

Public Document Pack



Democratic Services
White Cliffs Business Park
Dover
Kent CT16 3PJ

Telephone: (01304) 821199
Fax: (01304) 872452
DX: 6312
Minicom: (01304) 820115
Website: www.dover.gov.uk
e-mail: democraticservices@dover.gov.uk

23 May 2016

Dear Councillor

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** on Thursday 26 May 2016 at 6.00 pm, the Minutes which were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

Also enclosed are additional viability assessment documents for Application No DOV/15/00123 (Land at 191 and Forge Bungalow, London Road, Temple Ewell) which the Planning Officer has asked me to circulate.

4 **MINUTES** (Pages 2-16)

To confirm the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 April 2016.

12 **APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00123 - LAND AT 191 AND FORGE BUNGALOW, LONDON ROAD, TEMPLE EWELL** (Pages 17-41)

Erection of 10 semi-detached dwellings and creation of vehicular access and parking spaces (existing bungalow and garage to be demolished)

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nicky", written over the printed name "Chief Executive".

Chief Executive

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 21 April 2016 at 6.01 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor F J W Scales

Councillors: B W Butcher
J S Back
S F Bannister
T A Bond
B Gardner
N S Kenton
D P Murphy
A F Richardson
P M Wallace

Officers: Principal Planner
Principal Planner
Planning Officer
Planning Officer
Planning Consultant
Planning Consultant
Development Planner (KCC Highways, Transportation and Waste)
Ms Sarah Mason (Savills)
Planning Delivery Manager
Locum Planning Solicitor
Trainee Solicitor
Democratic Support Officer

The following persons were also present and spoke in connection with the applications indicated:

<u>Application No</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>
DOV/15/00525	Mr Ian Bull	Mr Christopher Norris
DOV/15/01035	Mr Nicholas Mulholland	Mr James Tillitt
DOV/16/00063	-----	Mr Miles Thompson
DOV/16/00090	Mr Gary Holmes	Mr Jordan Godden
DOV/16/00021	Ms Grace Mollart	-----
DOV/15/00457	Mr Robert Hughes	Mr Jeremy Proctor
DOV/16/00057	Councillor S C Manion	-----
	Mr Alan Dewar	
DOV/16/00072	Mr Nicholas Blake	-----

127 APOLOGIES

It was noted that Councillor T J Bartlett had sent an apology for absence.

128 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 12.4, it was noted that Councillor N S Kenton had been appointed as a substitute member for Councillor T J Bartlett.

129 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor B Gardner made a Voluntary Announcement of Other Interests in respect of Application No DOV/16/00090 (Former public conveniences, Route One Cycle, 70 Beach Street, Deal) by reason that he was a member of Dover District Council's Regulatory Committee that had granted the café a premises licence.

130 MINUTES

In respect of Minute No 124, Councillor Gardner requested that 'would' be substituted for 'could' in the final sentence.

In respect of Minute No 122, Councillor Gardner requested that the minutes be amended to reflect the fact that the Principal Planner had assured the Committee that the oversight in not notifying Members of the viability assessment would not recur.

Subject to the amendments to Minute Nos 122 and 124, the minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

131 ITEMS DEFERRED

The Chairman advised Members that Application No DOV/15/00525 was dealt with elsewhere on the agenda. Independent engineers had been commissioned to draw up a scheme in relation to Application No DOV/15/00952 (Aylesham Village Expansion) which would come back to the Committee in due course.

132 APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00525 - LAND SOUTH OF NEW DOVER ROAD, CAPEL-LE-FERNE

The Committee viewed plans and photographs of the application site which had been allocated for the development of 50 dwellings under Policy LA24 of the Council's Land Allocations Local Plan (LALP). The Principal Planner advised that the site lay between New Dover Road to the north and Old Dover Road to the south, with Helena Road to the west and the caravan park to the east. A bridleway abutted the western boundary of the site. The Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) was located to the north and south of the site, with Heritage Coast also lying to the south.

Members were advised that paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was relevant. This stated that the Local Planning Authority's (LPA) policies could not be considered up-to-date where it was unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing sites. In this circumstance, paragraph 14 of the NPPF, which presumed in favour of sustainable development, had to be considered. This set out that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the NPPF as a whole or against specific policies in the NPPF which indicated that development should be restricted. That said, the Committee should give considerable weight to the fact that this site had been allocated for housing within the LALP, a recently adopted Local Plan document. However, the overall presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 14 took precedence.

It was proposed to develop the northern part of the site with 40 dwellings, and to reinstate chalk grassland on the southern part. Whilst a settlement boundary was

shown across the site in the LALP, as outlined in Policy LA24, the exact boundary between the developed and undeveloped parts of the site would be established on the basis of ecological evidence. This evidence had been provided with the application and, although the developable part of the site was shown to extend beyond the settlement confines, the size of the chalk grassland and the developed area was considered acceptable. With reference to paragraph 4.24 of the report, Members were advised that proposals to plant trees on the southern boundary of the site were no longer appropriate as ecologists had advised that they would have a negative impact on the grassland. This was a material consideration which was considered to justify setting aside criterion iii of Policy LA24.

Of the 40 dwellings, six would be affordable homes, equating to 15% provision. A further contribution of £295,000 would be made towards off-site affordable housing. Officers were satisfied that the proposals were in keeping with surrounding properties. On the eastern side, the proposed dwellings would be no closer than 10 metres to the boundary with the caravan park. External lighting would be secured by condition in order to minimise any impact on the AONB. Southern Water had confirmed that there were no public surface water sewers serving the site and alternative means of disposal would therefore be necessary. Southern Water, along with Kent County Council (KCC) as the local flood authority, had suggested conditions to address concerns over surface water disposal.

Turning to access and highways, Members were advised that a contribution of £54,000 would be made to resurface the bridleway on the north side of New Dover Road in order to promote it as a pedestrian route. The proposed vehicle access point to the site fell within the 60mph speed limit zone, and a right-hand turning lane was proposed at the junction, along with a splitter lane at the eastern end. The applicant had offered to fund the relocation of the existing entry gateway – currently west of the site on New Dover Road - to a location east of the application site. A Construction Management Plan had been submitted which indicated that construction traffic would use the A20 in order to avoid right-hand turning into the site. In addition, the applicant had indicated that a temporary 40mph zone could be provided.

In assessing the application against the NPPF, the Principal Planner clarified that the benefits of the development were that it would provide 40 dwellings within an allocated site in a sustainable location. The relocation of the gateway, upgrading of the bridleway and reinstatement of the chalk grassland would also provide benefits. Whilst there would be a loss of countryside and an impact on the Heritage Coast, Officers had concluded that these adverse impacts were broadly commensurate with what was anticipated in the LALP allocation (under Policy LA24) and did not outweigh the benefits, and the granting of planning permission was therefore recommended.

Councillor A F Richardson referred to Policy LA24 which stated that planning permission should only be granted if the proposals were sensitively designed in terms of height, massing, etc, and provided there would be no adverse impact on the countryside. The Kent Downs AONB Unit had raised objections on the grounds that the development would have an adverse impact due to its design and inappropriate landscaping. In response, the Principal Planner clarified that the AONB Unit's comments had been in relation to the original scheme which had a different layout and a frontage onto New Dover Road. Following discussions with the applicant, a landscape buffer had been created to protect the AONB. Although the AONB Unit had not been re-consulted on the amended scheme (due to a general change in the consultation arrangements with the AONB Unit), the Council's

own expert was satisfied with the proposed safeguards to the AONB. Councillor Richardson expressed surprise that the AONB Unit had not been re-consulted, and suggested re-consultation should be normal practice in future.

Whilst he accepted the principle of development on the site which was established by the LPA's planning policies, this proposal pushed the boundaries. Not only was he uncomfortable with the uncertainty surrounding the split between development and biodiversity, but also by the fact that there would be encroachment beyond the settlement confines by 20 metres. He disliked the proposed designs of the dwellings which did not relate well to, or complement, the existing dwellings in the village.

Councillor Gardner pointed to the huge difference between the figures in the developer's viability assessment and the one commissioned by the LPA. The developer had initially indicated that they could not afford to provide any on-site affordable housing. Although they were now offering six units, he remained concerned that the LPA was not getting what was due to it. The developer was only offering two-bed houses which would be grouped in one corner of the site which he considered unacceptable. For this reason, together with the encroachment beyond the settlement confines, the application should be refused.

Councillor F J W Scales commented that the Parish Council and local residents had supported this site as being the best one for development. However, the proposals, albeit an improvement on the originals, were still not suitable for Capel. The case for encroaching beyond the settlement confines by 20/30 metres had not been substantiated, and the amount of land left for chalk grassland was insufficient. Although the relocation of the 40mph speed limit was to be welcomed, he suggested that it should start from the roundabout, with the A20 to the east of the site. Further discussions should be held between the Parish Council and KCC to consider this matter. He had held discussions with the Parish Council which, like him, firmly believed that the splitter lane should be in place before construction commenced. He was struggling to accept that the wider public benefits, such as tarmacking the bridleway and moving the gateway, outweighed the harm caused by developing outside the settlement confines since he would have expected these measures to be taken for a smaller development which did not adversely impact upon the AONB. He accepted that the reinstatement of chalk grassland would be a cost to the developer. However, ecological improvements to the southern half of the site had been an essential element in the allocation of this land for development.

Councillor T A Bond also raised concerns about encroachment beyond the settlement confines, the impact on the AONB and reduction in the size of chalk grassland. In his view, the development was not sustainable. The local primary school had limited places which would mean children having to travel by car or bus to attend school. He was also concerned that further information about drainage had yet to be provided. The pedestrian crossing should be moved further down, and measures should be taken to slow traffic given that the proposed access point was in a dangerous location.

The Principal Planner advised that the Council's Housing Manager had been consulted and was content with the mix of affordable housing provision. Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) generally preferred to have affordable housing units grouped together, particularly on smaller sites, as this arrangement was more practical to manage. Members were reminded that the precise boundary between development and biodiversity would be based on ecological evidence. Although the size of the chalk grassland area had diminished, the fact remained that it would not

be reinstated without this development activity. The Council's Ecology Officer was satisfied that the biodiversity proposal was a proportionate response which would improve, and add to, the existing grassland. KCC had not requested a financial contribution for school places due to there being another school nearby.

The applicant had indicated that they were willing to address local concerns with their Construction Management Plan but, at the same time, this had to be viable and practical. Officers could look at the wording of this to address matters raised, including potentially the provision of a right-hand turn facility before construction. However, a balance had to be struck between the applicant's and local interests, and any condition which was likely to prevent construction commencing in a timely manner might be viewed as unreasonable.

Southern Water had consulted KCC's Flood Team and both were content with conditions being attached to deal with drainage and flooding matters. In response to Councillor Bond, the Principal Planner added that, if Southern Water had considered there to be any risks, details of drainage arrangements would have been sought before the grant of permission. As it was, its view was that there were no inherent risks and the attachment of conditions would adequately address drainage matters.

The KCC Development Planner advised Members that the 40mph speed limit zone would be temporarily extended to the island to cover the site and access to the A20. This was not a planning requirement and it would be unreasonable to expect the applicant to extend it to the junction on a permanent basis. Turning right from the site was not an unusual arrangement and there was adequate visibility. Studies indicated that speeds along this road were close to the 40mph speed limit, and further evidence would be needed if the zone was to be extended. Councillor Scales stated that an opportunity was being missed to use the developer's £20,000 contribution to fund a permanent, more satisfactory solution. The Development Planner raised concerns about where additional funding, if needed, would come from, but suggested that the Parish Council approach KCC for discussions.

The Principal Planner reminded the Committee that, in the absence of a 5-year housing supply, the policies that defined the village confines were considered out of date. The Committee also needed to be satisfied that the adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweighed any benefits. Furthermore, if Members were minded to include a lack of affordable housing in the grounds for refusal, they needed to be aware that this would go against expert advice that 15% was now an acceptable figure. He advised that this figure had been reached through further negotiations and a re-examination of the costs that would be incurred by the developer on this site.

Councillor Gardner remained concerned that the conclusions of the two viability reports were so far apart. He questioned why the LPA was ignoring the advice of its own expert whose original investigations had concluded that twelve affordable housing units could be provided on site. Councillor Richardson accepted that 30% could not be provided. However, he believed that 15% was insufficient and wanted to understand why it was not possible to achieve a higher number.

The Savills representative advised that they had independently reviewed the viability assessment provided by the developer, examining costings, finance, profit return, etc. There was room for manoeuvre with each of these elements which were inevitably also open to some negotiation. The biggest difference between Savills' initial assessment and the developer's had been build costs. At the request of the

LPA, Savills had prepared a second appraisal, this time using Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) build cost figures relating to Dover district and taking into account the quality of build offered by the developer. The result was an increase in build costs of £9 per square foot; a small increase which had a big impact on overall build costs. Also of relevance was that the developer had made an assumption about the level of off-site financial contribution required. However, it turned out that this would be lower. It was clarified that utilising the off-site financial contribution towards affordable housing on-site would add only one or two extra units. It was also clarified that any increase in market values had been taken into account when calculating costings. It was stressed that Savills had gathered its own evidence, made its own calculations regarding build costs and had not been influenced by data put forward by the developer.

RESOLVED: (a) That, notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation, Application No DOV/15/00525 be REFUSED on the following grounds: (i) That the proposed development would encroach beyond the settlement confines of Capel-le-Ferne and, by reason of the design, height, style and massing of the development, would appear out-of-keeping with the prevailing character of the area and, in particular, would adversely affect the scenic beauty and character of the adjoining Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coast, contrary to the provisions of Policy LA24 (ii) of the Dover District Land Allocations Local Plan, Saved Policy CO5 of the Dover District Local Plan and the objectives of Paragraph 114 and 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework; (ii) That insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the development would be unable to provide 30% affordable housing (on site) and, as such, the proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policy DM5 of the Dover District Core Strategy; and (iii) By reason of grounds 1 and 2 above, the proposal would not constitute sustainable development in that the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits contrary to Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(b) That the precise wording of the refusal notice be delegated to Officers, in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee.

(The Chairman relinquished the chairmanship of the meeting for this item on the grounds that it was an application for a site within his ward and he wished to play a full part in the debate, unfettered by being Chairman. Councillor B W Butcher assumed the chairmanship of the meeting for this item.)

133 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 7.43pm for a short break and reconvened at 7.50pm.

134 APPLICATION NO DOV/15/01035 - MOT CENTRE, 46 WEST STREET, DEAL

The Committee viewed photographs and drawings of the application site. The Planning Consultant advised that the application sought permission for the erection of a three-storey block containing 17 one and two-bedroom apartments and maisonettes. The existing building had already been demolished. The application had been subject to significant negotiations and had generated a lot of public

interest. Since the report was written, an additional letter had been received which raised no new material considerations.

The building now proposed was of a similar height and bulk to the garage/testing station which had previously stood on the site, but would be set further forward. The design originally submitted was considered too bulky but, following amendments, was now considered of an acceptable standard for a site on the edge of a residential/town centre area. Whilst no parking would be provided, this was considered acceptable in what was a highly sustainable location. It was recognised that the development would add to pressure on existing parking facilities, but KCC Highways had raised no objections.

Flooding was a key consideration. The Environment Agency had raised no concerns, but sought the attachment of conditions regarding floor levels. The KCC Flood Team had made a holding objection on the basis that the proposal sought to discharge surface water into the existing foul water sewer. As an update, the Committee was advised that Southern Water had since agreed to such an arrangement which would need to be carefully conditioned. Private amenity space was another significant issue. Officers did not consider that the new building would be overbearing or lead to an additional loss of light for existing residents as it was similar in scale to the building which had previously stood on the site. The site stood opposite a row of trees and shrubs which, together with public realm space nearby, would provide screening and prevent overlooking.

In summary, the proposal accorded with Policy DM5 of the Council's Core Strategy in terms of the number of affordable housing units that would be provided. A financial contribution to library book-stock would also be made. The applicant had addressed a number of issues raised in relation to the original application. Although concerns over parking were recognised, this was a highly sustainable location. Subject to the conclusion of a Section 106 agreement and the finalisation of drainage details, it was recommended that planning permission be granted.

Councillor Gardner raised concerns over construction traffic and the storage of building materials. Surrounding streets were already oversubscribed in terms of parking capacity, and Sainsbury's had indicated that they would not allow residents to park in its car park. There were no apartment blocks in this part of the ward and the proposal was out of keeping with the area. Although the affordable housing provision was to be welcomed, the proposal would crowd a small site. He recommended that the application be refused. Councillor Richardson agreed, commenting that parking was a real issue and it was unrealistic to think that residents would use Pay and Display car parks. In design terms, he agreed that a pastiche design was not the answer, but neither was a big modern block that bore no relation to surrounding buildings. A contemporary design could work but this was not it. Councillor B W Butcher agreed that the design was inappropriate for the area and needed to be revisited. The Chairman referred to other industrial/commercial buildings nearby, such as Sainsbury's, which could not be ignored. However, he agreed that the proposed design was not sufficiently residential. He clarified that, for him, refusal on the grounds of parking was related to highway safety rather than convenience.

The Planning Consultant advised Members that, if they were minded to refuse the application on the grounds of parking, this would be difficult to defend at appeal since the site was in a sustainable location, close to the town centre, train station, bus services, etc. It was clarified that the Core Strategy sought a maximum of one parking space for a one or two-bedroomed flat.

RESOLVED: That, notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation, Application No DOV/15/01035 be REFUSED on the following grounds: (i) The proposed development, if permitted, would result in unacceptable overlooking into the gardens of adjoining properties to the detriment of the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers; and (ii) The proposed development, if permitted, would be of a scale and form that would fail to respond positively to the character and appearance of the locality and Conservation Area.

135 APPLICATION NO DOV/16/00063 - THE BARN, NORTH OF 7 MILLFIELD, ST MARGARET'S-AT-CLIFFE

Members were shown photographs and plans of the site which was the subject of the application. The Planning Consultant advised the Committee that the application sought planning permission to vary three conditions and remove one condition imposed when planning permission was granted in 2015 for the mixed use of a barn building. Since the report was written, a letter had been received from the applicant's agent requesting that a site visit be held. In addition, in the event that the Committee granted planning permission to vary Condition 6, an amendment to condition II of the report would be necessary. This would enable the LPA to re-issue planning permission to reflect the amended hours of operation.

The applicant was seeking to vary Condition 2 in order to insert a set of double doors into the internal partition in order to provide an internal link between the two areas of the barn. In addition, a variation to Condition 5 was sought to swap over the uses of the two sections of the barn building. This would result in the agricultural use taking place in the front section of the barn and the building use taking place in the rear section. The applicant had suggested that these conditions would enable plant and machinery to be moved around within the barn rather than around the building which was likely to cause harm to the condition of the ground and to the character and appearance of the countryside. The final variation was to extend the hours of operation from 8.00am to 7.30am on Mondays to Saturdays and the hours of use on Saturdays from 1.00pm to 6.00pm. The removal of Condition 3 which related to noise insulation was also sought, the applicant arguing that it was not necessary since the other conditions would regulate the use of the building.

Discussions at the Planning Committee meeting held on 9 April 2015 at which planning permission had been granted, had centred around balancing business use with the need to safeguard residential amenity and the countryside, etc. Members were referred to the previous Committee report at Appendix 2 and asked to note the Planning Inspector's comments. Officers were concerned that permitting the variation of Conditions 2, 3 and 5 would fail to safeguard residential amenity and the countryside. For these reasons, refusal of a variation to these conditions was recommended. Officers considered that a slight extension to the hours of operation as a variation to Condition 6 was reasonable, as set out at paragraphs 3.19 to 3.21 of the report. It was therefore recommended that this variation be approved.

Councillor Bond commented that he agreed with the Officer's recommendation, but could not accept a variation to Condition 6. The applicant had a history of non-compliance so he failed to see why the Committee should give him more. Councillors Richardson and P M Wallace concurred and recommended that the application should be refused. The Chairman added that the Committee had genuinely tried in its determination the preceding year to identify conditions that would enable it to grant planning permission and support the business. However,

the proposed variations would lead to an intensification of use and refusal was the correct decision.

Councillor Gardner questioned why enforcement action had not been taken against the applicant. The Committee had been assured when granting planning permission in 2015 that the conditions were reasonable and enforceable. Should the applicant fail to comply with these conditions, enforcement action must be taken. Councillor N S Kenton questioned whether the conditions were enforceable and whether the applicant's activities could be monitored.

In response, the Planning Consultant advised that it was easier to enforce and monitor physical changes such as the partition. Monitoring the hours of operation was more difficult although, at the Committee's behest, the installation of CCTV had been included in the previous conditions in order to identify breaches in operational hours. Officers had the right to monitor conditions on an ongoing basis even if, for example, the applicant had already erected the partition. Action could be taken against a breach of condition if this action was taken within ten years. Enforcement action could be taken within four years for operational development and ten years for uses of land. He accepted that applicants could not be relied upon to provide their own evidence of breaches. In such circumstances, the LPA often relied upon complaints. Members were reminded that a one-off breach of conditions did not necessarily mean that a continuous breach was taking place. Evidence of a continuous breach was needed in order to take enforcement action. It was confirmed that the applicant had been requested to provide CCTV footage of activity at the barn on a specific date and time.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/16/0063 be REFUSED on the following grounds:

- (i) The variation of Condition 2 would give rise to an unrestricted and uncontrollable intensification of the use of the barn building for business storage which would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby residential properties, contrary to Policy DM3 of the Dover Core Strategy and paragraphs 17, 56-59 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework;
- (ii) The removal of Condition 3 would fail to demonstrate that the future living conditions of the occupiers of nearby residential properties would be adequately safeguarded, contrary to paragraphs 17 and 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework;
- (iii) The variation of Condition 5 would give rise to additional commercial activities and comings and goings within the open countryside and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). These would result in an incongruous and obtrusive encroachment into the landscape which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the rural area, the setting of the Public Right of Way, the setting of the Conservation Area and the natural beauty and landscape of the AONB, contrary to paragraphs 17, 15, 75 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework;

(iv) The variation of Condition 6 would give rise to a further intensification of the use of the land that would be likely to result in harm to the residential amenities of occupiers of nearby properties.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any reasons for refusal in line with the recommendations and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

136 APPLICATION NO DOV16/00090 - FORMER PUBLIC CONVENIENCES, ROUTE ONE CYCLE, 70 BEACH STREET, DEAL

The Committee was shown photographs of the site. The Principal Planner advised that the application site was in Flood Zone 3 and within the Middle Street Conservation Area. The proposal sought planning permission for the creation of a seating area to the south of the café, providing 7 tables and 28 chairs in a temporary enclosure which would be removed outside opening hours. Concerns had been raised regarding the width of the walkway that would maintain access to the promenade. At its narrowest it would be 1.3 metres wide which was considered sufficient to provide adequate access for wheelchairs and pedestrians to the promenade from the area to the south of the building and vice versa. The seating area was well separated from the residential area, and there were no concerns surrounding anti-social behaviour. Representations had been received about the lack of cycle parking facilities at the café. To address this concern, it was recommended that an additional condition be imposed which would require that parking stands for 16 bicycles be provided prior to the first use of the seating area. It was understood that the applicant had served the requisite notice on KCC which owned the land on which the seating area was to be provided.

Councillor Gardner commented that, whilst the application was a reasonable one, Deal promenade was a popular place for pedestrians and, without more cycle storage at the cafe, the proposals were likely to obstruct access. There had previously been problems with cycles being left haphazardly, thus blocking the footpath. The Chairman stated that it would be important to establish where the cycle racks would go as this would affect access. The Principal Planner advised that permission had previously been granted for cycle storage on the eastern side of the café. Details of this had been provided as conditioned, but the racks had yet to be installed – although he understood they were on order. The intention to put netting around the area was welcomed by Councillor Bond who thought this was essential to ensure that the 1.3-metre access was maintained. The Principal Planner confirmed that the approved plans were conditioned and included a reference to the 1.3-metre access.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/16/00090 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

(i) A list of the approved plans;

(ii) Details of the proposed temporary means of enclosure to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the first use of the outside seating area and the means of enclosure removed from the land at the end of each day's close of business and stored within the building;

- (iii) No more than 7 tables and 28 chairs may be placed on the site at any one time;
 - (iv) All tables, chairs and barriers should be removed and stored within the building overnight;
 - (v) Hours of use of outside seating area shall not be outside of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Sunday and Bank Holidays;
 - (vi) Eight bicycle stands (for 16 cycles) to be provided prior to first use of the external seating area.
- (b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

137 APPLICATION NO DOV/16/00021 - 47 HIGH STREET, DEAL

Members were shown photographs and plans of the application site which was in Deal town centre and Flood Zone 3. The Planning Officer advised that the application sought permission for a change of use from a retail shop (Use A1) to a coffee shop (Use A3) with internal seating for 36. No external alterations were proposed. Since the report was written further letters of objection and support had been received, and these now totalled 92 and 10 respectively. The new representations raised no new issues that were not already covered in the report. Officers considered that the change of use would promote competitiveness and increase footfall into the town centre, and therefore recommended that permission be granted.

Councillor Gardner stated that he was content with the proposal, provided an informative was added stating that planning permission for outside seating must be sought. However, Councillor Bond disagreed, stating that such an informative was unnecessary. Councillor Butcher commented that the number of other cafés nearby was irrelevant in Planning terms.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/16/00021 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Timescale of commencement of development;
 - (ii) A list of approved plans;
 - (iii) Prior to the erection or installation of a flue/extraction fan/air-conditioning unit, details shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.
- (b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

APPLICATION NO DOV/15/00457 - LAND ADJOINING PENTIRE HOUSE, THE LEAS, KINGSDOWN

The Committee viewed photographs and plans of the application site which lay outside the settlement confines where development would normally be restricted, and within the AONB and Heritage Coast. The Principal Planner advised that The Leas was an area of low density development, undulating in nature, with chalk grassland to the east of the site and a golf course to the west. The proposal was for the erection of a detached, three-bedroomed dwelling which would be partially sunken at ground-floor level.

In the absence of a 5-year housing supply, which rendered the Council's planning policies out-of-date, the Committee was required to consider paragraphs 14 and 49 of the NPPF. These stated that permission should be granted unless the development was unsustainable or specific policies within the NPPF directed that permission should be refused. Since the dwelling would be in an isolated and unsustainable location, paragraph 55 of the NPPF was relevant. This set out four criteria for when isolated housing might be acceptable, including one relating to developments of exceptional quality or innovative design. The applicant claimed that this criterion was met. However, whilst the combination of proposed technologies, materials and form were considered to be innovative, the dwelling was not sensitive to the characteristics of the area and would fail to significantly enhance its immediate setting. The three remaining criteria were also not met.

Views of the dwelling from the west would be limited, and the removal of the concrete wall would be beneficial in terms of visual harm. However, the development would be highly visible from The Leas and the Saxon Shore Way to the east. Existing development along The Leas was characterised by generous plots with large separation distances between dwellings, leading to a feeling of spaciousness overall. The proposed dwelling would occupy a significant proportion of the site, and appear confined and congested within its plot when compared with neighbouring properties. Officers therefore considered that the proposed dwelling would increase the density of development and cause harm to the special character and appearance of the area which was within the AONB and Heritage Coast. Refusal was therefore recommended.

Councillor Butcher stated that the proposed dwelling would have a detrimental visual impact, with a design that was not sensitive to the surrounding area. He supported refusal of the application. Councillor Bond understood the Officer's conclusions but considered these to be subjective. In his view, the design was quite tasteful and he was minded to approve, although he recognised that granting permission could lead to similar applications. Councillor Kenton agreed that the design was to a high architectural standard and suggested that the dwelling would enhance its surroundings. Councillor Bannister agreed that it was an exciting design. However, he could not support the proposal because it was in an unsustainable location, and wild and open spaces such as this one should be protected. Councillor Richardson stated that, whilst he liked the design, the dwelling was in the wrong place. He was in two minds but, on balance, would not support the proposal because the site was an isolated one within the AONB and Heritage Coast. The Chairman also liked the innovative design but shared concerns about the sensitive location.

RESOLVED: That Planning Permission for Application No DOV/15/00457 be **REFUSED** on the following grounds:

- (a) The site lies outside of the settlement boundaries and, as such, the erection of a dwelling represents an unsustainable and inappropriate form of development within the countryside and within the designated Heritage Coast, contrary to Core Strategy Policy DM1, Saved Dover District Local Plan Policy CO5 and paragraphs 17, 58, 60, 61, 64, 69, 70, 73, 74, 109 and 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- (b) The proposed development, by virtue of its location and scale, would urbanise the site in a sensitive countryside location, causing a severe adverse effect upon the scenic beauty of the countryside and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and would result in the loss of green space and natural elements, contrary to Core Strategy Policies DM15, DM16 and CP7, Saved Dover District Local Plan Policy CO5, paragraphs 17, 58, 60, 61, 64, 109 and 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies SD1, SD3, LLC1 and HC3 of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2014-2019.

139 EXTENSION OF MEETING

The Chairman advised the Committee that, under the Council's Constitution, it was required to pass a resolution to continue the meeting beyond 10.00pm.

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9, the Committee does proceed with the business remaining on the agenda.

140 APPLICATION NO DOV/16/00057 - LAND SOUTH WEST OF FIELDINGS, STONEHEAP ROAD, EAST STUDDAL

Members viewed photographs of the application site. The Planning Officer advised that the application sought planning permission for the erection of a detached dwelling and garage on a site comprising a field on the south-east side of Stoneheap Road. The proposed dwelling had been advertised as an 'eco' home, and an e-mail of support had been received from the manufacturer since the report was written. There was a 34-metre hedgerow at the front of the site, and the applicant proposed to remove part of this for access. However, records showed that this land had never fallen within the residential curtilage of the site. It was therefore covered by the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 which prescribed that the LPA's consent would be needed for the removal of any hedgerow. KCC Highways had advised that to achieve the necessary vehicular access vision splays, 45-metre sight lines would be required each way. Since the applicant was only able to achieve 5 metres each way on land within his ownership, this was a concern. The site was outside the settlement confines where development would normally be restricted. However, in the absence of a 5-year housing land supply, the NPPF was relevant, particularly paragraph 55 which directed that isolated new homes should be avoided unless there were special circumstances. However, the design of the dwelling was not considered sufficiently innovative or of exceptional quality to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the setting and appearance of the countryside and rural street scene. Refusal of planning permission was therefore recommended.

Councillor Bond spoke in favour of the proposal. The site was surrounded by other properties, and he could not therefore see how the proposed dwelling would cause harm to the countryside and street scene. Councillor Kenton agreed, but

commented that the proposed design was not outstanding and for this reason he would not, on balance, support the application. Councillor Bannister referred to Policy DM11 of the Core Strategy which stated that development which would generate travel outside the rural confines should be refused unless it was justified by Local Plan policies. There was no justification for this development, and it should therefore be refused in support of the LPA's policies on the countryside and sustainable travel. Councillor Richardson stated that an 'eco' home was not in itself innovative or outstanding. Moreover, no evidence had been provided to allay concerns about the loss of ecological habitat on the site.

RESOLVED: That Planning Permission for Application No DOV/16/00057 be REFUSED on the following grounds:

- (a) The development would, if permitted, by virtue of its location, design, scale and the accompanying engineering works and loss of hedgerow, result in an unjustified, sporadic form of development, which would be visually intrusive and detrimental and harmful to the rural character and appearance of the countryside and the street scene, contrary to the aims and objectives of Core Strategy policies DM1 and DM15, Dover District Council Local Plan CO8 and the sustainability aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 7, 14, 55, 56 and 63;
- (b) The development proposes sub-standard visibility splays at its access with Stoneheap Road. The proposal would therefore result in a detrimental impact on highway safety contrary to the aims and objectives of paragraphs 34 and 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy DM11 of the Dover District Council Core Strategy;
- (c) Insufficient information, by way of an ecological scoping survey, has been submitted with the application to demonstrate the presence or otherwise of ecological habitats/protected species and, as such, whether the proposal is likely to result in the loss of, and/or harm to, such interests. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to policy DM15 of the Core Strategy and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 113 and 118 and National Planning Policy Guidance.

141 APPLICATION NO DOV/16/00072 - SITE ADJOINING THE COTTAGE, ST MONICA'S ROAD, KINGSDOWN

The Committee viewed photographs and plans of the site. The Planning Officer advised that, since the report was written, an e-mail had been received and circulated to Members clarifying the needs of the applicant. The proposal related to the erection of a detached dwelling on a site which comprised the side garden of The Cottage. Although within the settlement confines, the site was a sensitive location, adjacent to the Kingsdown Conservation Area and within 25 metres of St John's Church, a non-designated heritage asset. Due to the scale and form of the proposed building, and the loss of hedgerow and tree cover (amongst others), Officers had concluded that significant harm would be caused to the setting of the Conservation Area and the church. Officers also had concerns over the design features and characteristics of the proposed dwelling, and for these reasons it was

considered that the proposal would be an intrusive form of development, causing harm to the visual quality and character of the street scene. In addition, the proposal sought to remove a large number of trees which Officers considered excessive given that an abnormally large turning area was to be provided. The applicant had been informed pre-application that a development in this location was unlikely to be acceptable.

Councillor Bannister recognised that the site was within the village confines on a sizeable plot, but the proposal was for a large building with the loss of a significant number of trees. He suggested that a site visit would be helpful. Councillor Butcher expressed sympathy for the applicant's circumstances, but considered the proposed dwelling to be overly large. Councillor Richardson supported the idea of a site visit. He was not familiar with the site but suggested that issues were likely to revolve around the impact on neighbouring properties and the church. The Chairman reminded Members that an applicant's personal circumstances were not a material consideration as planning permission was granted to the land and not the applicant.

RESOLVED: That Application No DOV/16/00072 be DEFERRED for a site visit to be held on Tuesday, 24 May 2016 in order to assist Members in assessing: (a) the impact on the character of the area (including the removal of trees and hedgerow), the non-designated Heritage Asset and adjoining Conservation Area; and (b) the achievement of adequate sightlines, and Councillors S F Bannister, T A Bond, N S Kenton, A F Richardson and F J W Scales (reserve: Councillor J S Back) be appointed to visit the site.

142 APPEALS AND INFORMAL HEARINGS

The Planning Delivery Manager presented the report which gave details of eleven appeals that had been determined between January and March 2016. Ten decisions of the LPA had been upheld and the appeals dismissed. The one appeal upheld had been against an Officer decision.

The Committee noted the report.

143 ACTION TAKEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ORDINARY DECISIONS (COUNCIL BUSINESS) URGENCY PROCEDURE

The Committee noted that no action had been taken since the last meeting.

The meeting ended at 10.32 pm.



LTR/P03462/K/5/NA

01 December 2015

Mr Luke Blaskett
Dover District Council
White Cliffs Business Park
Dover
Kent
CT16 3PJ

Dear Luke

RE: PLANNING OBLIGATIONS - FORGE BUNGALOW, LONDON ROAD, TEMPLE EWELL - DOV/15/00123

Further to recent correspondence regarding the above I enclose details pertaining to the request for contributions towards affordable housing provision and open space.

A viability appraisal has been produced by J.F. Sindlow ACIOB, MICES. A letter from Mr Spindlow outlining his experience is also enclosed.

The appraisal consists of a Budget Summary and detailed breakdowns of Budget Costs for Site Preliminaries and Budget Costs for Infrastructure & Services.

The anticipated sales value of the proposed dwellings has been provided by Miles & Barr, as seen in the enclosed email dated 18 November 2015.

The demolition and site clear up costs were provided by Goody Demolition Ltd.

The appraisal allows for contingency at 5%. We are advised that the banks insist on this figure on any costs against which borrowing is required. A 5% contingency is not considered as unreasonable with this particular Brownfield site.

It is submitted that the evidence provided illustrates that a low gross profit (2%) can be expected from the proposed development. This profit level is below the minimum 15% gross profit threshold that would typically be expected to make a scheme feasible for a developer. This figure is backed by numerous planning appeal decisions.

Contributions of £98,000 and £5,173 have been sought towards affordable housing and open space respectively. We would submit that the development would not be economically viable were any financial contributions to be pursued by the Council.

A contribution of £103,173 would reduce the estimated 2% gross profit to 0%. Any contribution would remove the gross profit further from the threshold of 15%.

chartered planning and development consultants

David Stewart *B.Sc(Hons), Dip TP, Cert in Env Assessment, MRTPI*
Jeanne Taylor *Dip TP, MRTPI*
Associate: Karen Banks *BA(Hons), PG Dip, MRTPI*
Associate: Nathan Anthony *BA(Hons), MRTPI*

Lee Evans Planning, St John's Lane, Canterbury, Kent, CT1 2QQ
Canterbury: 01227 784444 London: 0207 812 0640 Fax: 01227 819102 **17**

email: townplanning@lee-evans.co.uk website: www.lee-evans-planning.co.uk



2010 WINNER
Equality and Diversity

Registered N° OC304363

New housing stock in Dover, and especially Temple Ewell, is at a premium and in light of the local and national demand for housing and the weight given to sustainable development in the NPPF it is submitted that viability should not be placed at risk by obligations.

The National Planning Policy Framework provides the policy backdrop against which this matter should be assessed:

“Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.”
(Paragraph 173 of the NPPF)

In summary, it is evident that the provision of the required contributions towards affordable housing and open space, on this site, would render the scheme unviable. A developer return of less than 2% is not reasonable when the applicant is already bearing the risks of the scheme himself, and the site would be unlikely to come forward were any further costs to be placed upon the scheme.

We would be pleased to discuss any issues arising or provide further information as may be required.

Yours sincerely

Nathan Anthony
ASSOCIATE/PLANNING CONSULTANT

Lee Evans Partnership LLP
Canterbury
Kent

Mr . J.F.Spindlow
41 Invicta Road
Whitstable
CT5 1PN

07806 535604
December 2015

**Feasibility for Proposed Development at Forge Garage,
London Road, Temple Ewell, Kent, CT16 3DG**

Dear Sirs,

This feasibility has been carried out by J.F.Spindlow ACIOB,MICES, I have been in the construction industry for 50years.

I have had contracts at the offices of 2 Chartered Quantity Surveying Practices, based in London and have worked for major construction companies in England and abroad.

I was a Director of a Groundwork company in Essex and Construction Director for Murston Construction Ltd. based in Ashford, Kent for the last 17 years, now retired.

Whilst at Murston I was responsible for the construction and financial control of 72 houses and flats in Dover as well as many other schemes.

The feasibility presented is consistent with the methods employed by Murston which have been successfully used for the past 17 years.

It is apparent that there are several costs particular to this site which demonstrate that for the site to be viable, the costs being levied by the council for social housing make the development uneconomical.

This is an important site, although small ,as there is very little new housing stock being built in Dover and the clean up of this site will add to the area and provide much needed housing.

Your faithfully

J.F.Spindlow

HOUSES AT TEMPLE EWELL				
PLOTS 1-10				
BUDGET SUMMARY				
COSTS		Square Feet		
PLOT 1	2 Bed Semi	1059 at £75	79,425	
PLOT 2	2 Bed Semi	1074 at £75	80,550	
PLOT 3	2 Bed Semi	1059 at £75	79,425	
PLOT 4	2 Bed Semi	1059 at £75	79,425	
PLOT 5	3 Bed Semi	1176 at £75	88,200	
PLOT 6	3 Bed Semi	1176 at £75	88,200	
PLOT 7	3 Bed Semi	1176 at £75	88200	
PLOT 8	3 Bed Semi	862 at £75	64650	
PLOT 9	3 Bed Semi	862 at £75	64650	
PLOT 10	3 BED DETACHED	1062 at £75	79650	
	Total Square feet 10565		792375	
	Square feet cost based on previous development			
	Infrastructure and services		491,147	
	Site preliminaries		139,300	
			1,422,822	
	Contingency 5%		71,021	
	Land purchase		420,000	
	Finance Costs 3%	1913843	57,343	
		TOTAL COSTS	1,971,186	
SALES	Miles and Barr			
1	3 Bed Semi		185,000	
2	3 Bed Semi		185,000	
3	3 Bed Semi		185,000	
4	3 Bed Semi		185,000	
5	3 Bed Semi		190,000	
6	3 Bed Semi		190,000	
7	2 Bed semi		190,000	
8	2 Bed semi		210,000	
9	2 Bed semi		210,000	
10	2 Bed semi		285,000	
		TOTAL SALES	2,015,000	
		TOTAL SALES	2,015,000	
		TOTAL COSTS	1,971,186	
		GROSS PROFIT	43,814	2.0%

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Houses Temple Ewell					
2	PLOTS 1-10					
3						
4	BUDGET COSTS FOR SITE PRELIMINARIES					
5						
6		<u>LAB</u>	<u>PLANT</u>	<u>MAT</u>	<u>SUBCON</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
7						
8	Site supervision					37,500
9	Attendant labour & plant					57,000
10	Accommodation					3,900
11	Storage					1,100
12	Welfare facilities					5,000
13	Compound and security					2,500
14	Temporary fencing					750
15	Site water					1,400
16	Site telephone & web					1,600
17	Site electrics					4,650
18	Site Gas					1,200
19	Rubbish skips					6,000
20	Builders clean					3,000
21	Protecting the works					2,000
22	Small Tools & Consumables					7,500
23	Signs					200
24	Maintenance\defects					4,000
25		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
26		0	0	0	0	139,300
27		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

	A	B	C	D	E	F
28	Site Supervision	50 Weeks				
29	Site Manager					37,500
30	Site Agents					0
31		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
32		0	0	0	0	37,500
33		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
34						
35	Attendant Labour & Plant					
36	Site labour					25,000
37	Snagging/making good					2,000
38	Telehandler & operator					30,000
39		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
40		0	0	0	0	57,000
41		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
42	Accommodation					
43	Supervisors					700
44	Canteen					700
45	Toilet					700
46	Delivery & collection					1,800
47		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
48		0	0	0		3,900
49		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
50	Storage					
51	Metal container					800
52	Delivery & Collection					300
53		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
54		0	0	0		1,100
55		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
56	Welfare Facilities					
57	Site Welfare					1,000
58	Health and safety inspections					3,000
59	Protective Equipment					1,000
60		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
61			0	0	0	5,000
62		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
63	Compound & Security					
64	Storage racking					0
65	Hardstanding/laydown area					2,500
66	Temporary crossover & access road					0
67	Security guard				0	0
68		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
69		0	0	0	0	2,500
70		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
71	Temporary Fencing					
72	Heras					750
73		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
74	Site Water					
75	Temporary Connection				0	200
76	Distribution on site					50
77	Consumption					1,000
78	Supply to houses prior to handover					150
79		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
80		0		0	0	1,400
81		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
82	Site Telephone & web					
83	Connection phone/fax					200
84	Connection web & e-mail					200
85	Rental & Calls					1,200
86		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
87					0	1,600
88		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

	A	B	C	D	E	F
89	Site Electrics					
90	Temporary Connection					1,500
91	Distribution on site					250
92	Accommodation & compound					500
93	Consumption					2,000
94	Supply to houses prior to handover					400
95		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
96		0	0	0	0	4,650
97		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
98	Site Gas					
99	Supply to houses prior to handover					1,200
100		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
101						
102	Rubbish Skips					6,000
103		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
104	Builders Clean					3,000
105		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
106	Protecting the Works					
107	Flooring					1,000
108	General					1,000
109		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
110				0		2,000
111		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
112	Small Tools & Consumables					7,500
113		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
114						
115	Signs					
116	Direction signs					200
117	Sign board					0
118		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
119				0		200
120		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
121						
122	Maintenance/defects					4,000
123		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									
26									
27									

	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
28									
29									
30									
31									
32									
33									
34									
35									
36									
37									
38									
39									
40									
41									
42									
43									
44									
45									
46									
47									
48									
49									
50									
51									
52									
53									
54									
55									
56									
57									
58									
59									
60									
61									
62									
63									
64									
65									
66									
67									
68									
69									
70									
71									
72									
73									
74									
75									
76									
77									
78									
79									
80									
81									
82									
83									
84									
85									
86									
87									
88									

	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
89									
90									
91									
92									
93									
94									
95									
96									
97									
98									
99									
100									
101									
102									
103									
104									
105									
106									
107									
108									
109									
110									
111									
112									
113									
114									
115									
116									
117									
118									
119									
120									
121									
122									
123									

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	HOUSES AT TEMPLE EWELL					
2	PLOTS 1-10					
3						
4	BUDGET COSTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE & SERVICES					
5						
6		<u>LAB</u>	<u>PLANT</u>	<u>MAT</u>	<u>SUBCON</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
7						
8	Garage clean up	0	0	0	0	79,170
9	Scaffolding	0	0	0	0	12,000
10	Foul drainage	0	0	0	0	30,000
11	Stormwater drainage	0	0	0	0	20,000
12	Service ducts	0	0	0	0	5,000
13	Perimeter fencing	0	0	0	0	1,000
14	Private access road	0	0	0	0	10,920
15	Retaining structures	0	0	0	0	37,397
16	Driveways	0	0	0	0	24,180
17	Landscape planting	0	0	0	0	3,500
18	Utilities	0	0	0	0	28,240
19	Building regulation fees	0	0	0	0	6,950
20	Planning fees	0	0	0	0	10,100
21	Architects fees	0	0	0	0	20,375
22	Engineers fees	0	0	0	0	18,100
23	Solicitors fees	0	0	0	0	24,600
24	N.H.B.C. fees		0	0	0	10,000
25	Marketing & sales	0	0	0	0	11,750
26	Estate agents fees	0	0	0	0	26,438
27	Council tax		0	0	0	2,000
28	Enviromental surveys	0	0	0	0	3,254
29	Section 106 fees	0	0	0	0	106,173
30						
31						
32		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
33		0	0	0	0	491,147
34		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
35						
36	Garage clean up					
37	Site investigation					3500
38	Demolition				Goody	45120
39	Remove fuel tanks					11900
40	Remove tarmac/concrete hardstandings					9300
41	Remove asbestos and suvey					1600
42	Remove contaminated soil					1800
43	Re-test soil					750

	A	B	C	D	E	F
44	Deeper topsoil to gardens for NHBC					2,700
45	Professional and technical fees					2,500
46						
47	Part of mitigation costs					
48						
49						
50						
51						
52		0	0	0	0	79,170
53						
54	Scaffolding					
55	External	10x£1200=				12,000
56	Bandstand & Boards					0
57	Mobile tower					0
58						
59		0	0	0	0	12,000
60						
61	Foul drainage					
62	Excavate trench					0
63						0
64	Backfill under road					0
65	Shingle					0
66	Pipe & fittings 100mm	Based on previous development			10x£3000=	30,000
67	Pipe & fittings 150mm					0
68	Concrete cover					0
69	Manholes - plastic					0
70	Manholes - concrete ring					0
71						0
72						0
73						0
74						
75		0	0	0	0	30,000
76						
77	Stormwater drainage					
78	Excavate trench					0
79	Shingle					0
80	Pipe & fittings					0
81	Concrete cover					0
82	Manholes - plastic	Based on previous development			10x£2000=	20,000
83	Excavate for polylite cells					0
84	Remove spoil from site					0
85	Polylite storage system					0
86	Shingle to polylite					0
87	Terram to polylite					0
88						
89		0	0	0	0	20,000
90						
91						
92	Service ducts					
93	Excavate trench					0
94	Sand bedding					0
95	Ducts	Based on previous development			10x£500=	5,000
96	Warning tape/draw cord					0
97	Concrete cover					0
98	Draw pits					0
99						
100		0	0	0	0	5,000
101						
102						
103	Perimeter Fencing					
104	Close boarded fence					400
105	Chainlink fence				0	
106	Knee rail fence					600
107						
108		0	0	0	0	1,000
109						

	A	B	C	D	E	F
110	Private access road	140m2				
111	Excavate					
112	Remove spoil					
113	Grade surface					
114	Terram	Based on previous development			140m2x£78=	10,920
115	Crushed concrete					
116	Type 1 bed					
117	Path edgings & foundations					
118	Temporary kerbs & removal					
119	Bitmac					
120		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
121		0	0	0	0	10,920
122		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
123	Retaining structures and tanking					
124						
125	Excavate)			
126	Temporary propping)			
127	Filling)			
128	Concrete reinforced base	Refer take off	}			37,397
129	Concrete reinforced walls)			
130	Tanking)			
131	Backfilling)			
132						
133						
134						
135	Part of mitigation cost due to sloping site					
136						
137						
138						
139						
140						
141						
142						
143						
144						
145						
146						
147		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
148		0	0	0	0	37,397
149		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
150	Driveways and parking 372m2					
151	Excavate					
152	Remove spoil					
153	Grade surface					
154	Crushed concrete	Based on previous development			372m2x£65=	24,180
155	Type 1 bed					
156	Path edgings & foundations					
157	Sand bed					
158	Block paving					
159		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
160		0	0	0	0	24,180
161		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
162	Landscape planting					
163	Work to remove existing trees					1,350
164	Plants & trees					2,000
165	Woodchip & bark					150
166		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
167		0	0	0	0	3,500
168		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

	A	B	C	D	E	F
169	Utilities					
170						
171	Disconnect existing electric supply				0	550
172	Disconnect existing gas supply					750
173	Gas connection					6,500
174	Water design fee	Structural Engineer				2,000
175	Water connection					2,500
176	Water Infrastructure	Based on previous development				3,000
177	Sewerage connection fee					150
178	Sewerage records					40
179	Sewerage Infrastructure					3,000
180	Electric main supply					8,500
181	Electric design fee				0	1,250
182	Repairs					0
183		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
184	Waiting for utility prices	0	0	0	0	28,240
185		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
186	Building Regulation Fees					
187	Dover and MLM Building Regs					4,500
188	Robust details	Based on previous development				250
189	Air pressure testing					600
190	SAP & energy					1,000
191	Sound testing					600
192		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
193					0	6,950
194		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
195	Planning Fees					
196	Dover Council					3,850
197	Lee Evans Planning					6,250
198		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
199					0	10,100
200		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
201	Architects Fees					
202	Lee Evans Partnership					19,625
203	Lloyd Bore (Landscape)					750
204		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
205					0	20,375
206		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
207	Engineers Fees					
208	Structural	Based on previous development				14,500
209	M & E				0	0
210	Setting out engineer					2,100
211	Party wall surveyor				0	1,500
212		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
213		0	0	0	0	18,100
214		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
215	Solicitors Fees					
216	Purchase					5,000
217	Search & registry fees					1,250
218	Stamp duty					12,600
219	Unilateral undertakings					3,500
220	Section 106 fees					0
221	Sell					15,000
222		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
223					0	24,600
224		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
225						
226	N.H.B.C. fees	Based on previous development				10,000
227		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
228	Marketing & sales					
229	Brochure					3,500
230	Photographs					250
231	Sales staff	0				0
232	Show home furniture & fittings					5,000
233	HIPS				0	1,000
234	Advertising/web					1,500
235	Sales boards					500
236		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
237		0	0	0	0	11,750
238		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

	A	B	C	D	E	F
239	Estate Agent Fees					
240	Fees	1.25% of GDV	£2015000.00			25,188
241	Site valuation & initial lending assessment					1,250
242		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
243						26,438
244		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
245						
246	Council tax	On unsold units	On unsold units			2,000
247		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
248						
249	Enviromental surveys					
250	Geo-enviromental report					0
251	Archaeologist				0	0
252	Tree survey					495
253	Sustainability					750
254	Ecology report					659
255	Considerate contractor					750
256	Topographical survey				0	600
257		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
258		0	0	0	0	3,254
259		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
260						
261						
262	Section 106 fees					
263						
264	Affordable housing					98,000
265	Play area					5,173
266						
267	Monitor fee					
268	Dover legal fees					3,000
269		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
270					0	106,173
271		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
272	Section 38 & 104 fees	Not applicable				
273						
274						
275						
276						
277						
278						
279		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
280						
281		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
282	Additional items	Not applicable	at this time of budgeting			
283						
284						
285						
286						
287						
288						
289						
290						
291						
292						
293						
294						
295						
296						
297						
298						
299						
300						
301						
302						
303						
304						
305						
306						
307		-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
308		0	0	0	0	0

	A	B	C	D	E	F
309		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									
26									
27									
28									
29									
30									
31									
32									
33									
34									
35									
36									
37									
38									
39									
40									
41									
42									
43									

	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
44									
45									
46									
47									
48									
49									
50									
51									
52									
53									
54									
55									
56									
57									
58									
59									
60									
61									
62									
63									
64									
65									
66									
67									
68									
69									
70									
71									
72									
73									
74									
75									
76									
77									
78									
79									
80									
81									
82									
83									
84									
85									
86									
87									
88									
89									
90									
91									
92									
93									
94									
95									
96									
97									
98									
99									
100									
101									
102									
103									
104									
105									
106									
107									
108									
109									

	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
110									
111									
112									
113									
114									
115									
116									
117									
118									
119									
120									
121									
122									
123									
124									
125									
126									
127									
128									
129									
130									
131									
132									
133									
134									
135									
136									
137									
138									
139									
140									
141									
142									
143									
144									
145									
146									
147									
148									
149									
150									
151									
152									
153									
154									
155									
156									
157									
158									
159									
160									
161									
162									
163									
164									
165									
166									
167									
168									

	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
169									
170									
171									
172									
173									
174									
175									
176									
177									
178									
179									
180									
181									
182									
183									
184									
185									
186									
187									
188									
189									
190									
191									
192									
193									
194									
195									
196									
197									
198									
199									
200									
201									
202									
203									
204									
205									
206									
207									
208									
209									
210									
211									
212									
213									
214									
215									
216									
217									
218									
219									
220									
221									
222									
223									
224									
225									
226									
227									
228									
229									
230									
231									
232									
233									
234									
235									
236									
237									
238									

	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
239									
240									
241									
242									
243									
244									
245									
246									
247									
248									
249									
250		add							
251									
252									
253									
254									
255									
256									
257									
258									
259									
260									
261									
262									
263									
264									
265									
266									
267									
268									
269									
270									
271									
272									
273									
274									
275									
276									
277									
278									
279									
280									
281									
282									
283									
284									
285									
286									
287									
288									
289									
290									
291									
292									
293									
294									
295									
296									
297									
298									
299									
300									
301									
302									
303									
304									
305									
306									
307									
308									

	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
309									

INCOMING E-MAIL MESSAGE

File Ref.: A

Project No.: P03462
Client: Park Lane (South East) Ltd
Description: Forge Bungalow/Garage, Temple Ewell - Erection of New Dwellings
Location: Temple Ewell

From: Jerry Spindlow [mail@jeremy888.plus.com]
Subject: FW: Proposed Housing Development at the Forge Bungalow site, Temple Ewell, Dover, Kent

To: nathan.anthony@lee-evans.co.uk; gary.remmington@lee-evans.co.uk
Attachments:
Doc Ref.: EML-INC/P03462/A/114
Sent: 27th Nov 2015 at 12:35 **Received:** 27th Nov 2015 at 12:41

Message:

From: Dominic Murphy [<mailto:DominicMurphy@MilesandBarr.co.uk>]
Sent: 18 November 2015 16:08
To: Jerry Spindlow
Subject: Proposed Housing Development at the Forge Bungalow site, Temple Ewell, Dover, Kent

Dear Mr Spindlow

Re Proposed Housing Development at the Forge Bungalow site, Temple Ewell, Dover, Kent

-

Thank you very much for your kind invitation to carry out the pre-valuation of the above proposed development. The opportunity was very much appreciated.

Together with my fellow colleague Paul Jones, we took some time looking over the architect drawings and plans you provided.

In order to be as accurate as possible with the valuations, we have also researched the immediate location and surrounding area for similar properties that are currently for sale and have recently sold. I also factored in my own experience and gut feeling.

On the basis of our research, we would expect to achieve offers in the region of

- **Plots 1 to 4** (2 bedroom terraced) £180,000 to £185,000.
- **Plots 5 to 7** (3 bedroom terraced) £185,000 to £190,000.
- **Plots 8 to 9** (3 bedroom semi-detached) £200,000 to £210,000.
- **Plot 10** (3 bedroom detached) £ 275,000 – £285,000.

Please feel free to contact me, should you have any queries with regard to my valuations.

Once again, thank you for allowing me to research the proposed development. I look forward to speaking with you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Dominic Murphy

T: (01304) 202111 | M: (07590) 230021
milesandbarr.co.uk



4 High Street,
Dover, Kent, CT16 1DR



Property
& Lifestyle
magazine



This e-mail and any attached files are confidential and for the use of the intended recipient(s) only. If you have received it in error please notify the sender immediately and then delete the message from your system. Any copying, distribution or disclosure of its contents is strictly prohibited. At present the integrity of e-mail across the Internet cannot be guaranteed and messages sent via this medium are potentially at risk. Therefore we will not accept liability for any claims arising as a result of the use of this medium to transmit information by or to Miles & Barr. This communication is from Miles & Barr Limited, Tel: 01843 570 500. Thank you for your co-operation.



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com