

# 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](http://www.dover.gov.uk)  
e-mail: [democraticservices@dover.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@dover.gov.uk)

13 March 2024

Dear Councillor

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** on Thursday 14 March 2024 at 6.00 pm, the following report that was unavailable when the agenda was printed.

4 **MINUTES** (Pages 2-15)

To confirm the attached minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 22 February 2024.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Nicky", is written over the text "Chief Executive". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Chief Executive

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 22 February 2024 at 6.00 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor M J Nee

Councillors: J S Back  
 D G Beaney  
 E A Biggs  
 S B Blair  
 P M Brivio  
 N S Kenton  
 R M Knight  
 J P Loffman  
 H M Williams

Officers: Planning and Development Manager  
 Team Leader (Development Management) - Strategic Sites  
 Principal Planner  
 Principal Planner  
 Senior Planner  
 Planning Consultant  
 Principal Planning Solicitor  
 Property/Planning Lawyer  
 Democratic Services 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/23/01174	Ms Lorraine Corrigan	-----
DOV/22/01207	Ms Andrea Risvold Ms Karen Banks	Mr John Bulaitis Cllr C F Woodgate
DOV/23/01055	-----	Mr David Long
DOV/23/00995	-----	Mr Stephen Moore
DOV/23/00521	Mr Harry Kenton	Mrs Brenda Baker

104 APOLOGIES

It was noted that apologies had been received from Councillors D G Cronk and S M S Mamjan.

105 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4, Councillors P M Brivio and S B Blair had been appointed as substitute members for Councillors D G Cronk and S M S Mamjan respectively.

106 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor N S Kenton declared an Other Significant Interest in Agenda Item 12 (Application No DOV/23/00521 – The Larch Nursery, Beacon Lane,

Woodnesborough) by reason that his son was a planning agent and would be speaking in support of the application.

Councillor M J Nee stated that he had been involved in casework in relation to Agenda Item 6 (Application No DOV/23/01174 – The 4 Acres, Elms Vale Road, Hougham). He had been in communication with an objector and had also visited the site with the applicant. To avoid any perception of bias, he would leave the meeting during this item.

107 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2024 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

108 ITEMS DEFERRED

The Committee was advised that the item listed remained deferred.

109 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

The Democratic Services Officer called for nominations for a chairman to preside over the meeting for the following agenda item in the absence of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

It was proposed by Councillor D G Beaney and duly seconded that Councillor J S Back be elected chairman. On being put to the vote the motion FAILED.

It was proposed by Councillor J P Loffman and duly seconded that Councillor E A Biggs be elected chairman. On being put to the vote the motion was CARRIED.

RESOLVED: That Councillor E A Biggs be elected chairman to preside over the meeting for Agenda Item 6 (The 4 Acres, Elms Vale Road, Hougham) in the absence of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

110 APPLICATION NO DOV/23/01174 - THE 4 ACRES, ELMS VALE ROAD, HOUGHAM

The Committee was shown an aerial view, map, drawings and photographs of the application site which was situated within the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (now called National Landscape). The Planning Consultant advised that retrospective planning permission was sought for the stationing of three shipping containers and the erection of associated structures for use as stables, tack and storage.

In relation to the history of the site, the Committee was advised that an application for a change of use of the land for the grazing of horses (for agricultural use) had been granted in 2001. The refusal of a subsequent application in 2002 for the keeping of horses had been appealed and dismissed on the grounds that the proposed field shelter would be harmful to the AONB. He explained that the keeping of horses was when stabling and other paraphernalia would be introduced on a site. At that time the Local Planning Authority (LPA) would not have wanted to see such structures and paraphernalia on a site within the AONB.

Councillor J P Loffman sought clarification on the policies that were relevant in considering the application and how they were applied. He also queried the

reference to insufficient information having been provided in relation to the need for stabling on the site.

The Committee was advised that the site consisted of fields which were open with an appearance that was rural in character. The structures were highly visible from the highway and a row of conifers had recently been planted. The Planning Consultant stressed that the introduction of associated fencing, paraphernalia and boundary planting, which was not of an indigenous species, had a detrimental visual impact on the existing rural and open character and appearance of the land. Furthermore, insufficient information had been submitted to support the notion that stabling was necessary for the grazing of horses on the land. On the latter point he clarified that, whilst he had been in contact with the agent who was the normal conduit for queries, it had been with a view to keeping him apprised as to if and when the application would be going to the Planning Committee rather than seeking further information. He had not been in contact with the applicant and, whilst he had visited the site, he had been able to gauge the visual impact of the scheme and to see what he needed to see without going onto the land.

Given the time that had elapsed since the previous refusal, Councillor D G Beaney queried whether there were new guidelines for the keeping of horses and whether compliance with RSPCA and animal welfare guidelines was a factor in the need for the proposed stabling. He knew the site well and recalled that there had been horses on the site for a long time. He noted the presence of hardstanding on the site and suggested that parts of the site had been in use for more than four years, thereby qualifying for a certificate of lawful use. He pointed out that it was unlikely that the applicant would be moving the horses from the site and the animals would therefore require accommodation.

The Planning Consultant advised that, in assessing the application, reference would have been made to the Horse Society's guidance on field sizes, but RSPCA guidance would not normally be consulted. Whilst the previous refusal had been a long time ago, the site's location in the AONB remained an important material consideration. He clarified that the stationing of containers was a use of the land and therefore the 10-year rule applied. In other words, the containers would have to have been there for ten years in order to qualify for a certificate of lawful use. From memory, he thought the current use of the land had started in 2017. If the Committee was minded to refuse the application, enforcement would be considered and how long the use had existed on the site would be investigated as part of any enforcement action. This would include consideration of the presence of the hardstanding and matters incidental to that. On this point he advised that if the hardstanding had been laid on the land to supplement, or be incidental to, the unauthorised use of the land, this could be caught under the 10-year rule rather than the 4-year rule.

The Planning Consultant stressed that Officers were not opposed to the principle of stabling or buildings being erected on the site for the accommodation of horses. However, this proposal, due to its size, design and location, was considered unacceptable. Should the applicant submit new proposals, Officers would look at them and assess whether they were appropriate for the location.

**RESOLVED:** (a) That Application No DOV/23/01174 be REFUSED on the grounds that insufficient information had been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development is necessary, functionally required on the land, or is ancillary to the existing lawful use of the land for horse grazing. The proposed development, by reason of its location,

design, appearance and use of materials, is incongruous, alien and poorly related to the open and visual context of the land, unsympathetic with the surrounding open countryside and fails to conserve or enhance the natural beauty and quality of this nationally designated and protected landscape (AONB). As such, the proposed development is in conflict with Policy DD21 of the Local Plan, Policies DM1, DM15 and DM16 of the Dover District Core Strategy; Policies PM1 and NE2 of the draft Local Plan; contrary to the aims and objectives of paragraphs SD1, SD2 and LLC1 of the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan 2021-2026, and comprises an unsustainable form of development in conflict with paragraph 8 and the aims and objectives of paragraphs 135, 180 and 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary reasons for refusal in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

(Councillor M J Nee left the meeting during consideration of this item.)

111 APPLICATION NO DOV/22/00717 - FALCONSVIEW MEADOWS, BARVILLE ROAD, WALDERSHARE

Members viewed an aerial view, a plan and photographs of the application site. The Planning Consultant advised that planning permission was sought for the change of use of the land to a gypsy/travellers' site with four additional pitches each containing one mobile home and a touring caravan, and the erection of two amenity buildings, parking, hard surfacing and alterations to the existing vehicular access.

Members were advised that the size of the application site had been reduced by approximately half since the application was first submitted. The application had been held up by various factors, including the submission of a speed survey (which had now been undertaken and found to be satisfactory by Kent County Council (KCC)), comments from KCC's archaeology unit and further information on the applicant's personal circumstances and the health of the occupiers. He explained that there was already a gypsy pitch adjacent to the site which had received planning permission in 2007. The current application would share the same access. From 2022 additional static and touring caravans had begun to occupy the site.

Councillor J S Back referred to the report which stated that KCC contributions would be due if the number of pitches rose to ten. He requested that a condition be added to restrict the number of pitches on the site given that the number now proposed had already been reduced at the request of Officers. He also asked that the pitches be restricted to use by family members and not rented out. The Planning Consultant clarified that KCC contributions were triggered at ten units or if the site exceeded half a hectare. As the site had now been reduced to 0.4 of a hectare, the applicant would no longer be required to make contributions. There would be two caravans per pitch, with only one being for primary residential use. A condition would be imposed restricting the maximum number of pitches to four. Condition 4 would require a plan to be submitted showing the exact locations of the tourers, refuse bins, etc. These conditions would ensure that the number of pitches and layout of the site were safeguarded.

In response to Councillor H M Williams, the Planning Consultant advised that the radii of the access would be widened to enable vehicles to enter and exit the site more easily and to turn better within the site. Whilst objections had been raised by local residents about visibility and the speed of vehicles entering and leaving the site, KCC Highways had raised no technical objections to the proposed access works. Councillor Loffman expressed concerns about KCC Highways' approach and queried whether the size of vehicles using the site and any commercial activity would be monitored. Councillor N S Kenton sympathised but pointed out that residents would be using an existing access which meant that it was difficult to object on highways grounds. He remarked that an application for a more sheltered site at Marshborough had been refused due to landscape impact, and queried why this much more visible site was recommended for approval.

The Planning Consultant advised that it was difficult to impose conditions restricting family use only as it was not included in government guidance. However, if there were personal circumstances that required a family to live together, that could be conditioned. Whilst the guidance indicated that conditions should be imposed regarding occupation for gypsies and travellers only, monitoring these was ultimately a matter for planning enforcement.

He advised that planning permission should not be withheld if an enforceable condition could be imposed to address a harm. In connection with condition 4, the 11-month period was a standard one that had traditionally been used by the planning inspectorate. However, if Members felt that the sightlines were needed sooner, an earlier timeline could be imposed, although he did not recommend anything under three months. Turning to the Marshborough site, he reminded Members that those proposals had involved the pitches and caravans being stationed in front of the access which made them highly visible. Since it was not possible to put planting across an access, the application had been refused. In this case, the applicant had been advised that a good standard of landscaping (including native hedgerow) and fencing should be provided in order to assimilate the scheme into the landscape. In response to Councillor Kenton, the Planning Consultant clarified that the restriction on the size of vehicles in condition 7 had been decided in consultation with the applicant. Condition 8 on external lighting was a safeguard to prevent poles, etc being installed.

RESOLVED: (a) That, subject to the completion of a unilateral undertaking to secure financial payments towards mitigating the impact of the development on the Thanet Coast & Sandwich Bay SPA, Application No DOV/22/00717 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Limit occupation to gypsies and travellers;
- (ii) Approved plans;
- (iii) No more than four gypsy pitches on the site, and no more than two caravans on each pitch. Only the static caravan on each pitch shall be occupied for a primary residential use;
- (iv) Use to cease: if details of siting of static and touring caravans, foul and surface water, refuse storage, parking and turning areas, visibility splays, site access, boundary treatments, soft landscaping,

biodiversity measures and an implementation timetable are not provided within 3 months of the decision; if such details are refused or not determined within 11 months and no valid appeal is made; if such an appeal is not allowed; or if the approved details are not completed in accordance with the approved timetable;

- (v) Geophysical survey prior to the erection of amenity buildings;
- (vi) No commercial activity, including storage;
- (vii) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on the site;
- (viii) Sightlines works to be carried out within 3 months of permission being granted;
- (ix) No external lighting, other than that which has been approved by the LPA (the latter to be intruder activated).

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary conditions and legal agreement in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

112 APPLICATION NO DOV/22/01207 - LAND AT ST ANDREW'S GARDENS, SHEPHERDSWELL

The Committee was shown an aerial view, map, plans and photographs of the application site. As an update, the Principal Planner advised that an additional public representation had been received commenting about the emergency access being outside the ownership of the applicant, field archaeology not being completed and highways.

The Chairman sought clarification on the emergency access which appeared to be critical to the scheme being developed. The Principal Planner advised that the neighbouring site was a parcel of land which was under consideration for nine dwellings with access off Mill Lane. Following discussions with both applicants, it had been agreed that the emergency access for this site ('the eastern parcel') would be provided via the other site. A condition was proposed to require the submission of the emergency access details and that there should be no occupation of the eastern parcel of land until the emergency access had been provided through the other site. She confirmed that the development in the eastern parcel could not be occupied unless the other site at Mill Lane was developed. She confirmed that the access would not be adopted so the proposals would not need to meet KCC's guidance on matters such as gradients. However, Officers would be looking for details of site level changes and suitable pedestrian access which would be secured at the reserved matters stage.

Councillor Beaney commented that the development of these sites would make getting around Shepherdswell even more difficult. He would have preferred to see the emergency access application first, and sought clarification regarding reserved

matters. Councillor Kenton noted that it was a contentious application. Whilst outline applications were commonplace, they did not usually come forward with all matters reserved. This meant that there was no certainty here and, with the principle of development established, the applicant could come back at the reserved matters stage with a very different scheme. Councillor Williams welcomed the provision of affordable housing and requested that it be offered to local people first.

The Principal Planner advised that a condition could be imposed to restrict the height of buildings to one storey if that was what Members wanted. The idea of a local lettings plan had been discussed with the Strategic Housing Manager and the applicant who had both indicated their support in principle.

Councillor E A Biggs commented that the site appeared to be a difficult one to develop which meant there were significant issues for Members to grasp. In his view there was currently too much uncertainty surrounding the development, and he believed that some of the issues needed to be resolved before outline permission was granted. Councillor S B Blair argued that the steep gradient of the road would make it difficult for elderly residents to get around, as well as causing access problems for refuse trucks, fire engines and ambulances.

The Principal Planner advised that, as a site allocated for development in the draft Local Plan, it had already been through the same scrutiny as other sites. The majority of sites had constraints and it was not unusual for a large number of conditions to be attached to address them. In relation to the topography of the site, she pointed out that this was similar to the existing development in St Andrew's Gardens which had been built on the same land. Access to the eastern parcel was, in fact, less steep than the access to the western parcel. In terms of archaeology, the proposed condition would require a field evaluation to take place which should give the protection Members wanted.

Councillor Beaney stressed that the draft Local Plan required there to be emergency access at the site. He was therefore of the view that it was unreasonable to ask the Committee to approve the application when the matter was unresolved. He also sought reassurance that the speed survey would be available when it came to determining reserved matters. Councillor Kenton commented that, whilst this was a difficult site, it was in the draft Local Plan which meant that it would have been subject to significant consultation and been deemed a suitable and deliverable site. Although it was not unreasonable to ask the Committee to agree the principle of development on the site, more detail of the proposed scheme should have been submitted.

The Team Leader Development Management (TLDM) advised that the application was proposing linkage to the other site and discussions with the applicant gave Officers confidence that an emergency access would be provided by means of the other site. The guarantees Members were after were provided by condition 20. He reiterated that the site had been through the Local Plan process and consequently considered by the planning inspector. Notwithstanding that the draft Local Plan had not been adopted, the site's inclusion carried some weight. A real benefit of the scheme was that it would deliver housing that was suitable for older people which was seldom built in the district. On this note, he stressed that a condition could be added to ensure that the dwellings were single storey. Moreover, it was intended that the dwellings would be built to Building Regulations M4(2) standard which related to adaptable and accessible dwellings. The scheme would provide 30% affordable housing, the applicant having indicated a willingness to offer this in the



first instance to local residents. In addition, a significant number of financial contributions would be made, such as £200,000 towards secondary school education, as well as contributions to open space and play pitches. The details of the scheme, such as design, layout and gradients, would be examined at the reserved matters stage, and the conditions proposed at outline would ensure that these matters were addressed then.

The Chairman stated that, whilst it was an unusual application due to the complete lack of detail, he was reassured that if access could not be achieved through the other site, there would be no development. In terms of accessibility within the site, he noted that Building Regulations M4(3) standard for wheelchair housing set out requirements for levels from parking spaces to front doors only and did not go beyond parking spaces. Moreover, the number of conditions proposed also reassured him. Although he was sympathetic to residents' concerns, this was a site that had already been allocated for development in the draft Local Plan and he was minded to support it.

Councillor Loffman stated that it seemed wrong that the site's development was contingent upon the other site being developed. He suggested that all the conditions should return to the Committee for consideration, particularly the ones dealing with highways and archaeology. However, both the Chairman and Councillor Kenton advised against this as being too onerous and inappropriate for many of the conditions which were technical and should rightly be considered by the experts. They agreed that all reserved matters relating to the emergency access, layout, landscaping, scale, design and appearance should be brought back to the Committee. The TLDM added that KCC would always be consulted on archaeology as they were the professionals. He also advised that the Committee would have sight of the emergency access arrangement and speed survey when the reserved matters application was considered.

RESOLVED: (a) That, subject to a Section 106 agreement to secure financial contributions and provision of affordable housing, Application No DOV/22/01207 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Reserved matters details, including existing and proposed site levels, site sections and building heights, and demonstration that requirements for surface water drainage can be met;
- (ii) Outline time limits;
- (iii) Approved plans;
- (iv) All homes built as Part M4(2) minimum;
- (v) Details for the provision of Part M4(3) homes;
- (vi) Samples of materials;
- (vii) Details of refuse and recycling facilities;
- (viii) Programme of archaeological works to be submitted and determined prior to reserved matters submission for layout;

- (ix) Biodiversity Method Statement;
- (x) Landscaping and Biodiversity Design, including provision of Landscape buffers;
- (xi) Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan;
- (xii) Construction Management Plan;
- (xiii) Vehicle parking;
- (xiv) Bicycle parking;
- (xv) Details for the gradient of the access;
- (xvi) Submission and approval of highway definitions plans;
- (xvii) Details of the construction of roads;
- (xviii) Visibility splays;
- (xix) Turning facilities;
- (xx) Details of emergency access via Mill lane site to be submitted at the same time as reserved matters submission for layout and thereafter provided prior to the occupation of the eastern parcel;
- (xxi) Details of off-site highway works – pedestrian crossing points;
- (xxii) Travel plan;
- (xxiii) Protection of trees and hedges;
- (xxiv) Unexpected contamination;
- (xxv) Full details of surface water drainage;
- (xxvi) Verification report for surface water drainage;
- (xxvii) Full details of foul drainage.

(b) The Planning Committee stipulated that the Reserved Matters application (including details of emergency access, design, appearance, landscaping, scale and layout), as well as any Section 73 applications, should be determined by the Committee.

(c) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning 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.

113 APPLICATION NO DOV/23/01234 - 51 CHURCH PATH, DEAL

Members viewed a plan and photographs of the application site which was within the urban confines of Deal. The Principal Planner advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of a detached dwelling. As an update to the report, she informed Members that amended drawings had been received showing that the proposed dwelling had been reduced in size and would be half a metre narrower; this was deemed to be a non-material change. One additional representation had been received from Deal Town Council raising concerns about the proximity of the proposed dwelling to no. 53, congestion and access for delivery vehicles during construction, closure of Church Path, parking and pedestrian safety.

Councillor Back commented that this was an infill site in a sustainable location and the dwelling would be single storey. He proposed that the application should be approved.

RESOLVED: (a) That, subject to a Section 106 agreement for SAMM payment, Application No DOV/23/01234 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Date of approval;
- (ii) Approved plans;
- (iii) Samples of materials;
- (iv) Provision of bicycle storage facilities;
- (v) Provision of refuse/recycling storage facilities;
- (vi) Removal of some permitted development rights;
- (vii) Archaeological watching brief;
- (viii) Reporting of unexpected contamination.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions and legal agreement in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

114 APPLICATION NO DOV/23/01055 - SITE REAR OF 19 AND 21 BEWSBURY CRESCENT, WHITFIELD

The Committee was shown an aerial view, drawings, plans and photographs of the application site which was within the settlement confines of Whitfield. The Senior Planner advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of a dwelling on land to the rear of existing properties. There was already a number of houses classed as backland developments on this road and in Whitfield generally. The impact on visual and residential amenity was considered acceptable and approval was recommended. In response to Members who requested clarification regarding acoustic fencing and the hedge, the Senior Planner suggested that the landscaping condition could be split into two to address concerns.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/23/01055 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time;
- (ii) Plans;
- (iii) Samples of materials;
- (iv) Parking and turning space provision;
- (v) Bicycle and refuse storage;
- (vi) Landscaping provision;
- (vii) Boundary treatments.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions, obligations and reasons in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

115 APPLICATION NO DOV/23/00995 - LAND REAR OF 439 FOLKESTONE ROAD, DOVER

Members were shown an aerial view, drawings, plans and photographs of the application site which was situated in the settlement confines of Dover. The Senior Planner advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of two dwellings on land to the rear of 439 Folkestone Road. She advised Members that the access would be widened and resurfaced. The proposals were considered acceptable by KCC Highways, and access for emergency vehicles was covered under Building Regulations and separate legislation. In response to a query from Councillor Williams, the Chairman clarified that any damage caused to walls or property by construction vehicles would be a civil matter between the builder and homeowner and was not relevant to the consideration of the application. Councillor P M Brivio noted that there were a large number of conditions which she welcomed.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/23/00995 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time condition;
- (ii) Plans;
- (iii) Samples of materials;
- (iv) Hard and soft landscaping scheme, including details of hard surfacing/driveway finish (with use of a bound surface for first 5 metres of the access from the edge of the highway and measures to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the highway) and boundary treatments and maintenance for 5 years following completion;
- (v) Construction management plan;

- (vi) Provision and retention of vehicle parking spaces;
- (vii) Closure of the existing access not used for the widening of the access track;
- (viii) Provision and permanent retention of secure covered cycle parking facilities;
- (ix) Provision and maintenance of 2-metre x 2-metre pedestrian visibility splays behind the footway with no obstructions over 0.6 metres above footway level;
- (x) Gates to open away from the highway and be set back a minimum of 5 metres from the edge of the carriageway;
- (xi) No further openings in the roof of the dwellings;
- (xii) Provision of refuse storage and details of collection arrangements/location;
- (xiii) Provision of secured cycle storage.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions, obligations and reasons in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

116 APPLICATION NO DOV/23/00521 - THE LARCH NURSERY, BEACON LANE, WOODNESBOROUGH

Members viewed an aerial view, drawings, plans and photographs of the application site which was situated outside settlement confines and within the countryside for planning purposes. The Principal Planner advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of eight dwellings with associated landscaping and parking at a former agricultural nursery. The site was allocated for development in the draft Local Plan which carried moderate weight at this point.

Councillor Back referred to the site being in the draft Local Plan and could see no basis on which to refuse the application. The Principal Planner clarified that, as a former nursery, the site was not classed as previously developed land. In response to Councillor Williams who asked that solar panels be installed, the Chairman reminded her that they were covered by Building Regulations and could not be conditioned under current planning policies.

RESOLVED: (a) That, subject to the completion of a unilateral undertaking to secure financial payments towards mitigating the impact of the development on the Thanet Coast & Sandwich Bay SPA, and the retention and maintenance of landscaping, Planning Application No DOV/23/00521 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time limits;
- (ii) Approved plans;

- (iii) Existing and proposed site levels and building heights;
- (iv) Samples of materials;
- (v) Details of hard landscaping;
- (vi) Full details of windows and doors, including the depth of reveals;
- (vii) Biodiversity Method Statement;
- (viii) Biodiversity Enhancement;
- (ix) Lighting;
- (x) Soft landscaping plan;
- (xi) Tree protection details;
- (xii) Foul drainage;
- (xiii) No infiltration of surface water drainage;
- (xiv) Contamination;
- (xv) Demolition and Construction Management Plan;
- (xvi) SUDS;
- (xvii) SUDS verification;
- (xviii) Programme of archaeological works;
- (xix) Refuse, recycling facilities and cycle storage to be provided in accordance with details submitted;
- (xx) No flues, vents, grilles or meter boxes;
- (xxi) Boundary details/enclosures as per submitted plans.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to agree a contribution for off-site highway work, settle any necessary planning conditions and secure a legal agreement, in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

(Councillor N S Kenton left the meeting during consideration of this item.)

117 APPEALS AND INFORMAL HEARINGS

The Committee noted that there was no information to receive regarding appeals.

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

The Committee noted that no action had been taken.

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm.