

- a) **DOV/16/00408 – Erection of one detached dwelling, two semi-detached dwellings and creation of vehicular access and associated landscaping – Land adjacent to 120 New Street, Ash**

Reason for report: The number of third party contrary views.

- b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Planning Permission be Refused.

- c) **Planning Policy and Guidance**

Dover District Core Strategy (CS)

- Policy DM1 states that development will not be permitted on land outside the urban boundaries and rural settlement confines, unless justified by other development plan policies, or it functionally requires such a location, or it is ancillary to existing development;
- Policy DM11 advises that development that would increase travel demand should be supported by a systematic assessment to quantify the amount and type of travel likely to be generated and include measures that will help to satisfy the demand. Development beyond the urban confines must be justified by other development plan policies.
- Policy DM13 sets out parking standards for dwellings and states that provision for parking should be a design-led approach based upon the characteristics of the area, the nature of the development and design objectives;
- Policy DM15 sets out that development which would result in the loss of, or adversely affect the character or appearance, of the countryside will only be permitted in certain circumstances, provided that measures are incorporated to reduce, as far as practicable, any harmful effects on countryside character;
- Policy DM16 sets out where the landscape is harmed, development will only be permitted if it is in accordance with allocations made within the Development Plan Documents and incorporates necessary mitigation or it can be sited so as to avoid or reduce the harm and/or incorporates design measures to mitigate the impacts.
- Policy CP1 advises on the hierarchy of settlements throughout the Dover District and states that a hamlet, is not suitable for future development unless it functionally requires a rural location;
- Policy CP2 identifies the requirement for allocating land for houses and employment;

- Policy CP3 identifies the distribution of housing allocations, stating that land to be allocated to meet the housing provisions of CP2 will include land for 1,200 homes in rural areas.
- Policy CP5 requires all new residential properties to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 and encourages the incorporation of energy and water efficiency measures in non-residential buildings under 1,000sqm gross floor space.
- Policy CP6 requires infrastructure to be in place or provision for it to be provided to meet the demands generated by the development.
- Policy CP7 seeks to protect and enhance the existing network of Green Infrastructure, and states that integrity of the existing network of green infrastructure will be protected and enhanced.

#### Dover District Land Allocations Local Plan 2015

- None relevant

#### Material Considerations

##### *National Planning Policy Framework*

- The NPPF sets out that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Para 7 sets out there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:
  - An economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;
  - A social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and
  - An environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.
- Paragraph 8 continues that these roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. Economic growth can secure higher social and environmental standards, and well-designed buildings and places can improve the lives of people and

communities. Therefore, to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. The planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions.

- Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that at its heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that for decision-taking this means approving proposals that accord with the development plan without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:
  - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
  - Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.
- The NPPF sets out 12 core planning principles, which includes securing high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants and conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations.
- Paragraph 49 Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.
- Paragraph 55 sets out to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.
- Paragraph 56 sets out good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to making places better for people.
- Paragraph 58 sets out Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics. Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:
  - will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
  - establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;

- optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks;
  - respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;
  - create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and
  - are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.
- Paragraph 60 states that whilst planning decisions should not impose architectural styles or particular tastes, it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness
- Paragraph 61 includes that planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.
- Paragraph 64 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
- Paragraph 128 requires the applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution to their setting.
- Paragraph 131 sets out that local planning authorities should take account of:
  - the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
  - the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
  - the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- Paragraph 132 states when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building,

park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

- Paragraph 133 sets out Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:
  - the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
  - no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
  - conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
  - the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.
- Paragraph 134 sets out where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

#### *National Planning Policy Guidance*

- Provides guidance on matters relating to main issues associated with development

*Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* states that 'In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority...shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting'.

*Section 66(1) of the Act* states that, 'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, ... shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.'

*Section 72(1) states that* 'In the exercise, with respect to any building or other land in a conservation area, ..., special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area'.

#### *Dover Heritage Strategy*

An objective of the Strategy is to “ensure the intrinsic quality of the historic environment is protected and enhanced and that these assets are used to positively support regeneration”.

*Historic Environment in Local Plans; Good Practice Advice (GPA) (2015) and The Setting of Heritage Assets; Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3*

The GPA's provides information to assist in implementing the policies in the NPPF and the NPPG in respect of alterations to listed buildings and development affecting their setting.

*The Kent Design Guide*

Sets out examples of good design across a broad spectrum of development types and identifies a number of guiding principles.

d) **Relevant Planning History**

PE/15/00153 – Pre-application advice for two dwellings on the site

e) **Consultee and Third Party Responses**

DDC Ecological Officer – Comments discussed below.

DDC Tree Officer – No concerns

DDC Conservation Officer – No objections

KKC Highways – Whilst no objection in principle to the proposal, make the following comments:

- The proposed access point appears to conflict with the existing position of the 30mph gateway and associated signage. It also appears that an existing telecommunications chamber will be affected by the access. Therefore suggest the access is relocated a few metres to the north
- the parking space within each car port should be a minimum of 2.9metres wide. The garage for plot will not count as providing car parking but there is sufficient room on the forecourt to provide 2 spaces. The private drive behind all parking spaces should be a minimum of 6 metres wide to provide suitable manoeuvring room in/out of the spaces.
- the gradient of the access should be no steeper than 1 in 10 for the first 1.5 metres and no steeper than 1 in 8 thereafter, and this should be shown on the plans.

Ash Parish Council – Object on the following grounds:

- The site is outside the village confines
- the development will radically alter the rural character of the existing street scene

- the plans overdevelop the site (especially in the context of the area)
- The development will extend the ribbon development of this part of the parish which was specifically rejected in the LDF
- the new property opposite this development cited as justification for this development was rebuilt on the footprint of a very old cottage
- the issue of the destruction of the established wild life habitat as cited in the public comment was noted

Public representations: 8 letters in support and 2 letters in objection.

Letters of objection:

- Traffic and highway safety concerns, with speed of cars and the access is on the edge of 60mph limit
- the bank of the site is unstable
- the site supports wildlife
- The site is not open land, but part of residential curtilage
- the plans identify trees along the eastern boundary but no arboricultural assessment has been submitted to establish whether the trees might be affected by development in such close proximity
- The considerations in paragraph 17 of the NPPF would be harmed by the application proposal.
- the site is outside the settlement boundary, the opposite side of the road has been included and illustrates very different character
- the development would consolidate and extend ribbon development along new street in an undesirable fashion, extending development into open countryside that should continue to be protected
- the proposed plots (2 and 3 in particular) would be sited some 3.1m above the level of New Street. the dwellings would dominate the road frontage and overlook dwellings on the opposite side of the road
- this would have an overbearing and detrimental impact on the character of the new street
- notwithstanding the housing land supply issue, the application site is inappropriate for development
- the need to provide access, the proposed dwellings are pushed back, such that there is very little room to the rear boundary
- there would be rooms from habitable rooms at first floor level directly overlooking the neighbouring gardens
- this would be serious overbearing and loss of privacy

- Hills Down is a Grade 2 Listed Building and there would be less than substantial harm
- it would be a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building.
- Object to the new entrance. This would result in loss of well-established bank and wildlife habitat. Any changes to the street scene should be kept to a minimum

Letters of support:

- The application makes the best use of the land
- It supports government policy with the housing shortage
- The design of the properties and layout are appropriate, sympathetic and complement the existing architectural design
- A good enhancement to the village of Ash and the surrounding local area
- This infill development will not damage the character of Ash
- It would provide three family homes

f) 1. **The Site and the Proposal**

- 1.1 The application site is located outside the settlement confines of Ash and is therefore considered countryside. It is located between Jasmine Cottage and the bungalow at no. 120 New Street. It forms undeveloped land and is understood to have formerly been part of no. 120. The site is raised from the street level by approximately 3m, and there is a bank along the road frontage with an established boundary (hedgerow/shrubs).
- 1.2 There is an existing access to the southern corner with a concrete driveway. This is located outside the 30mph zone.
- 1.3 Jasmine Cottage is located north of the site and fronts Saunders Lane. Hills Down is located north east of the site (neighbouring Jasmine Cottage) and it is a Grade II Listed Building. Its rear garden extends down along the east boundary of the site. Both of these properties are also outside the settlement confines.
- 1.4 Opposite the site to the west there are four existing dwellings, including one under construction. As part of the Land Allocations Local Plan the settlement confines was extended to include the dwellings and surrounding land. They form part of Policy LA23 (Land at the Vineries & 111 and 115 New Street) for limited frontage development. This side of the road is characterised by a ribbon of development which extends north to the village. This application site was not considered as part of the LALP.
- 1.5 The proposal seeks the erection of one detached dwelling and two-semi-detached chalet bungalows.



- 1.6 The proposal would retain the bank, albeit with the existing mature hedgerow/boundary treatment to the road frontage removed, and the dwellings set back into the site. They would be set behind the building line of no. 120. New planting and trees are proposed in front of the dwellings.
- 1.7 Plot 1 is a detached four bedroom house, with the bedrooms in the roof space. It includes a front gable projection, with a pitched roof and half hipped feature to the south. It also includes a garage linked to the dwelling. The detached dwelling would be 10.5m wide, with a depth of up to 11.5m. The ridge height is approx. 6.8m. The garage is a front facing gable, with storage in the roof space. It also has a pitched roof. It is approx. 5.2m wide x 5.5m deep x 5.6m high.
- 1.8 The semi-detached chalet bungalows are 2-bedrooms, with the bedrooms in the roof space. They would have a ridge height of approx. 7.4m. The pair would sit slightly higher than plot 1. The units would be approx. 11.6m wide and extend approx. 9.6m deep. Each unit would have a separate car port.
- 1.9 The development also proposes a new access, infilling the existing access and two parking spaces for each unit.
- 1.10 The Planning Statement submitted with the application outlines the following justification for the proposed development:
- *The site has a much stronger affinity with the built up area of the village rather than the countryside beyond no. 120. The proposal would not prejudice the structure of the village and would relate to the houses immediately on the opposite side of New Street.*
  - *although the site is outside the settlement boundary, policy DM1 is not consistent with the broad aims and objectives of the Framework given the lack of a five year supply of housing land within the District.*
  - *The planning permissions for the new houses opposite reflects the sustainable nature of the location. In terms of paragraph 7 of the Framework the application proposal would meet the economic, social and environmental roles of sustainability. The three houses would provide a small but positive contribution to housing in the village and wider district and re-inforce the role of Ash identified in policy CP1.*
  - *There are no specific policies, such as a national designation or historic asset designation that apply to the site and that would indicate a conflict with the objectives of the Framework or that development of the site should be restricted.*
- 1.11 Pre-application advice was sought prior to submission. This was based on a development for two dwellings and DDC advised that the development was contrary to local policies and a strong enough case

had not been presented to demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause harm to surrounding occupants, the street scene and the wider landscape.

## 2. **Main Issues**

- 2.1 The main areas of assessment are:
- The principle of the development;
  - The impact on the countryside
  - The impact on heritage
  - The Impact on residential amenity
  - The impact on the highway
  - Other matters; and
  - Conclusion

## 3. **Assessment**

### Principle of development

- 3.1 Core Strategy Policy DM1 outlines that development should be located within settlement confines unless justified by other Development Plan Policies or it functionally requires such a location. The application site is outside any settlement confines, and therefore is considered countryside.
- 3.2 As the District cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply and having regard for paragraphs 14 and 49 of the NPPF, the Councils housing policies cannot be considered up-to-date. Whilst housing supply policies should not be considered up to date (in line with paragraph 49 of the NPPF), due weight should still be afforded to relevant policies in the development plan according to their consistency with the NPPF (paragraph 215 NPPF). Accordingly policies such as DM15, relating to countryside protection, and which accord with the objectives of the NPPF will still be afforded significant weight.
- 3.3 In line with the stated objective of the NPPF (paragraphs 7 and 8) for proposals to comply with the objectives of sustainable development, all three dimensions (economic, social and environmental) should be achieved. The specific matters relevant to this application are considered in the following paragraphs.

### Impact on the street scene and the countryside

- 3.4 To the north of the site, Jasmine Cottage fronts Saunders Lane, and whilst 120 New Street Ash is located to the south, the site itself is undeveloped land in an elevated position. The bank along the west boundary and the existing boundary treatment as visual features are considered to make a positive contribution on the approach to the village.
- 3.5 It is recognised that opposite the site there are existing dwellings, and dwellings recently constructed. However it is considered these have a different relationship to the street scene than the application site. The land is more closely related to the built up part of Ash, as highlighted

by the Inspectors report for the Land Allocations Local Plan (LALP), and as existing they front New Street at street level. The settlement confines was changed to include this site as part of the LALP.

- 3.6 Whilst it is recognised no. 120 to the south east is an existing bungalow it is of modest scale and does not result in an intrusive form of development in the countryside. It is effectively part of rural sporadic development found beyond such site confines. The proposed development would introduce further built form at an elevated position which would not respond to the street scene and character of the area as described above. The dwellings form two storey dwellings and the ridge height would be 10m above the street level.
- 3.7 Although the dwellings would be set back from the street, (assumed to reduce the impact on the street scene), the introduction of a relatively high density form of development which would be of a significant scale and height would result in an unbroken frontage, beyond the confines out of keeping with the sporadically developed street scene here. The appearance and impact of the new buildings would be made more obvious due to the resulting loss of mature road edge hedging and works to the embankment which would further expose the site. The proposals would appear as a cramped form of development, with small rear gardens in depth and to the front considerable hard standing to create the private drive and parking area. This would not be in keeping with the pattern of development surrounding the site, which are set in more spacious plots with larger gardens in a loose knit form.
- 3.8 The relocation of the access would also result in the loss of the existing boundary treatment and changes to the existing bank to ensure the access and required visibility splays could be achieved. The loss of this hedgerow and planted bank would impact negatively with the loss of the rural natural appearance of the site.
- 3.9 Overall, it is considered the proposed dwellings would completely alter the rural approach to the village, introducing built form at an elevated position, incongruous with the street scene and would result in a cramped form of development not in keeping with the rural character or appearance of the street scene, contrary to DM15.
- 3.10 DM15 sets out that development which would result in the loss of, or adversely affect the character or appearance, of the countryside will only be permitted in certain exceptions. The proposed development does not meet any of the exceptions, as it is not in accordance with allocations made in Development Plan documents; or justified by the needs of agriculture; or the need to sustain a rural community; and it does not show that it cannot be accommodated elsewhere.

#### Impact on Heritage

- 3.11 As set out above Hills Downe is a Grade II listed building. The dwelling is located north east of the application site and its rear garden runs along the eastern boundary of the application site.
- 3.12 It is noted concern was raised in terms of the impact on the setting of the listed building.

- 3.13 No details have been provided by the applicant to describe the significance of the heritage asset. However in accordance with paragraph 129 of the NPPF, the LPA should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset, taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise.
- 3.14 The listed building is a late C17 house, remodelled C18. It is red brick with rendered and weather boarded rear wing, with plain tile roof, in three parallel ranges. Two storeys and garret with moulded brick eaves cornice to half hipped roof with stacks to rear left and rear right. There is a flight of six steps with swept iron rails ion plain balusters.
- 3.15 The listed building fronts Saunders Lane and there are glimpses of the building as you approach Saunders Lane from New Street. Whilst the application site adjoins the rear garden, it is approximately 35m from the rear of the listed building to the site, and a further approximately 3m to Plot 1.
- 3.16 Given the distance between the application site and the listed building, and the intervening trees, it is not considered the proposed development would harm the significance of the listed building and its setting as it would not visually connect with it.
- 3.17 This also accords with Section 66(1) of the Listed Buildings Act which requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses. In this instance it is considered that the proposed development would preserve the listed building and its setting.

#### Residential Amenity

- 3.18 The rear of proposed dwellings would be approximately 5-6m from the eastern boundary of the application site. It is recognised there are existing trees along the eastern boundary however they are not located within the application site. DDC Tree Officer considered that these trees would not be harmed and that they could be protected through conditions to ensure no harm during construction. The first floor of the proposed units would have the potential to overlook in to the garden area, this forms part of the garden for Hill Downe. No additional boundary treatment is indicated along the eastern boundary. However on balance given that the windows would overlook towards the rear of Hill Downes garden and the existing trees on the site, it is not considered the development would result in an unacceptable impact on loss of privacy in this instance.
- 3.19 To the front, the proposed dwellings are set back into the site and there is a distance of approximately 24m from plot 3 to April Cottage, and approximately 25m to The Vineries. Given the distance it is not considered this would result in level of overlooking that would justify a reason for refusal.
- 3.20 There are no first floor windows proposed from Plot 3 side elevation to no. 120 New Street. There is one first floor side elevation window

proposed from Plot 1 to Jasmine Cottage, however this is to a bathroom, so it could be secured by obscure glazed. As such there are no concerns in relation to the residential amenity impact on these properties.

- 3.21 Overall, the development is considered acceptable in relation to impact on residential amenity.

### Highways

- 3.22 The proposed development includes relocating the existing access, which is currently located outside the 30mph zone. It would be relocated within the 30mph.
- 3.23 Whilst KCC Highways did not object in principle, the comments sought changes to the access so that it was relocated further north away from the 30mph gateway and signage, along with the telecommunications chamber.
- 3.24 In terms of parking, whilst sufficient parking spaces were indicated KCC Highways commented that they should be of a minimum 2.9m wide and there should be minimum 6m behind the spaces to allow for suitable manoeuvring. This is not met by the current proposals which only indicate spaces approx. 2.5m wide and between a 4-5m distance behind the spaces.
- 3.25 KCC commented that the proposed access point appears to conflict with the existing position of the 30mph gateway and associated signage. It also appears that an existing telecommunications chamber will be affected by the access. Therefore KCC Highways suggested the access is relocated a few metres to the north.
- 3.26 Finally KCC Highways commented the gradient of the access should be no steeper than 1 in 10 for the first 1.5 metres and no steeper than 1 in 8 thereafter, and this should be shown on the plans.
- 3.27 The submitted plans do not meet the comments outlined by KCC Highways, and as such the proposed development is not considered acceptable in highway terms. However it is considered should these issues be addressed, the related access and any further introduction of additional hardstanding would further compound the issues identified above in terms of the impact on the character and appearance of the area

### Other Matters

- 3.28 Core Strategy Policy CP5 seeks all new residential developments to meet Code for Sustainable Homes. However this part of the policy is no longer being applied as the Government have withdrawn Code for Sustainable Homes. As such, this application is no longer required to achieve Level 4 Code for Sustainable Homes. The buildings would however be constructed to current Building Regulation standards, which would be comparable to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4, such as energy performance.

- 3.29 In terms of ecology, no details in relation to the biodiversity of the site. The Ecology Officer commented that should the application be refused that an informative is added informing the applicant that if there is any re-submission for the site, a reptile strategy would be required demonstrating how no harm would come to any reptile species that may occur on the site.

#### Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 3.30 The site is outside the settlement boundary and the development would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy DM1. It is recognised that there is a 5 year housing supply deficit, however an additional three dwellings would only make a very small contribution towards this deficit. Development would only be acceptable in these terms if it were considered to be acceptable in all other respects.
- 3.31 In this instance, the development would be at an elevated level and would result in a dominant and intrusive form of development which would detract from and be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would be incongruous in the street scene resulting in an urbanising form of development and would not relate to the rural nature and appearance of the site on the approach to the village.
- 3.32 The development would not meet the requirements in terms of a suitable access, which would also result in the loss of the existing bank planting and hedgerow which is considered an important positive feature.
- 3.33 As such whilst the scheme would provide three additional dwellings, this is not considered to be a sufficient contribution to the district's housing supply to justify the development which would result in harm and would be contrary to Policies DM1, DM13, DM15 and paragraphs 17, 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### g) **Recommendation**

Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The site is located outside the settlement confines and by virtue of its location, elevated position, design and form loss of existing boundary treatment and relationship with the surrounding rural landscape and development, would result in the loss of a valuable, unspoilt rural road frontage, harming the approach to the village and result in an obtrusive cramped form of development, incongruous in the street scene harmful to visual and rural amenity and the character and appearance of the surrounding area as part of the countryside. There is no overriding justification for the development which is contrary to Policies DM1, DM15 of the Dover District Core Strategy and Paragraphs 17, 56 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development fails to demonstrate an acceptable access and appropriate gradient, and insufficient manoeuvring space for vehicles to the proposed parking, and would result in unacceptable development in respect of

highway safety contrary to Policies DM12 and DM13 of the Dover District Core Strategy.

Case Officers

Kate Kerrigan