, the design of the swale was not to provide protection to neighbouring properties as this feature is to serve purely as conveyance. Whilst that is the case, the simulations undertaken and mentioned above suggest there should be spare capacity within the feature to intercept any overland flows from the development entering the boundaries of neighbouring properties adjacent.

(Interim Comment)

The applicant has submitted a Proposed Drainage Strategy (prepared by Stuart Michael Associates, October 2022) and additional Technical Note (prepared by Stuart Michael Associates, January 2023). The drainage strategy proposes to manage surface water runoff through a infiltration into the ground and discharging into the public combined sewer.

1. The outline planning permission (OL/TH/18/1488) includes a condition (Condition 21) related to the submission of a detailed surface water drainage scheme. Until Condition 21 has been discharged, we cannot make an informed decision on the proposed site layout in relation to this reserved matters application and would ask that our holding objection remains.

2. The Technical Note indicates that the applicant is involved in consultation with

Southern Water to confirm that the two connections to the combined sewer systems will be acceptable at discharge rates of 4.8 l/s and 1.8 l/s. Although we hold no objection to this, we would recommend that the LPA receives evidence of this confirmation before approving the reserved matters application. If the connections are not accepted by Southern Water, the drainage scheme would require an amendment.

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.

(Initial Comment)

We have reviewed the Proposed Drainage Strategy (prepared by Stuart Michael Associates, October 2022). The drainage strategy proposes to manage surface water runoff through a infiltration into the ground and discharging into the public combined sewer.

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

1. The drainage strategy includes greenfield runoff rates which have been used to calculate the required attenuation volumes for the areas which will be discharging into the public combined sewer. We request to see the calculations used to derive these greenfield runoff rates.
2. We note that the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP, August 2018) includes a ground investigation report, soakage testing results, infiltration rates and microdrainage calculations for the infiltration. We request that further details be included within the Proposed Drainage Strategy regarding the infiltration rate for Network A and the microdrainage calculations to evidence the half drain times of the infiltration features.
3. The site is located within an Environment Agency SPZ (predominantly SPZ1, with a small area within SPZ2). We request to see evidence of consultation with the Environment Agency, to ensure that any constraints or specific requirements have been considered in these areas.
4. Network A and Network C both propose to discharge into the public combined sewer which is managed and maintained by Southern Water. We request to see evidence of the agreed discharge rates with Southern Water to ensure that the combined sewer system will have enough capacity for the surface water discharge.
5. The microdrainage calculations use FeH (1999) rainfall data. At this stage, we would expect to see the drainage system modelled using FeH (2013) rainfall data instead.
6. We note the drainage information provides details of operational performance using FEH rainfall data within the simulation criteria. The information suggests that exceedance occurs in a number of areas throughout the development during the climate changed adjusted 1 in 100 year events.

At this stage, we would expect to see a more detailed exceedance plan provided, indicating the extent of flooding with reference to actual proposed levels. It should be ensured that key access routes are not blocked and that no property flooding occurs in these areas. All exceedance must be contained within the site boundary to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere. We expect that optimisation could be made to the drainage networks to reduce exceedance volumes where it is necessary to do so. 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.

Southern Water -

(Final Comment)

No discharge of foul sewerage from the site shall be discharged into the public system until offsite drainage works to provide sufficient capacity within foul network to cope with additional sewerage flows are complete. Southern Water is currently in process of designing and planning delivery of offsite sewerage network reinforcements. As previously advised Southern Water seeks to limit the timescales to a maximum of 24 months from a firm commitment of the development.

Southern Water has undertaken a desktop study of the impact that the additional surface water flows from the proposed development will have on the existing public sewer network. This initial study indicates that these additional flows may lead to an increased risk of flooding from the sewer network. Any network reinforcement that is deemed necessary to mitigate this will be provided by Southern Water.

Southern Water and the Developer will need to work together in order to review if the delivery of our network reinforcement aligns with the proposed occupation of the development, as it will take time to design and deliver any such reinforcement.

It may be possible for some initial dwellings to connect, pending network reinforcement. Southern Water will review and advise on this following consideration of the development programme and the extent of network reinforcement required.

Southern Water will carry out detailed network modelling as part of this review which may require existing flows to be monitored. This will enable us to establish the extent of any works required.

(Initial Comment)

No discharge of foul/surface water sewerage from the site shall be discharged into the public system until offsite drainage works to provide sufficient capacity within foul/surface water network to cope with additional sewerage flows are complete. Southern Water is currently in process of designing and planning delivery of offsite sewerage network reinforcements. As previously advised Southern Water seeks to limit the timescales to a maximum of 24 months from a firm commitment of the development.

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

Regarding Surface water drainage works, we are unable to find any update regarding our sewer requisition scheme reference SWS-S98-000639. The connection to the public sewerage network can be carried out once the requisition works agreed and implemented on site.

All other comments in our response dated 22/11/2018 remain unchanged and valid.

Environment Agency - We have no further comments to make on this planning application, Beyond those in our previous comments at the outline stage, KT/2018/124914/01-L01 dated 15 November 2018.

KCC Biodiversity -

(Final Comment)

We previously commented on planning application CON/TH/22/1345 relating to the discharge of C6 for phase 1.

This application relates to the reserved matters application for phase 1 and we advise that we are satisfied that the detailed plans demonstrate that the habitat creation proposed within the mitigation strategy can be achieved.

The reptile mitigation has been updated due to changes to the layout and a temporary reptile receptor site will be created directly to the north of the site. The receptor site will be in a cemetery extension area and we understand that it is not required in the short term. The temporary receptor site will be used for at least 2 years while the grassland habitat in the north of the site has established and can support reptiles. Once the grassland has established it is likely that a precautionary approach will be used to push the reptiles in to the development site. We highlight that the management will be carried out under the watching brief of an ecologist. We would encourage the habitat within the temporary receptor site to be retained as long as possible prior to the precautionary mitigation being implemented. When we previously commented on this site we raised the following concerns:

1. A footpath is proposed directly to the Skylark and turtle dove mitigation area. It's likely that during the nesting period it's likely that any birds foraging and nesting within that area will be disturbed. Therefore we recommend that the footpath is designed to avoid going directly adjacent to that area.
2. The landscaping plan does not correspond with the planting plans. The planting plans refer to tussocky grassland but the management plan refers to rough grassland. Both documents must correspond.
3. The management plan details that the grassland within the wildflower meadow areas will be cut to 100mm. As the site is known to have reptiles there is a risk that reptiles will forage within these areas and therefore we recommend that they are cut to a minimum of 150mm to avoid killing and injury.
4. No details have been provided on the SuDS area. There is a need to ensure that it is managed appropriately.

We advise that the documents have been updated to address the above comments and no further information is required on these matters.

With regard to point 1 we acknowledge that the footpath has not been moved however it has been detailed within the document that a dense hedgerow will be established within the boundary and a fence will be erected around the site to minimise the risk of residents accessing the skylark/turtle dove mitigation area. The submitted information details that the hedgerow will be planted as soon as practically possible to give sufficient time for the hedgerow to establish before residents move in to the site.

We advise that sufficient ecological information has been submitted as part of this reserve

matters application.

(Initial Comment)

We previously commented on planning application CON/TH/22/1345 relating to the discharge of C6 for phase 1.

This application relates to the reserve matters application for phase 1 and we advise that we are satisfied that the detailed plans demonstrate that the habitat creation proposed within the mitigation strategy will be created.

However we highlight the following points/concerns and advise that they must be addressed prior to the determination of the planning application.

- A footpath is proposed directly to the Skylark and turtle dove mitigation area. It's likely that during the nesting period it's likely that any birds foraging and nesting within that area will be disturbed. Therefore we recommend that the footpath is designed to avoid going directly adjacent to that area.
- The landscaping plan does not correspond with the planting plans. The planting plans refer to tussocky grassland but the management plan refers to rough grassland. Both documents must correspond.
- The management plan details that the grassland within the wildflower meadow areas will be cut to 100mm. As the site is known to have reptiles there is a risk that reptiles will forage within these areas and therefore we recommend that they are cut to a minimum of 150mm to avoid killing and injury.
- No details have been provided on the SuDS area. There is a need to ensure that it is managed appropriately.

Comments provided for application CON/TH/22/1345

Condition 6 states: No development shall take place (including any ground works, site or vegetation clearance) until a Biodiversity Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The content of the method statement shall

include the:

- a) Purpose and objectives for the proposed works;
- b) Detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) necessary to achieve stated objectives;
- c) Extent and location of proposed works, including the identification of a suitable receptor site,
shown on appropriate scale maps and plans;
- d) Timetable for implementation, demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of construction;
- e) Persons responsible for implementing the works, including times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to undertake / oversee works;
- f) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs;
- g) Initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant);
- h) Disposal of any wastes for implementing work.

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter

We recommend that this condition is discharge for the implementation of works within phase 1.

The Biodiversity Method Statement has detailed the following:

- Dwarf Spurge – notable arable weed
- Breeding population of Slow worm and common lizards
- 19 species of birds – including skylarks and turtle doves which are red listed species.
- Fox den
- Suitable habitat for foraging bats
- Suitable habitat for hedgehogs

To mitigate the impact to the species found on site the report has detailed the following will be carried out:

- Bat sensitive lighting plan which ensure dark corridors are created on the site boundaries
- Protection of the habitats to be retained on site during construction – including reptile habitat.
- Destructive search to be carried out where reptile and hedgehog habitat is to be impacted
- Creation of a skylark plots/ foraging area for birds – restricted access to the public.
- On going surveying of the fox den to assess if badgers have utilised it.
- Creation of tussocky grassland within the wider site
- Creation of dense areas of scrub
- Enhancement of hedgerows.
- SUDS pond designed to benefit biodiversity.
- 38 bat boxes integrated in to buildings across both sites
- 3 log piles and 3 hibernacula
- 33 integrated bird nest features
- On going species and habitat monitoring.

We have reviewed the ecological mitigation strategy and we advise that we are satisfied that it is sufficient to discharge the condition for phase 1. However we highlight that site conditions may change by the time the works for phase 2 commence and therefore we recommend that the mitigation strategy is reviewed prior to the commencement of works on phase 2.

We highlight that the information within the mitigation strategy must be reflected within the submission for the following conditions/applications when they are submitted to the LPA.

Reserve matter applications

C9 - LEMP

C10 Ecological Enhancements

C40 - Lighting

TDC Strategic Housing Manager -

(Final Comment)

In the updated reserved matters Planning Statement letter dated 31/01/2023 produced by Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes it states the following:

Upon review of the submitted Proposed Housing Mix for Phase 1, this is now slightly more congruent with TDC's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) dated 2016. The proposal is offering to provide an additional four 1-bed units; therefore, this is more reflective of the village's housing needs and meets the wider overarching needs of the district, by providing 30% on site affordable housing and is compliant with policy SP23.

(Interim Comment)

Within Thanet District Council's Local Plan (adopted July 2020), SP23 requires residential schemes of 10 or more units to provide 30% of the dwellings as affordable housing, including extra care facilities falling under the Use Class C3.

The above reserved matters application is for Phase 1 of approved outline planning application OL/TH/18/1488. This proposes 133 units as part of the Phase 1 works with 30% of these as affordable housing (40 units). This is compliant with Policy SP23 and is supported by TDC's Strategic Housing department. The tenure of the AH units shall be split 70% Affordable Rent (AR) and 30% Shared Ownership (SO). This equates to 28 AR units and 12 SO units.

Upon review of the submitted unit mix and density, as stated in TDC's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) dated 2016, requires a greater number of 1 and 2 bed units. The housing need within the village of Minster has been investigated further to identify the numbers of residents bidding on available affordable rented properties through Kent Home Choice.

The results below show the total number of properties that have been advertised in Minster since January 2021 and the total number of bids received on each property:

- Three bedroom house and received 196 bids - Advertised October 2022
- Two bedroom second floor flat and received 45 bids - Advertised Sept 2022
- Two bedroom bungalow and received 81 bids - Advertised July 2022
- Two bedroom ground floor flat and received 70 bids - Advertised July 2022
- Two bedroom first floor flat and received 27 bids - Advertised February 2022
- Two bedroom first floor flat and received 24 bids - Advertised December 2021
- One bedroom bungalow for over 50's only 62 bids - Advertised July 2021
- Two bedroom ground floor flat and received 7 bids - Advertised April 2021
- Two bedroom second floor flat 23 bids - Advertised Jan 2021

The above information shows 9 affordable rented properties became available to rent within the last year. Seven of these were 2 bedroom flats. All 9 properties received a high number of people bidding on each of them. Residents outside of the village could bid on the available properties as Kent Home Choice allows residents to choose a property (with criteria applying); however, there is a strong probability that the majority of bids would have been received from people residing or with a connection to the village.

(Initial Comment)

Within Thanet District Council's Local Plan (adopted July 2020), SP23 requires residential schemes of 10 or more units to provide 30% of the dwellings as affordable housing, including extra care facilities falling under the Use Class C3.

The above reserved matters application is for Phase 1 of approved outline planning application OL/TH/18/1488. This proposes 133 units as part of the Phase 1 works with 30% of these as affordable housing (40 units). This is compliant with Policy SP23 and is supported by TDC's Strategic Housing department. The tenure of the AH units shall be split 70% Affordable Rent (AR) and 30% Shared Ownership (SO). This equates to 28 AR units and 12 SO units. In the submitted, Planning Statement Reserved Matters application Residential - Phase 1 , created by Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes dated September 2022, section 5 states the following:

Upon review of the submitted unit mix and density, it is broadly reflective of the overarching affordable housing needs across the district, as stated in TDC's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) dated, 2016. The indicative mix of affordable units across this part of the scheme is acceptable.

TDC Conservation Officer - Following a review of the proposed application I would like to state that I do not object from a heritage perspective.

Historic England - No comment

COMMENTS

This application is a reserved matters application, for consideration of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping only. The principle of the development, along with the access, was assessed and approved through the original outline application ref: F/TH/18/1488.

This application has been called to planning committee by Cllr Abi Smith, to allow members to consider the impact on highway safety, and the lack of affordable housing in relation to local requirements.

This application has also been called to planning committee by former Cllr Reece Pugh, to allow members to consider the impact on the living conditions of residents in Fairfield Road, and the changes to the path adjacent to Greenhill Gardens.

Character and Appearance

Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan states that 'the primary planning aim in all new development is to promote or reinforce the local character of the area and provide high quality and inclusive design and be sustainable in all other respects. Development must:

- 1) Relate to the surrounding development, form and layout and strengthen links to the adjacent areas.

- 2) Be well designed, respect and enhance the character of the area paying particular attention to context and identity of its location, scale, massing, rhythm, density, layout and use of materials appropriate to the locality. The development itself must be compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces and be inclusive in its design for all users.
- 3) Incorporate a high degree of permeability for pedestrians and cyclists, provide safe and satisfactory access for pedestrians, public transport and other vehicles, ensuring provision for disabled access.
- 4) Improve people's quality of life by creating safe and accessible environments, and promoting public safety and security by designing out crime.

External spaces, landscape, public realm, and boundary treatments must be designed as an integral part of new development proposals and coordinated with adjacent sites and phases. Development will be supported where it is demonstrated that:

- 5) Existing features including trees, natural habitats, boundary treatments and historic street furniture and/or surfaces that positively contribute to the quality and character of an area are should be retained, enhanced and protected where appropriate.
- 6) An integrated approach is taken to surface water management as part of the overall design.
- 7) A coordinated approach is taken to the design and siting of street furniture, boundary treatments, lighting, signage and public art to meet the needs of all users.
- 8) Trees and other planting is incorporated appropriate to both the scale of buildings and the space available, to provide opportunities for increasing biodiversity interest and improving connectivity between nature conservation sites where appropriate'.

Layout and Landscaping

The layout provides a single vehicular access from Tothill Street that extends through the site from east to west. Off the access road extending to the north are a number of cul-de-sacs. All dwellings front the road, and are setback with parking either to the front or side. A variety of dwelling types are provided, including terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings. There is some staggering in the building lines of the units, as well as the ground levels, which adds interest to the development.

The street elevation fronting Tothill Street is setback, with an access road provided parallel to Tothill Street. Hedgerow planting is retained to the front boundary, retaining the existing character of the area, and softening views of the development from Tothill Street. Whilst the hedging is retained, a strong street elevation of housing development is still provided, which complies with the existing pattern of development within Tothill Street.

Development to the north of the site is slightly more spacious than that to the centre, with greater spacing between the units, reducing the impact of longer views of the development.

Either side of the access road onto Tothill Street a large open space is provided, with the potential for landscaping. A footpath connection is provided through the open space that extends west, connecting onto the existing bridleway, improving pedestrian movement from Tothill Street.

The Locally Equipped Play area is provided to the centre of the site, making it easily accessible for all future occupiers of the development, as well as existing residents within the village, who could access it from either the bridleway or Tothill Street.

Landscaping is provided to all boundaries of the development, with a wide landscaped area provided to the east of the existing bridleway, along with a further area of wide open space. The landscaping in the locations shown provide wide buffers between the development and the boundaries of the site, providing landscaping enhancements and screening of the development from wider views.

The main access road through the site contains layby parking, which achieves parking for visitors, with tree planting in between that creates tree lined streets, in accordance with paragraph 131 of the NPPF.

To the south of the site only landscaping is proposed, which is incorporated within the sustainable urban drainage systems. An emergency vehicular access onto Greenhill Gardens is provided, as approved through the outline application, and footpath connections from this access road, as well as along the southern boundary, are provided through the site to create additional pedestrian and cycle connections through the development and onto the bridleway.

A swale is provided adjacent to the rear boundary of properties in Greenhill Gardens, which provides a buffer between development within any future phase and the neighbouring properties in Greenhill Gardens.

Hard surfacing consists of a mix of tarmac and block paving, with a hoggin path provided in the location of the bridleway, and to the south of the site through the open space. Tarmac has been used for the main access road, and a number of the layby parking spaces. Amendments were requested reducing the extent of tarmac. Amended plans have been submitted showing more of the layby visitor parking spaces changed to block paving, which will help to reduce the extent of tarmac within the development. The hard surfacing as now proposed is considered to be acceptable.

Overall the proposed layout and landscaping achieves a low density housing development that is in keeping with the rural character of the village, with good pedestrian and cycle connections through the site, and landscaping enhancements adjacent to the boundaries of the site. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan.

Open Space

Policy GI04 of the Thanet Local Plan requires that new residential development make provision for appropriate amenity green space and equipped play areas to meet the standards set in tables 10, 11 and 12 within the policy.

Within the outline application, 214no. units were approved, resulting in a predicted population of 514. Using this figure, the following open space provision within the site is required: 0.3 hectares of amenity green; 0.13 hectares of children's playspace; 0.92

hectares of semi-natural greenspace; and 0.1 hectares of allotment space. Whilst the table requires public park and garden provision, this is only viable on the larger strategic housing sites. The proposal provides a large area of open space due to the reduced number of dwellings that was approved when compared to the allocation number, which was a result of part of the site to the north being unable to be developed due to the archaeological exclusion zones, and therefore being used for landscaping purposes instead.

With this submission an open space plan has been submitted highlighting the size of different landscape elements within the site. The plan includes 3.54ha of Semi-Natural Open Space (compared to the 0.92ha required), 0.75ha of Amenity Green Space (compared to the 0.3ha required), 0.29ha of Play Space (compared to the required 0.13ha), 0.14ha of Allotment /Community Orchard (compared to the 0.1ha required), and the 0.99ha future cemetery expansion. The open space provision significantly exceeds the requirements of Policy GI04, and is therefore considered to be acceptable.

The play area provided through this phase of development forms one of two play areas to be provided within the overall development, with the remaining play area (LAP) located to the centre of the other phase(s). A playspace layout plan has been submitted that shows there will be seven pieces of play equipment within the play area, including a slide and climbing tower, double swing, roundabout, springer, stepping logs, stretch posts and a balance beam. The Fields In Trust guidance recommends a minimum of six pieces of equipment, and therefore the number, along with the quality of equipment proposed, is considered suitable as an equipped play area within the site to serve smaller children.

The proposal is considered to comply with Policy GI04 of the Thanet Local Plan, and therefore the open space provision is considered to be acceptable.

Scale and Height

Condition 42 of the outline permission stated that the future reserved matters application should show no development exceeding 1.5 storeys in height in the area to the rear of Greenhill Gardens, and no development exceeding 2-storey in height to eaves level elsewhere in the site. The application for phase 1 does not include the land to the rear of Greenhill Gardens for development.

The elevation plans for the proposed development show all units of 2-storey in height to eaves level. A storey heights plan has been submitted showing all units will be 2-storey, with the garage structures single storey in height. The street elevation plans further show that none of the unit types contain dormer windows at roof level, so whilst the condition would have enabled accommodation within roof space, this has not been proposed.

The height of the proposed units are typical of a 2-storey building, at approximately 8.7m to ridge level.

The scale and height of the proposed development is considered to be acceptable, and in keeping with and sympathetic to the scale and height of development within this village location, in accordance with Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan.

Design

The proposed design incorporates traditional style properties with pitched roofs. A mix of unit types has been proposed, including 12 house types and the flats, which is encouraged within this village setting where a variety of unit types exist, particularly within Tothill Street.

A street elevation plan has been submitted, which shows the proposed street elevation within the internal access road, as well as the outward facing street elevations to the north and west facing the open countryside. A street elevation has also been submitted for the entrance access road, and onto Tothill Street, which is considered to have the potential for the greatest impact given its visibility in the context of surrounding development.

The street elevations facing the internal access road provide a mix of semi-detached, detached and terraced units. The units have wide windows at ground floor level with porch canopies and window headers. Some of the units are provided with bay windows at ground floor level. Due to the ground level change the roof forms are broken up, with the eaves and ridge heights stepping up as the ground levels change. Whilst some of the units have flush front elevations, others contain gable projections.

In terms of the palette of material, the proposal includes a mix of plain red, multi stock red, and brown brick, rustic red and grey roof tiles, and natural render and dark hardie plank cladding, which helps to provide enough variety within the development to appear in keeping with the area.

Concern was originally raised with the Tothill Street elevation, which contained only a few building types and the use of limited materials. As this elevation will be viewed in the context of other development in Tothill Street, these units will have the greatest visual impact. Amended plans were requesting introducing bay windows to some of the front elevations, in keeping with the neighbouring terrace, and introducing a greater number of materials. The plans as amended provide two of the units with double bay projections, two with gable projections, and the use of both red and brown bricks, the two roof tiles, and the render and cladding to two of the properties. Whilst some concern has been raised by residents that yellow brick has not been used, there are a variety of material types present within Tothill Street, including the materials proposed, and therefore the proposed palette of material is not considered to be out of keeping with the area.

The design of the development, as amended, is considered to be appropriate for this edge of village location, and in keeping with the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with Policy QD02 of the Thanet Local Plan.

Impact on Landscape Character Area

The approval of the outline application for 214no. dwellings units was on the basis of a net density of 30.5 dph, and a gross density of 16.5 dph, which is low, and sympathetic to the open rural character and setting of the surrounding area.

The site lies within the Chalk Plateau Landscape Character Area, which is characterised as a generally flat or gently undulating landscape, with extensive, unenclosed fields under

intensive arable cultivation. This open landscape is fragmented by the location of large scale developments such as the former airport, Manston Business Park and a sporadic settlement pattern to the north of the airport. The character of this area is also defined by the proximity of the edges of the urban areas. This character area contains the highest point on the island at Telegraph Hill. The elevated plateau results in long distance panoramic views to the south over Minster Marshes and across Pegwell Bay and, in the west, across the Wantsum. The elevated central chalk plateau also forms a skyline in many views back from lower landscapes in Thanet, including the coast and marshlands.

Policy SP26 of the Thanet Local Plan states that development proposals should demonstrate how they respect and respond to the character, key sensitivities, qualities and guidelines of the relevant landscape character areas, as detailed in the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA), and that all development should seek to avoid skyline intrusion and the loss or interruption of long views of the coast and the sea.

A Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal was submitted with the outline application. The appraisal confirmed that there are locally accessible views of the site from the public right of way to the west, and the cycle route/footpath to the north. Views from the south and east are limited due to the presence of properties and hedgerow along Tothill Street. Due to the land rising and plateauing to the north the report stated that there are no perceptible medium and long-distance views from the north. Views from the north, however, would be possible from the access road below the A299, along with long distance views from the A299 when approaching from the west where boundary landscaping is less dense.

The appraisal concluded that the proposed development would appear to have no or very limited landscape effects, given the infill location of the application site, and its location adjacent to existing development that provides a backdrop to the development.

The assessment took into account the opportunities and constraints of the area, along with a sensitive design approach, to create a landscape strategy for the site, which proposed to limit harm to the setting of the site, and the views from the surrounding area. The strategy sought to create a landscaping buffer along the western boundary of the site, strengthening boundary vegetation with native species that also benefit biodiversity; retain and connect onto existing footpath/bridleway/cycle links; create wetland channels and features as part of the surface water management scheme; provide public open spaces, small copses, and other tree/hedgerow planting within the site to enhance the landscape setting of the site; along with other ecological enhancements. It was determined that any future landscaping scheme should be based upon these landscape strategy principles.

The submitted landscaping strategy provides soft landscaping to the northern boundary of the site, which includes the provision of bunds. These are necessary in this location to enable boundary planting given the restriction of these areas as archaeological exclusion zones, which would normally prevent tree planting due to root damage to archaeology. Details of the bunds would be required by condition, but the principle of the bunds in this location, together with the planting on top of the bunds, will help to soften the appearance of the development in long distance views.

The western boundary soft landscaping proposal includes the strengthening and enhancement of the boundary planting, with a 4m wide hedgerow proposed along the length of the boundary, along with new tree planting.

The proposed landscaping will enhance views from the north and west, and soften the appearance of the development through the landscape improvements provided. The proposed development is therefore considered to comply with Policy SP26 of the Thanet Local Plan, and paragraph 170 of the NPPF.

Impact upon Living Conditions

Policy QD03 of the Thanet Local Plan states that 'all new development should be compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces and not lead to the unacceptable living conditions through overlooking, noise or vibration, light pollution, overshadowing, loss of natural light or sense of enclosure; be of appropriate size and layout with sufficient usable space to facilitate comfortable living conditions and meet the standards set out in QD04; include the provision of private or shared external amenity space/play space, where possible; provide for clothes drying facilities and waste disposal or bin storage, with a collection point for storage containers no further than 15 metres from where the collection vehicle will pass'.

Impact on Neighbouring occupiers

The site adjoins the rear boundaries of residential properties in Fairfield Road and Greenhill Gardens, along with some properties in Prospect Gardens. The site lies opposite properties in Tothill Street. The majority of dwellings within Fairfield Road and Greenhill Gardens are single storey in height; with the properties in Tothill Street mainly 2-storey in height.

The approved parameter plan with the outline application showed the height of development to the rear of properties in Greenhill Gardens restricted to 1.5 storeys in height due to the shallow depth of their gardens of approximately 16m-20m. All other development was restricted to 2-storey in height to eaves level through the outline consent.

The phase of development being considered through this application does not include development to the rear of Greenhill Gardens or Prospect Gardens. The only properties to be affected by this development are those in Fairfield Road. Properties in Fairfield Road have deeper gardens of approximately 34m, however, there is a large ground level difference between the properties in Fairfield Road and the application site, with the application site on a higher ground level than the neighbouring properties. Additional information has been sought during the application to determine the impact on the residents. Section plans have been submitted.

The originally submitted section plans did not show the full relationship between the existing properties and the proposed development. Full section plans that show the difference in ground level between the buildings was requested, along with a reduction in ground level of the proposed dwellings, and consideration of the rear boundary treatment. Full sections have since been submitted for three different locations along Fairfield Road, including nos. 5, 13, and 27 Fairfield Road. The slope of the garden within these sites is illustrative, as access was not achieved for a full survey, but the ground level of the properties is accurate based

upon topographical survey data. In addition, the level of the proposed dwellings has been dropped by 300mm and the 1.8m high fence proposed to the rear of the plots has been increased in height to 2.4m. The rear gardens serving the existing properties are shown in the sections as measuring approximately 31m-34m in depth, and the proposed gardens are shown as 11m-14m in depth. A minimum distance of 42m between the rear elevation of the proposed development and the rear elevation of the existing properties is therefore achieved. Whilst there may be some overlooking of the neighbouring properties from the proposed first floor rear facing windows, the distance, along with the raised fencing height, (which will limit views towards neighbours from proposed ground floor windows and garden area) is considered to limit overlooking to an acceptable level. The impact upon the living conditions of properties in Fairfield Road is therefore considered to be acceptable, subject to a condition that requires the provision of a 2.4m fence along the southern boundary of the proposed dwellings. Such provision will also help with security for neighbouring gardens.

There is an existing retaining wall to the side of no. 114 Tothill Street, which lies adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. Information has been sought as to whether any further works regarding land stability will be required in this location. The agent has advised that the existing retaining wall will remain and that level changes in this location are not significant so the only action needed is likely to be the introduction of gravel boards to boundary treatment within the site.

No.114 lies adjacent to the proposed development. The nearest proposed dwelling, plot 108, fronts Tothill Street but is setback further into the site. There is a distance of 5m between the proposed side elevation of plot 108 and the shared boundary with no.114 Tothill Street, and a total distance of 7.5m to the closest side elevation of no.114. This distance is considered adequate to prevent any unacceptable loss of light or outlook for no.114.

A double garage is proposed in front of the proposed dwelling on plot 108. The garage is 7m from the side elevation of no.114, and single storey in height with the roof pitching away. Given the distance, single storey height, and the limited number of windows that exist within no.114's side elevation, the impact upon light and outlook from the garage is considered to be acceptable.

Within the side elevation of plot 108 is a ground floor secondary lounge window, and a first floor bathroom window. Due to the ground level difference both windows could overlook the rear garden of no.114. As such a condition has been added that requires both windows to be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7m from the internal ground level. This is the same for plot 121, which also overlooks the rear end of the rear garden of no.114 and neighbours beyond, with a distance of only 2.5m to the shared boundary. Subject to this safeguarding condition the impact upon the privacy of the occupiers of no.114, and neighbours beyond in Tothill Street, is considered to be acceptable.

Given the proximity and relationship of plot 108 with no.114, any future development on plot 108 may impact upon the living conditions of no.114. A condition is therefore proposed removing permitted development rights for future development on plot 108 in order to safeguard the future living conditions of the occupiers of no.114 Tothill Street.

Concern has been raised by neighbours regarding the potential for additional noise and disturbance from the proposed development. The main vehicular access proposed into the site is to the north, onto Tothill Street. The access is a significant distance from the nearest residential properties in Fairfield Road. Opposite the proposed access is a bus stop within a layby area, beyond which is the side elevation of the nearest neighbouring property in Tothill Street, and then the garden areas of the adjacent neighbours. Given the distances and the orientation of the nearest neighbouring properties, it's not considered that vehicle movements in and out of the proposed access or within the development would cause significant noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers. Furthermore, a number of landscape buffers are provided within the development, which will help with some reductions of noise and disturbance. The proposed residential use is in keeping with the surrounding residential use, and is therefore compatible with neighbouring uses.

The impact upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers is considered to be acceptable, and in accordance with Policy QD03 of the Thanet local Plan, and paragraph 127 of the NPPF.

Impact on Future occupiers

In terms of the impact upon future occupiers, each dwelling has been provided with doorstep playspace, in accordance with Policies QD03 and GI04 of the Thanet Local Plan.

Within the proposed development the units have been assessed against Policy QD04, which states the minimum space requirements of the units in relation to the nationally described space standards. The smallest 1-bed unit is 50sqm, which meets the minimum requirement of 50sqm; the smallest 2-bed is 77sqm, which exceeds the minimum requirement of 61sqm; the smallest 3-bed is 89sqm, which exceeds the minimum requirement of 84sqm; and the smallest 4-bed unit is 133sqm, which exceeds the minimum requirement of 97sqm. Each of the units therefore achieves the nationally described space standards as set out within Policy QD04 of the Thanet Local Plan.

There is space within each garden area for refuse storage and clothes drying facilities, including the flats, as well as private amenity space for each units where required.

The impact upon the future occupiers of the development is considered to be acceptable, and in accordance with paragraph 130 of the NPPF and Policies QD03 and QD04 of the Thanet Local Plan.

Highway Safety

The principle of 214no. dwellings on the site and the associated vehicle movements from this has been approved through the outline application, along with the access into the site from Tothill Street, and the provision of an emergency access onto Greenhill Gardens. The legal agreement for the outline application secured £166,000 towards improvements at Spitfire Junction, and approved plans for the development included improvements to the Tothill Street arm of the roundabout junction through its widening to create an additional lane leading on the roundabout. This combined mitigation was considered to appropriately offset the harm to the highway network.

Concerns have been raised by residents regarding the width of the access mouth, and the lack of a central island for pedestrians when crossing the junction. The design of the access was approved through the outline application. Vehicle swept path plans and a safety audit was submitted with the outline application, and uncontrolled crossing points were approved at the access and on Tothill Street. No requirement for a pedestrian refuge island at the access mouth was identified.

The advice of KCC Highways on this matter has been sought. They've advised that the proposed access is 7.3 metres wide, with a 2 metres wide footway on either side, and a 10 metres wide radii at the junction with Tothill Street. An uncontrolled crossing point at the access was approved, along with a further crossing point in Tothill Street, which was moved further south, closer to the desire line in relation to the existing footway.

KCC has seen the concerns raised by residents through this application, and noted the comparisons made to Laundry Road, which has a central refuge island; however, KCC advise that Laundry Road is considerably wider, approximately 16 metres in width at the crossing point, when compared to the 7.3m proposed for the development access. KCC further comments that Fairfield Road to the south of the proposed site is approximately 7 metres in width and does not have a pedestrian refuge island.

A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was submitted with the outline application, and the width of the access was not raised as a concern, and therefore at the time of determination a refuge island was not a requirement. KCC comments that whilst the access is overly wide (by approximately 0.5m), the width of the highway narrows within the site to a more appropriate alignment for the number of dwellings. Furthermore, the inclusion of a refuge island at the access would preclude the access of larger vehicles such as refuse freighters, and the access has been designed to enable two large vehicles to pass and vehicles exiting to the north or south to not cross excessively into oncoming traffic flows on Tothill Street. The presence of a refuge island would therefore be likely to result in other highway safety issues.

The access has previously been approved, with the benefit of a road safety audit, and therefore the redesign of the access is not a consideration for this application, especially given that there is no evidence to support the need for this additional feature.

Layout and Parking

Through this reserved matters application, consideration is to be given to the internal road layout and parking provision proposed. A single access road enters the site from Tothill Street, extending south before heading towards the western boundary. A number of smaller cul-de-sacs and through routes extend off this access road. This road layout works well for achieving adequate housing depths, with clear access to the LEAP and open space to the west. Parking is provided in the form of 2 spaces per dwelling, and one space per flat, with approximately 27no. visitor parking spaces originally proposed. Each property has a garden, where cycle parking can be accommodated.

KCC Highways were consulted. They advised that further information was required to prove the layout acceptable. This included tracking plans for a 13 metre long vehicle, clarification

on the square junction features, an increased number of tactile paving and dropped kerbs at intersections for pedestrians, an increase in footpath connections, increased depth of grass verges, details of the surface material, road widths indicated on the plans, and an increased number of visitor parking due to the tandem parking layout shown for some properties.

Amended plans and additional details were submitted addressing the concerns raised by KCC. KCC further advised that the tracking plans were acceptable, but the use of a raised table for traffic calming should be introduced to the centre of the site. Some planting was identified as causing visibility problems, and evidence of pedestrian visibility splays was sought, along with further clarity on the pedestrian crossing points at all junctions and intersections. Six additional visitor parking spaces were introduced, but KCC considered them poorly located, with a further increase in the number achieved if possible.

The final amended details submitted show the provision of 40no. visitor parking spaces, suitable pedestrian visibility splays to all driveways, and visibility splays of 2.4 metres x 25 metres illustrated for a 20mph speed environment. Trees have been removed where they would impact upon visibility, and a footpath link and bollards has been proposed along the emergency access link road. KCC has advised that they are now satisfied with the plans as amended, and consider the impact upon highway safety to be acceptable.

A plan identifying the location of the electric vehicle charging points has been provided, which shows one electric vehicle charging point per dwelling, which is accepted.

The impact upon highway safety is considered to be acceptable, subject to safeguarding conditions.

Public Right of Way

A public right of way (bridleway) exists along the western boundary of the application site. The bridleway connects the A299 to the north with Prospect Road to the south. The bridleway is not currently hard surfaced, and having visited the site it would appear that the formal bridleway is on the line of a dry ditch that is overgrown and unusable as a form of access. Instead an alternative walking route has been created to the west of the bridleway on land belonging to the adjacent landowner, which appears to be used by local residents.

The outline application secured within the S.106 agreement the 'resurfacing and widening of bridleway TE29 in its entirety, to a minimum width of 3m, in accordance with such reasonable requirements and specifications, which shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Council'. A further bridleway contribution of £29,000 was secured for the resurfacing and widening of the bridleway between the north-western corner of the site and the A299, which due to separate land ownership would be carried out by KCC if an agreement could not be made between the applicant and the adjacent landowner to carry out the works.

The proposed site layout plan did not originally show the bridleway on the plans, or connections to the bridleway from within the site. Amended plans have been submitted showing the location of the bridleway on the western boundary. The location of the bridleway as shown on the proposed site layout plan is in the same location as the existing bridleway

shown on a plan produced by KCC, with the only difference being the proposed widening required through the legal agreement, and as such no diversion of the public right of way is taking place.

The existing bridleway is within an overgrown ditch and unusable. In order to make the existing bridleway usable, the infilling of the ditch is required, before it can be resurfaced with Hoggin (a mix of gravel, sand and clay bound together). Illustrative section plans have been submitted showing how this engineering work would take place, however these plans are not being approved at this stage due to a full survey of the bridleway being required. A condition requiring accurate section plans to be submitted prior to any works to the bridleway taking place is therefore proposed.

Concern has been raised by residents that this is an ancient bridleway and should be protected. Whilst it is appreciated that the ditch does offer some visual benefits, it is not usable as a bridleway in its current condition, and therefore the benefits of infilling and resurfacing the ditch so that it can be used by pedestrians, cyclists wishing to connect onto the existing cycle path along the A299, and horse riders, is in officers view considered to outweigh the visual harm resulting from the infilling of the ditch. Furthermore, these works have already been approved through the outline application.

KCC's Public Rights of Way Officer has been consulted, and visited the site prior to providing their formal advice. During the outline application they advised that the bridleway serves as a cycle path connection onto the strategic cycle network, as well as a footpath link, and that in the future the bridleway would provide important pedestrian, equestrian and cycle access to and from the development site, whilst linking to a wider walking, equestrian and cycling network, providing opportunities for sustainable travel in the area, which is what led to the justification for mitigation in the form of the resurfacing and widening of the path. However, they have advised that it could be possible to retain the ditch without its infilling if the local community feel that the retention of the ditch is important, as the bridleway has now been added to their yearly vegetation clearance programme meaning that the ditch will be cleared and made usable for residents as a footpath (although it would not be usable as a bridleway without its widening).

In order to address the concerns raised by residents, the applicant has made a further submission of plans that includes two options for the bridleway. Option A retains the existing location of the bridleway, but involves its widening to 3m and resurfacing, with pedestrian and cycle connections into the site. This option involves the removal of existing vegetation adjacent to the bridleway, but its replacement with new planting, including a 4m wide hedge.

Option B involves the retention of the ditch, with no infilling, and the retention of the existing boundary vegetation. Option B does not involve any widening of the bridleway, so it could not be used by horses, but the plan submitted shows that the bridleway could still be connected into the site, with some excavation works to provide sloped paths to connect onto the bridleway with retaining walls.

In officers view Option A is the preferred option, as this would enhance pedestrian, cycle and equestrian movement, however, this application offers an alternative option should the retention of the ditch be considered a preferred option.

The approval of the bridleway works is not required to be resolved through this reserved matters application, as they are required to be submitted under a separate submission required through the legal agreement; however, the layout and landscaping of the site is a consideration for this application. The only difference each option would have upon the landscaping is the location of the hedge, which would either be retained in its current position through option B, and strengthened, or relocated through option A to beyond the bridleway widening. The detailed landscaping adjacent to the boundary could be conditioned to be submitted alongside the bridleway works under the legal agreement, and therefore it is not necessary for the bridleway works to be determined at this stage.

The Public Rights of Way Officer has been consulted and made some comments on both options. On option A they've advised that the character of the bridleway should be retained, including the retention of hedgerow to the west of the bridleway. This is in a different land ownership, and therefore would not be intended for removal through this application. They've also advised that the bridleway should remain on the same alignment, which the agent has confirmed within their submission. On option B they've requested further details in relation to the vegetation clearance, and requested the provision of a hoggin surface and again for it to be retained on the same alignment. Through this option the ditch is retained, and therefore it would be the same alignment. It has been queried with the agent whether the ditch would be resurfaced and they've confirmed that this would be possible and can be resolved through the submission under the legal agreement. Therefore it is considered that the principle of the layout and landscaping of the bridleway can be approved through this reserved matters application, subject to a safeguarding condition for the detail to be agreed.

Size and Type of Housing

Policy SP22 of the Thanet Local Plan states that proposals for housing development will be expected to provide an appropriate mix of market and affordable housing types and sizes having regard to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) recommendations as may be reviewed or superseded. It further states that the Council will encourage proposals for residential development to incorporate a higher ratio of houses to flats (as recommended in the SHMA).

In terms of market housing provision the application originally proposed 57no. 3-bed houses, and 36no. 4-bed houses. When considering the proposed provision against the SHMA recommendations, the provision is closer to the need identified through the 2021 assessment, where there is a greater need for larger family units, and as such it can be considered that the proposed unit mix size addresses current need. A revised schedule of accommodation has been submitted (to address the concerns raised below), with the ratio changing slightly to 58no. 3-bed houses and 35no. 4-bed houses. This slight change raises no concerns.

In terms of affordable housing, the original submission proposed 2no. 1-bed flats, 2no. 2-bed flats, 23no. 2-bed houses, and 13no. 3-bed houses. The SHMA seeks a higher number of smaller affordable units. Concerns were also raised by the Council's Strategic Housing Officer, and local residents, regarding the lack of smaller affordable units within the scheme. An amended schedule of accommodation has been submitted to address the concerns

raised. The proposal now offers 6no. 1-bed flats (an increase of four), 2no. 2-bed flats, 18no. 2-bed houses (a reduction of five), and 14no. 3-bed houses (an increase of one).

The Council's Strategic Housing Officer has reviewed the revised accommodation schedule and is of the view that it is more in keeping with the SHMA, with the additional 4no. 1-bed units being offered, and is more reflective of the village's housing needs, whilst also meeting the wider overarching needs of the district.

A mix of flats, terraced units, semi-detached units, and detached units have also been provided, achieving a good mix across the site. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy SP22 of the Thanet Local Plan.

The proposal offers 4no. M4(3) accessible units and 36no. M4(2) accessible units, with the units identified on the proposed site plan. This complies and exceeds the requirements of Policy QD05 of the Thanet Local Plan.

Affordable Housing

The legal agreement submitted with the outline application agreed to the provision of 30% affordable housing on site.

Within this application, 40no. units are proposed as affordable, which achieves the 30% provision required through the legal agreement for this phase. The units are identified on the proposed site plan, and consist of a number of terraced and semi-detached housing units towards the centre of the site, along with two small flat blocks.

The Council's Strategic Housing Officer has raised no concerns with the number or location of the units.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy SP23 of the Thanet Local Plan and paragraph 65 of the NPPF.

Biodiversity

Within the previous outline application an ecological assessment was submitted with the application, which concluded that no protected species had been identified within the site. Mitigation measures were proposed for breeding birds and reptiles. For breeding birds this included limiting construction work to outside of bird nesting season, and for reptiles this included a method statement detailing the measures to be undertaken prior to site clearance to minimise potential impacts upon reptiles.

KCC previously raised no concerns subject to conditions requiring the submission of a biodiversity method statement (condition 6), ecological design strategy (condition 10), and landscape and ecological management plan (condition 9); with the landscape and ecological management plan aimed at helping to achieve biodiversity net gains within the site.

With this application submission the Biodiversity Method Statement has been submitted, which includes proposed ecological enhancements within the site, along with mitigation

measures and biodiversity monitoring. The Method Statement confirms that updated surveys have been undertaken, with minor changes to habitats noted. Boundary habitats were found to have increased suitability for reptiles due to a reduction of management on site, a mammal hole of a size/shape suitable for badgers identified, and Dwarf spurge *Euphorbia exigua* noted, which is in decline and listed on the rare plant register. As a result, updated Phase 1 surveys for reptiles, breeding birds and badgers have been undertaken.

The surveys have confirmed a presence of slow worms and common lizards on the site, which will be relocated to retained habitat to the north (within the cemetery). A total of 19no. Bird species were recorded. Whilst the proposal will result in some loss of arable habitat, the site is surrounded by arable habitat and therefore there is not likely to be an impact to the local population. Foraging habitat is intended to be provided through new landscaping within the application. The badger survey showed that badgers are not likely to be using the burrow at this time.

The mitigation strategy intends to retain scrub, hedgerow and trees where possible; collect seeds for the dwarf spurge and translocate them to the south west of the site where it will mostly resemble an arable habitat; erect exclusion fencing to prevent reptiles entering the construction zones; carry out a destructive search for reptiles of the vegetation to be removed within the eastern boundary for the vehicular access; the provision of skylark and turtle dove foraging plots; checking of burrows prior to construction works; and precautionary measures in relation to hedgehogs.

In terms of enhancements, the open space will include wildflower grassland, with native tree, hedge and shrub planting to the north-western boundary (including a bund within the archaeological exclusion zones), and scattered mixed native trees within the site; and the swale and SuDs pond will be planted with native emergent and wildflower grassland, and the pond will include a gently sloping bank to allow access for birds, hedgehogs and other biodiversity. Twenty bat boxes are proposed within phase 1 (with a further 18no. bat boxes within phase 2), three log piles and three hibernacula are proposed within the grassland habitat for reptiles, and twenty bird brick boxes are proposed.

KCC Biodiversity has been consulted and initially advised that they were satisfied that the detailed plans demonstrated how the habitat creation proposed within the mitigation strategy that has been approved under condition 6 of the outline consent will be created. However, they highlighted a number of concerns. These included the provision of a footpath directly to the Skylark and turtle dove mitigation area, which could result in disturbance during nesting season; the landscaping plan and planting plans not corresponding with one another; the intention to cut grassland within the wildflower meadow areas to 100m instead of the recommended 150m; and details required for the SUDs area. In addition, queries have been raised regarding the bridleway resurfacing and widening works and the impact that this would have upon the ecology to the western boundary of the site.

An amended Biodiversity Method Statement has been submitted. The document provides changes to the ecological construction programme, by providing a temporary reptile receptor site within the area to be used for the churchyard expansion to the north of the site, translocating reptiles to the field margins, before into the receptor area prior to the commencement of works, followed by the erection of reptile exclusion fencing. It is then

intended to gradually displace the reptiles from the temporary receptor area back into the phase 1 open space following completion of landscape works within these areas.

The document also now states that ditch vegetation currently on the existing bridleway line will be removed under ecological supervision, and that around the skylark foraging area hedgerow planting is being brought forward to take place prior to commencement of works in phase 1, so that it will have matured and become established prior to the occupation of phase 2. Planting along the western and southern boundaries of the site with thick thorny native dense continuous native scrub will also be brought forward into this phase to provide further nesting opportunities for turtle doves, along with the provision of a supplementary feeding site whilst these areas and the foraging plots become established.

KCC Biodiversity has been re-consulted. They have confirmed that they are satisfied with the information submitted, and the bringing forward of hedgerow planting as soon as practically possible to give it time to establish before residents move into the site. Whilst the footpath adjacent to the skylark/turtle dove foraging area has not been moved, however the planting of a dense hedge and the erection of fencing around this area will limit any impact, and therefore KCC have accepted this proposal.

In terms of the amended reptile mitigation, KCC have raised no concerns subject to the management being carried out under the watching brief of an ecologist, and the habitat within the temporary receptor site being retained as long as possible prior to the precautionary mitigation being implemented.

In terms of the ditch and planting to the western boundary of the site, in the location of the existing bridleway, the biodiversity method statement describes it as a dry ditch, with scattered hawthorn/blackthorn/wild apple scrub and pockets of semi-improved grassland and tall ruderal vegetation. The field margins are noted to offer potential for arable/cereal margin species to be present, while the small area of semi-improved grassland along the western boundary track/ dry ditch in combination with scattered scrub offers structural variation and plant diversity that is rarely seen elsewhere on the site. The marginal habitats are considered to be of ecological importance in the context of the Site.

The resurfacing and widening of the bridleway to 3m, which was secured through the outline planning application, will result in much of the existing vegetation adjacent to the boundary needing to be removed, and the submitted illustrative section plans for the ditch show how they intend to infill the ditch to create a flat and usable surface.

Option B has since been submitted, which provides the option to retain the existing ditch, along with the vegetation to either side, and the provision of additional planting to strengthen the boundary planting. KCC Biodiversity has advised that the details contained within the letter identifying the two options do comply with the details agreed through the Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy, subject to a hedge width of 4m being maintained, which the agent has confirmed.

Subject to safeguarding conditions, the impact upon biodiversity is considered to be acceptable, and in accordance with Policy SP30 of the Thanet Local Plan and the NPPF.

Drainage

A drainage strategy has been submitted with the application in relation to both surface water and foul drainage.

Flood risk and Surface Water Drainage

The site is located predominantly within Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1, with a small area of Source Protection Zone 2 located towards the northern boundary of the site. The submitted drainage strategy confirms that a risk assessment has been carried out and identified that the discharge of all surface water to ground would exceed target concentrations of potential courses of contamination, and would therefore present a risk to underlying aquifers. Only surface water runoff from roof areas can therefore be infiltrated to ground (providing the system is fully sealed). All other surface water runoff will discharge to Southern Water combined sewers.

The submitted drainage strategy confirms that the principle of providing three separate networks for surface water drainage was agreed through the outline application. One network had surface water runoff collected from the roofs that would be attenuated and discharged by infiltration to the ground.

The second network had surface water runoff from the road and hardstanding areas that would be controlled with the use of SUDs features such as permeable paving, swales, bioretention filter drain, and basin before discharging to the public combined sewer at a restricted discharge rate.

The third was specifically for plots 108-114, adjacent to Tothill Street, with the surface water to roofs, hardstanding areas and the roads being collected into one network and discharged through permeable paving, filter drains and underground attenuation crates before discharging into the public combined sewer in Tothill Street. This was a result of the site level constraints.

The reserved matters application follows the principles and details set out and agreed through the outline application.

KCC SUDs has been consulted and initially requested further details/evidence to support the figures provided within the strategy; however, these details were submitted under the condition discharge application for condition 21 of the outline consent. Upon further review KCC SUDs has advised that they remove their objection to the reserved matters application as the condition application for condition 21 (detailed surface water drainage scheme) has since been approved and discharged following the last consultation response, and therefore they have no further objections to drainage matters.

Some concerns have been raised by neighbouring residents in Greenhill Gardens regarding the swale located to the rear of their boundary. The view of KCC SUDs on the location of the swale has been sought, and whether this could cause any flooding concerns for neighbouring residents. KCC has advised that the swale is designed for the conveyance of surface water through the site from the north (including connections part way through for

phase 2) to the attenuation basin in the south, and therefore during periods of high rainfall there would be water flows within the swale. At all other times the swale is unlikely to contain water.

KCC has advised that based upon the modelling evidence submitted, the maximum recorded depth of water within the swale is recorded as 0.321m deep for the 100-year return period, including a 40% allowance for climate change. The output suggests that there is ample capacity within the swale to accommodate all these flows with no exceedances reported, and the presence of the swales will prevent any overland flows of surface water into neighbouring properties. The swale is therefore a useful feature that will be beneficial in preventing flooding for neighbouring properties.

Foul Drainage

The submitted drainage strategy confirms that there are two proposed foul networks. One network will collect foul water from the majority of houses via a gravity system, and will connect to the existing southern water combined sewer in Prospect Road.

The second network will collect foul water from the houses (7 dwellings) in the North Eastern side of the site near Tothill Street, and will discharge into the existing southern water combined sewer located at Tothill Street.

The Environment Agency has raised no concerns. Southern Water has advised that no discharge of foul water sewerage from the site into the public system shall occur until off-site drainage works have been carried out to provide sufficient capacity within the network to cope with additional sewerage flows.

Southern Water has advised that they are currently in the process of designing and planning delivery of off-site sewerage network reinforcements, and that it may be possible for some initial dwellings to connect, pending network reinforcement.

The principle of the connection is agreed, subject to the reinforcement works identified above. Southern Water will be carrying out these works and liaising separately with the applicants under a separate process under the Water Industry Act 1991, and therefore it is not a consideration for the planning application.

The proposed impact on groundwater and flood risk is therefore considered to be acceptable, and in accordance with Policies CC02 and SE04 of the Thanet Local Plan.

Other Issues

Air Quality

An Emissions Mitigation Statement has been submitted with the application, which follows on from the air quality assessment submitted with the outline application. The total emissions mitigation cost identified for the development is estimated at £266,749 over a five year

period, and therefore this cost needs to be used to make air quality improvements through the development.

The emissions mitigation measures identified within the emissions mitigation statement includes the use of low NOx boilers, electric vehicle charging points, bike stores, welcome packs, cycle and footway improvements, and landscaping and planting, which cumulatively provides a cost of approximately £381,080, which exceeds the mitigation cost identified.

Environmental Health have been consulted and initially raised concerns that electric vehicle charging points and low NOx boilers are standard mitigation, and therefore should not be included as part of the mitigation for the damage costs.

A technical note has been received that replaces the costs for the electric vehicle charging and boilers with the off-site highway financial contribution that is being used towards improvements at the Spitfire junction, along with the cost for the off-site highway works in Tothill Street, which again will improve vehicle movement on the highway, and reduce the impact to air quality.

The Environmental Health officer has advised that the technical note, which updates the emissions mitigation measures, is accepted; along with the standard mitigation EV points (which have been identified on the plan and show 137no. electric vehicle charging points) and low NOx boilers. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Environmental Health's technical guidance and Policy SE05 of the Thanet local Plan, subject to a safeguarding condition requiring the provision of the EV spaces as active electric vehicle charging points.

Heritage

The site boundary is 180m from the Holiday Inn, a Grade II Listed building. Between the listed building and the application site is the cemetery, along with substantial planting. Given the distance it is not considered that the proposed development would be viewed within the context of the listed building, and as such the development would not impact on and would preserve the setting, and significance of, the listed building. The Conservation Officer has confirmed that she has no objections from a heritage perspective.

Archaeology

The outline application approved a parameter plan that contained archaeological exclusion zones. The proposed layout plan is not showing any development within the archaeological exclusion zones. The only things within these areas are footpath connections, part of the access road, and landscaping. Landscaping is usually only considered acceptable if particular species are used that limit root damage to archaeology, or if bunds are used to raise the roots from the archaeology. In this case bunds are proposed adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. On this basis the proposed planting is not likely to cause harm to archaeology. The impact upon archaeology is therefore considered to be acceptable, and in accordance with Policy HE01 of the Thanet Local Plan.

Special Protection Area Mitigation and Appropriate Assessment

European sites are afforded protection under the Conservation and Habitats and Species regulations 2010 (as amended the Habitat Regulations) and there is a duty placed upon the competent authority (in this case TDC) to have regard to the potential impact that any project may have on those sites.

The Council undertook a Habitat Regulations Appropriate Assessment with the outline application, and a contribution was secured towards the SAMM to mitigate the harm.

Natural England raised no objections to the assessments and therefore the proposed development, subject to the mitigation measures that were secured. The application is therefore not restricted by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

Conclusion

The proposed layout, scale, and design of the development is considered to be in keeping with the village character, and the pattern of development within Tothill Street. The proposed landscaping is considered to achieve landscape enhancements within the site, with new tree, hedge and wildflower planting proposed adjacent to the northern, western and southern boundaries of the site. Adequate open space provision is achieved, which significantly exceeds the minimum requirements.

Additional information has been submitted to determine the impact upon neighbouring occupiers, which on balance, is considered to be acceptable, subject to safeguarding conditions that remove permitted development rights for the closest plot, and require boundary fencing be installed to a height of 2.4m to part of the southern boundary.

The road layout and parking provision proposed, along with the internal pedestrian visibility splays, is considered to be acceptable, with an acceptable impact upon highway safety. New footpaths are provided through the site that create connections onto the existing bridleway from Tothill Street, as well as to the south, which will improve permeability.

The enhancement of the bridleway is proposed, either through infilling and resurfacing, or through improvements that enable the retention of the ditch. Either option enables connections into the site and improved use of the existing bridleway.

Drainage has been dealt with via condition, although the layout plan shows the location of swales and basins that will reduce flood risk, and prevent overflowing to neighbouring land.

The Biodiversity Mitigation Strategy has been dealt with via condition, although details have also been submitted through this application that provide details of how existing habitats and protected species will be preserved and relocated during construction works and beyond.

The proposed development is considered to have an acceptable impact upon the surrounding area, and comply with the parameters set out within the outline application. It is therefore recommended that Members approve the application subject to safeguarding conditions.

Case Officer
Emma Fibbens

TITLE: R/TH/22/1393

Project Land On The West Side Of Tothill Street RAMSGATE Kent

