

a) **DOV/18/00095 - Erection of a detached dwelling with associated access and parking - Land adjoining The Minns, Mantles Hill, Ripple**

Reason for report: Councillor call-in

b) **Summary of Recommendation**

Refuse planning permission.

c) **Planning Policies and Guidance**

Development Plan

The development plan for the purposes of section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) comprises the Dover District Council Core Strategy 2010, the saved policies from the Dover District Local Plan (2002) and the Land Allocations Local Plan (2015). Decisions on planning applications must be made in accordance with the policies of the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

A summary of relevant planning policy is set out below:

Core Strategy Policies

- CP1 – Location and scale of development must comply with the Settlement Hierarchy. Ripple is a Hamlet; identified as not suitable for further development unless it functionally requires a rural location.
- CP6 – Development which generates a demand for infrastructure will only be permitted if the necessary infrastructure to support it is either in place, or there is a reliable mechanism to ensure that it will be provided at the time it is needed.
- DM1 – Settlement Boundaries. Development not permitted outside urban or rural boundaries unless alternative policies allow.
- DM11 – Location of Development and Managing Travel Demand.
- DM13 – Parking standards
- DM15 - states that development which would result in the loss of, or adversely affect the character or appearance, of the countryside will only be permitted if it is:
 - i) In accordance with allocations made in Development Plan Documents, or
 - ii) Justified by the needs of agriculture; or
 - iii) Justified by a need to sustain the rural economy or a rural community;
 - iv) It cannot be accommodated elsewhere; and
 - v) It does not result in the loss of ecological habitats.

Provided that measures are incorporated to reduce, as far as practicable, any harmful effects on countryside character.

- DM16 - states that development that would harm the character of the landscape, as identified through the process of landscape character assessment will only be permitted if:
 - i) It is in accordance with allocations made in Development Plan Documents and incorporates any necessary avoidance and mitigation measures; or
 - ii) It can be sited to avoid or reduce the harm and/or incorporate design measures to mitigate the impacts to an acceptable level.

Dover District Council Local Plan 'saved' policies (DDLDP)

There are no saved local plan policies that are relevant to this application.

Dover District Land Allocations Local Plan (2015)

There are no relevant policies in this plan.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- Paragraph 7 of the NPPF states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.
- Paragraph 11 states that “planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise”.
- Paragraph 12 states that the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan. Development which accords with an up-to-date development plan should be approved and development which conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.
- Paragraph 14 states there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay.
- Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out 12 Core Planning Principles which, amongst other things, seeks to: proactively drive and support sustainable economic development; secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future residents; recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and support thriving rural communities within it; and actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.
- Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that “housing applications should be considered in the context 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 housing sites.
- Chapter three of the NPPF seeks to support a prosperous rural economy.
- Chapter four of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable transport.
- Chapter six of the NPPF seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing, requiring Local Planning Authorities to identify specific deliverable sites sufficient

to provide five years' worth of housing. Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Of particular note, is paragraph 55 which directs housing in rural areas to be located where they will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. New isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided, unless they would: provide essential rural worker housing; provide the optimum viable use of a heritage asset or would secure the future of a heritage asset; re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting; or be of an exceptional quality or innovative design. Such a design should be: truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; reflect the highest standards in architecture; significantly enhance its immediate setting; and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

- Chapter seven requires good design, which is a key aspect of sustainable development.
- Chapter eleven requires that the planning system contributes to and enhances the natural and local environments, by protecting valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils, recognising the value of ecosystems, minimising impacts on, and where possible enhancing, biodiversity, preventing pollution and remediating contamination.

Other Documents

The Kent Design Guide (KDG)

- The Guide provides criteria and advice on providing well designed development.

d) **Relevant Planning History**

16/00349 00349 CLEUD storage of a non-residential touring caravan and steel container APP

97/00812 Change of use from rough land to garden creation REF

97/00372 Erection of a bungalow & garage REF

80/01097 Outline application for a new dwelling REF Appeal Dismissed 9/4/81

78/01166 Outline application for a 3 bedroom bungalow REF

e) **Consultee and Third Party Responses**

Ripple Parish Council: objects on the grounds of over development, concerns over the environment, there will be a massive amount of spoil, there is an illegal entrance and it is outside of the settlement confines of Ripple'.

Principal Ecologist: - no comment

Southern Water: No objection. However, they point out that there is no public foul sewer in the vicinity/area of the site and alternative means of foul sewerage will need to be examined. If a septic tank is proposed or private waste water then the Environment Agency will need to be consulted. Arrangements will need to be made for the long term maintenance of SUDS.

Cllr Manion: comments as follows:

- ❖ I believe that it is a self-build application;
- ❖ I believe that there is a move to grant such applications as a priority;
- ❖ I understand that there have been a number of comments regarding this application from the surrounding community
- ❖ I request that this application is determined by planning committee

Public Representations: 8 letters of objection and 12 letters (2 within time) of support.

The reasons for objection are summarised as follows:

- Ridge top development outside the confines
- Contrary to policy DM1, devt outside the village envelope
- Overlooking/loss of privacy to adjacent property
- Design and position is out of keeping
- Not in sympathy/in keeping with surrounding countryside, the character of the village or in the best interests of the village
- Richmond Park caters for additional housing requirements within the local area
- Poor access via a steep and narrow hill, conflict with dairy farm and farm shop on opposite side of the road
- Proposal would be viewed from many vantage points within the village boundaries
- Previous applications refused on highway grounds – the road is much busier now
- Self- build proposal will cause more disruption as will take longer
- The applicants should be required to tidy up the site
- The proposal will involve the loss of a considerable amount of spoil and cause environmental effects as a result
- Potential to impact on the local bat population
- Unconvinced by the case put forward for screening

Non-material objections were submitted in relation to the disruption that the build will cause to villagers and the farm.

The comments in support of the application are summarised as follows:

- The plans are well thought out and sympathetic to the location and surrounding area
- The proposal would be of visual benefit to the area and would fit well in the plot
- The building is not out of place considering the varied designs in the area
- There is an acute housing shortage in general and this site is suitable for one dwelling
- The land has already been granted a certificate of lawfulness which should help prove suitability for future use
- From the nearest house only a single storey dwelling would be visible – no different to most properties on the first part of Church Lane leading to Portland Terrace
- A good use of land being used as waste land; derelict plot
- Solley's farm shop is only open 6 months of the year so no conflict with traffic
- No conflict with traffic attending Ripple School as this is on the other side of the village
- DM1 is outdated and old fashioned

- Self build is encouraged by the government
- Solar tiles, recycled water, positive footprint are all good for the environment
- There is a right to build
- Low level of traffic being generated by the proposal
- No visual harm, no impact on ecology or traffic

f)

1. **The Site and Proposal**

The Site

- 1.1 The application site is approximately 0.27 hectares in size and is situated in the hamlet of Ripple. The site is located towards the upper end of 'Mantles Hill' on a plot of land set behind residential dwellings that front Church Lane and adjacent to 'The Minns', a single storey bungalow accessed off Mantle Hill. The applicants currently live in the property 'Judges Gate' which fronts Church Lane; and the application site is attached but does not form residential curtilage.
- 1.2 To the north of the site is farmland and to the north east is an access to Church Farm and Solleys Farm Shop. To the south and west is open countryside. The site slopes gently from east to west and is adjacent to a small wooded area.
- 1.3 The site does not fall within any specific designation, save for being countryside. The site is described as being managed grassland within the application documents, however there is a somewhat unkempt appearance with overgrown vegetation within and on the site boundaries. There is an area of free form hardsurfacing within the site, 3 vehicles and a large storage container. There is a metal field gate which provides the access into the site.
- 1.4 The site is to the north-east of the centre of Ripple; the hamlet has a primary school, Church and a farm shop. There are a network of PRoW that serve the hamlet and surrounding area; the nearest bus stop is in Church Lane and the village is on three bus routes with a 6 day a week service.

The Proposal

- 1.5 The application seeks permission for the erection of a self/custom build dwelling for the applicants to occupy. The proposed four bedroom dwelling is described as 'a contemporary interpretation of a traditional property'. The application has been submitted with the following supporting documents:
- Planning Statement
 - A Visual Impact Assessment
 - Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey
 - Pre-development Tree Survey and Report
 - A unilateral undertaking

2. **Main Issues**

- 2.1 The main issues for determination are as follows:
- The principle of the development
 - The design
 - Impact on the character and appearance of the locality

- Impact on ecology
- Residential amenity
- Other material considerations (self-build register)

3. **Assessment**

The Principle of Development

- 3.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This advice is reiterated in paragraph 12 of the NPPF.
- 3.2 The site is located within the settlement of Ripple. Under Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy, Ripple is identified as a Hamlet. No village confines are applied to this category of development, being a location which is not considered suitable for further development unless it functionally requires a rural location. The proposed dwelling in this instance does not functionally require a rural location and it is not ancillary to any existing development. Policy DM1 presumes against development in such a location (beyond settlement confines) and circumstances unless justified by other development plan policies, none of which apply here. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CP1 and DM1.
- 3.3 Policy DM11 seeks to manage travel demand and states that development that would generate travel will not be permitted outside rural settlement confines unless justified by development plan policies. There are no other policies which support the principle of the development and as such the proposal is also contrary to Policy DM11.
- 3.4 A recent appeal decision at Walmer, Deal (DOV/17/00487) concluded that the Council has a little over 4.5 years supply of housing. Given this position, paragraph 49 of the NPPF applies whereby relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date and the 'tilted balance' set out in paragraph 14 is engaged.
- 3.5 Relevant policies in the development plan can also be out-of-date for reasons other than lack of a 5 year housing land supply and thereby also be a trigger for the 'tilted balance'. In March 2017 DDC Cabinet agreed to commence the review of the Core Strategy and LALP through the preparation of a single local plan. The decision to review the CS and LALP is an acknowledgement that in some cases policies in the plan are out of date. With regard to this application, it's recognised that policies in the Core Strategy (Policies CP2 & CP3) are not up to date.
- 3.6 Paragraph 215 of the NPPF also states that in cases where development plan policies pre-date the NPPF (as here), 'due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).'
- 3.7 The objectives of Policies CP1, DM1 and DM11 are considered to be broadly consistent with the aims and objectives of the NPPF. That said there is an element of tension between the current framing of DM1 and CP1 and the advice in the Framework/NPPG to the effect that blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements

from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence. It is recognised that the evidence underpinning these Core Strategy policies would now warrant review. For decision making purposes this has some effect on the weight to apply to Policies DM1 and CP1.

- 3.8 Paragraph 55 of the NPPF requires that local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless the proposal fits within the following special circumstances:
- The building was of an outstanding or innovative nature;
 - Would provide a rural workers dwelling;
 - Would be the optimum viable use for a heritage asset;
 - Would re-use redundant buildings that would lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting
- 3.9 The term 'isolated' is not defined in the NPPF but within the special circumstances reference is made to farm workers dwellings, or conversions of redundant farm buildings which, of course, are unlikely to be wholly isolated by their nature. Isolated also is a reflection of where something is more remote and away from other places, buildings and the like.
- 3.10 The applicant has made reference to the Court of Appeal, Braintree vs SoS for Communities; Greyread Ltd; & Granville Development. This appeal relates solely to the issue of the term 'isolated' in para 55 of the NPPF and how this is interpreted. The issue being the meaning of the word 'isolated' in the expression 'new isolated homes in the countryside'. It is not considered that the proposed dwelling would be 'isolated' in the dictionary sense.
- 3.11 As set out above, the application site is located within the open countryside where the Core Strategy restricts development unless it falls within specific criteria. Policies DM15 and DM16 seek to protect the countryside and landscape character. Their objectives are consistent with the NPPF and both policies are applicable to the assessment of the application.
- 3.12 The site is currently undeveloped but does benefit from a Certificate of Lawful Development for the storage of a container and a touring caravan. However, in terms of character, notwithstanding the patches of hardstanding, the site generally has an unkempt appearance to it. There appears to be some occasional use such as parking but in essence, the visual impact of the site in its present form is very localised and minimal.
- 3.13 Paragraph 12 of the NPPF is clear in its guidance however, that the Framework does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. In this case, the proposal is contrary to the Development Plan. Where relevant policies are out of date, planning permission should be granted unless 'any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole'.
- 3.14 As such, the test for this application is whether or not the proposal would give rise to adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The report considers, in the context of the NPPF and the tilted balance in particular, whether any other material considerations exist which would justify granting planning permission contrary to the Development Plan.

The Design

- 3.15 The proposed development is promoted as having been designed to fit with the topography of the site and the general landform in this locality. The dwelling would be three storeys in total; however it has been designed to appear single storey to the east where it faces 'The Minns', and two storey to the west with a basement level for parking below.
- 3.16 The roof scape is proposed in two elements with fully hipped roofs and a valley between which is linked by a flat roof central section – contemporary in nature. The western elevation is outward facing across the valley and will appear as two storeys with a fully hipped roof and central flat roof dormer that descends to ground floor level.
- 3.17 The proposed material palette will reflect the Kent vernacular with a plain clay tiled roof, white render and brickwork plinth. In addition, a contemporary element features dormers clad in zinc, aluminium windows and rainwater goods.

Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Locality

- 3.18 The application site falls within the Character Area 9 of the Dover District Landscape Character Assessment: Eastry Arable and Woodland Clumps. The key characteristics of the area are identified as follows:
- Gentle ridge and topography of the Downs
 - Small settlements enclosed
 - Orchards and vineyards
 - Poplar shelter belts
 - Arable land; rectangular fields; native hedgerows
 - Mixed buildings; minor roads; footpath network
- 3.19 Essentially, the pattern and rhythm of the landscape is of a series of small settlements with open arable land in-between.
- 3.20 Policy DM15 seeks to protect the countryside. Development will only be permitted if it is in accordance with allocations made in the development plan, is justified by the needs of agriculture, or justified by a need to sustain the rural economy or a rural community. In addition it must be shown that development cannot be accommodated elsewhere and does not result in the loss of ecological habitats. This application is not submitted on the basis of agricultural need; it is not in accordance with any allocations and is not required to sustain a rural economy or rural community. Therefore the proposal is considered not to be in accordance with policy DM15.
- 3.21 Policy DM16 states that development that would harm the character of the landscape will only be permitted if it is in accordance with allocations made in the development plan, incorporating any necessary mitigation; or it can be sited to avoid or reduce the harm and/or incorporate design measures to mitigate impacts to an acceptable level.
- 3.22 The relevant landscape character assessment recognises the small enclosed settlements that make up the broad character of the area. Nearby dwellings follow a linear pattern along Church Lane with some sporadic buildings such as the farm. Outside of the built form there are expanses of open countryside with far reaching views which extend from 'upper Ripple'. One of the core

planning principles contained within the NPPF is that planning should 'take account of the different roles and character of different areas' and recognise 'the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside' (para 17). This proposal is very different in character to the more traditional form of dwellings in the locality, it will occupy a parcel of land at the edge of existing dwellings, it is substantial in its built form and will alter the softer, rural character which is currently found at the top of Mantles Hill.

- 3.23 The application documents include a number of photographs which are submitted to demonstrate that the proposal will not cause harm to the character of the countryside. The visual study seeks to demonstrate that the proposal will sit against and alongside an existing settlement of dwellings. If the proposal were substantially smaller in scale then this may be a stronger consideration, however the occupation of this currently undeveloped plot of land, with a dwelling of significant size and requiring an engineered solution to try and mitigate against a three storey building, results in a development out of context for its rural setting and which would have a jarring impact against the its immediate setting and that which extends beyond this cluster of dwellings.
- 3.24 This is a sensitive location, sited in an attractive landscape within the District. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a CLEUD for limited storage on the site this is not of a scale that causes harm to the landscape. The site is relatively unspoilt in nature and by allowing this development it will allow a permanent, prominent structure along with domestic paraphernalia to the detriment of this character. It remains that this building would be highly visible, and visually intrusive within this sensitive landscape.
- 3.25 This proposal does not accord with the core planning principles as set out in the NPPF as it will fail to respect the character of this hamlet and cause harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Whilst not adjacent to a PRow, Ripple has a network of formal and informal paths/tracks running across the hamlet from which this proposal will be visible.
- 3.26 In design terms, this is very much a standalone form of development in the locality. Whilst there is a mix of materials and development styles, this eclectic mix of a contemporary style dwelling with traditional features would result in an urbanising form of development inappropriate to the locality and causing harm to the softer, rural edge that is currently the setting at this part of Mantles Hill.
- 3.27 Accordingly, the development is considered to be unacceptable in terms of its appearance and its effect on the countryside. It is contrary to Core Strategy policies and the guidance contained in the NPPF.

Impact on Ecology

- 3.28 Under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006), "Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity". In order to comply with this 'Biodiversity Duty', planning decisions must ensure that they adequately consider the potential ecological impacts of a proposed development.
- 3.29 The National Planning Policy Framework states that "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by...minimising impacts on biodiversity and delivering net gains in biodiversity where possible." Paragraph 99 of Government Circular (ODPM 06/2005)

Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations & Their Impact Within the Planning System states that "It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision."

- 3.30 The application was accompanied by an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Report. The report finds that the site has limited potential to support protected species such as Great Crested Newts (2 ponds within 500m – unsurveyed) or reptiles. It finds that the tree, shrub and hedgerow habitats around the site boundary are all suitable for use by breeding birds. The report makes recommendations with regard to a sensitive lighting strategy to respect potential bat foraging and commuting paths; a precautionary method of works to minimise impacts on GCN; some pruning and management of vegetation outside of the bird breeding season.
- 3.31 In light of the above considerations, there are no objections on the grounds of ecology.

Residential Amenity

- 3.32 The closest dwelling to the application site is The Minns. There is a distance of approximately 40m between the proposed dwelling to the side elevation of this single storey bungalow. The proposed dwelling is located to the western side of the plot and it is considered that the combination of distance and the fact that it is, in effect, a single storey elevation that faces The Minns, there would be no undue harm to residential amenity that would arise from the proposal with regard to overlooking/loss of privacy.

Other Material Considerations

- 3.33 In support of the application, reference has been made to an appeal decision at a site in Kingsdown (Land to the west (beyond) Strathfleet, Victoria Road, Kingsdown.) The case was similar in respect that it was also for a self-build dwelling that was outside a settlement boundary. However, in the case of the appeal site, Kingsdown is a settlement where a range of services exists to meet limited day to day needs of residents, and Ripple is a hamlet. The appeal proposal was considered by the Inspector to relate to the settlement and the character of the site was very much residential in location, siting and character. It is therefore considered that the appeal decision does not carry significant weight in the determination of the current proposal.

Self-Build Register

- 3.34 The applicant is registered on the Councils self-build register and this has been cited as a further reason to support the application. A draft unilateral undertaking has been submitted by the applicant. This agreement would commit the applicant to undertaking a self-build dwelling (as defined in the agreement) and restricts the occupancy to the applicant only for a period of 3 years following first occupation.
- 3.35 Development plan policy does not specifically refer to a self-build register. In such circumstances, Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against

the policies in The Framework taken as a whole; or when specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

- 3.36 The commitment to living in the property for a period of 3 years after completion is not considered a reason to override the policies of restraint in the countryside; nor is it a reason to cause permanent damage to the character and appearance of the area. The Council has adapted to changes in legislative requirements and does keep a self-build register as required. The case for granting planning permission on the basis of it being a self-build is an argument that could be repeated time and time again as a means to gain permission for an otherwise unacceptable development. The NPPF is clear with regard to its protection of the countryside and even where the Development Plan is silent on a specific policy if the harm is considered demonstrable then planning permission should be refused. It is therefore considered that the self-build element carries insufficient weight in the planning balance to grant planning permission.

Highways

- 3.37 The proposed development is for a single dwelling accessing an unclassified road. As such, it falls outside of the KCC highways consultation protocol.
- 3.38 There is an existing access onto Mantles Hill from the application site. Objections have been received that the siting of this, together with frequent use, will give rise to conflict with farm traffic and other road users.
- 3.39 The proposal is for a single dwelling with an existing access that is staggered by some 30 metres to the access to Church Farm. The traffic that uses Mantles Hill is localised; the school is in the other part of the Hamlet to the west. The likely volume of traffic generation from one dwelling would not be likely to cause a severe impact on the highway network. Accordingly, there is no objection to the proposal on highway grounds.

Sustainability

- 3.40 There is a bus stop in Ripple which is opposite Sutton Road. This is approximately a 10 minute walk south west of the application closer to the heart of the hamlet. Services 541, 542 and 544 operate from this stop and offer a service 6 days a week. The services cover routes to Sandwich, Walmer, Deal, Dover, Aylesham, Wingham and Canterbury and the intervening villages. There is one bus a day in each direction from one of the services.
- 3.41 Whilst Ripple is served by a local bus service it is a limited service and with only one bus a day in each direction it is not considered a viable alternative to private transport.
- 3.42 It is therefore considered that the proposal would conflict with policy DM11.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 The proposal is for a self-build dwelling designed to fit in with the topography of the site. The fact remains that a permanent structure of this scale will alter the character of this rural landscape.

- 4.2 It is not contended that the proposal is a para 55 dwelling in terms of innovation or agricultural need.
- 4.3 The proposal is contrary to policies DM1, DM11, DM15 and DM16 of the Dover District Core Strategy where new development outside of existing settlement boundaries is resisted and the highest level of protection is given to landscape protection.
- 4.4 The tilted balance is engaged due to some of the policies of the local plan being considered dated and the questionable position on the 5 year housing land supply.
- 4.5 The proposal would cause harm to the rural character and appearance of the area.
- 4.6 The self-build element of the proposal carries little weight in overriding policies of constraint.
- 4.7 Overall the development is inconsistent with the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Development Plan. For the reasons given above it is considered that this application is unacceptable, and as such it is recommended that planning permission be refused.

(g)

Recommendation

REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION for the reasons given below:

- 1) The proposed development, if permitted, by virtue of its siting, form, materials and scale, would result in an incongruous, intrusive, alien and unsustainable form of development, bringing about significant harm to the character and appearance of the countryside. The proposal would be viewed from nearby public rights of way and would be highly visible within its rural setting. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DM1, DM11, DM15 and DM16 of the Dover Core Strategy and NPPF paragraphs 17 and 55.

Case Officer

Amanda Marks