

Thanet District Council

Quality Development Topic Paper

May 2013



Contents

Introduction	4
Policy Context	6
Part A - General Design Principles	7
Part B - Areas of High Townscape Value	11
Part C -Housing Density.....	14
Part D - Development on Garden Land	17
Part E - Sustainable Design and Construction	18
Appendix 1 – Policy DCS22 from the Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation Document	20
Appendix 2 - AHTV assessment	21
Appendix 3 - Density Policies from current and previous local plans	24
Appendix 4 - Assessment of planning applications for development on garden land	26

Quality Development & Heritage Topic Paper

The purpose of this paper is to draw together evidence to inform local plan policies that will help create homes and communities that people will be attracted to, and places that people want to live in. This can be achieved by:

- Securing high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings to support the economic strategy
- Quality homes (new and private rented) built to the highest quality and environmental standards
- Maintaining and enhancing existing high standards of townscape value throughout the district
- Promoting and reinforcing local distinctiveness
- Safeguarding areas and features, including open space and vegetation, which contribute to the quality of the local environment

This paper considers various aspects of design that will identify policy options.

Part A – General Design Principles, Green Infrastructure, Crime and Disorder, Advertisements

Part B – Areas of High Townscape Value

Part C – Housing Density

Part D – Development on Garden Land

Part E - Sustainable Design & Construction

Introduction

Quality Development means ensuring that new developments are of a high standard, are appropriate for their location and surroundings and make a positive contribution to the built environment. Quality Development plays a major part in our quality of life and affects the way in which we live, work and how the district is perceived. The Kent Design Guide (adopted by the Council in 2006 as a Supplementary Planning Document) states that quality development can:

- Raise peoples spirits
- Create a higher quality of life
- Enrich the existing environment
- Create higher capital value
- Attract people
- Increase marketability and prestige
- Lift confidence in surrounding areas

The NPPF suggests the use of design codes to help deliver high quality outcomes. However it also states that the sites and the scale of development identified in a plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened.

It is intended that a set of design codes will be locally produced and applied to Cliftonville as this is an area identified as needing particular attention. District-wide design policies will be applied to the rest of the district, although it is intended that a Supplementary Planning Document will be produced that will include more detailed design issues, such as space standards and a review of the Conversion to Flats Guidelines

Thanet is a pre-dominantly coastal district which is interspersed with rural settlements. Margate, Ramsgate and Broadstairs are the principal settlements in Thanet, and each is famous for its seaside setting and attractive historic town centre. Thanet's origins can be traced to pre-historic activity with the remains of all periods from the Neolithic to Modern are recorded within the area and consist of both burial and settlement archaeology. It is this rich heritage and the close proximity to the sea that gives Thanet its special character and distinctiveness. This is emphasised by the large number of highly graded designated heritage assets, often connected to the strong relationship with the sea either in the form of commerce, health or leisure.

The towns, villages, coast and countryside enjoy a diverse and rich built heritage which contributes significantly to Thanet's unique sense of place and identity. Thanet has 21 conservation areas and 2500 listed buildings – the highest concentration in the South East. There are a number of highly significant Grade I or II* listed buildings, including St Augustine's and Sir Moses Montefiore Synagogue, Ramsgate, Scenic Railway, Margate. The historic town centres contain a high concentration of listed buildings. Thanet is also rich in archaeological remains. The remains of all periods from Neolithic to Modern are recorded within the area and consist of both burial and settlement archaeology.

Some of the key distinctive qualities of Thanet's historic environment include:

- The richness of 18th and 19th 20th century development linked to the sea (including grand residential terraces, harbours, leisure and health facilities as well as defence.)
- The strong associations with internationally recognised personages including AW Pugin, Sir Moses Montefiore and George Sanger and their significant legacies within the built environment.
- The presence of significant historic technical innovation (including the Scenic Railway, Clifton baths, Albion Gardens)
- The wealth of public and private historic open spaces (including many planned squares, parks, cemeteries, chines, cliff top promenades, coastal topography and significant views)
- The Victorian/Edwardian suburbs and post - war housing developments (including Westgate on Sea)

Thanet can be described as a district with a diverse and vibrant character. The character of the district coastal areas owes much to the juxtaposition of grand seafront developments and the smaller scale domestic 'vernacular' buildings associated with working harbours and holiday resorts. The character of the rural areas owes much to the strong links with early Christianity and the ensuing development of medieval parishes centred on the church.

There are Areas of High Townscape Value which have valuable characteristics. Some suburbs and the rural villages have been developed at a low density, with large, well spaced properties and a number of tree lined streets.

Some of the urban areas boast a rich architectural heritage including attractive Victorian Terraces and Regency Squares and large and attractive and art deco properties along the coasts. However there are some areas in the district where the townscape quality is not quite so good, with developments of mediocre and poor quality, and areas of neglect. The urban areas have been developed to a high density, with high numbers of flats – largely due to the availability of large properties formerly used as hotels which lend themselves to conversion to flats, and the subdivision of larger family homes.

In order to improve the quality of the built environment and make the district more attractive to residents, visitors and investors, it is necessary to secure high quality developments. This does not just relate to the appearance of buildings, but also the spaces between buildings and the routes that link buildings and spaces. It also relates to the residential amenity value of an area, ie, whether a proposed development would have a detrimental impact to the residents who live next to or near an application site.

This paper provides background evidence for Quality Development policies in the Local Plan and considers and reviews the existing Areas of High Townscape Value, considers options for housing densities, considers the effect of design and other standards on the viability of development, and the issue of development on garden land.

Policy Context

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27th March 2012 and replaces previous national planning policy documents (Planning Policy Statements and Planning Policy Guidance).

The NPPF places a high importance on good design and quality design:

'Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality of life, including (but not limited to):

- *making it easier for jobs to be created in cities, towns and villages;*
- *moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature;*
- *replacing poor design with better design;*
- *improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure; and*
- *widening the choice of high quality homes'*

In order to achieve this, it states that planning should *'always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings'* and 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'*.

The NPPF states that local plan policies should set out the quality of development that will be expected for an area, based on an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics. Design is also about the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.

The NPPF suggests the use of design codes to help deliver high quality outcomes. This is an issue that will be dealt with in a Quality Design SPD, which will also review existing SPGs such as the Conversion to Flats Guidelines, and consider issues like space standards.

The NPPF also requires control over advertisements in terms of amenity, public safety and their cumulative impacts.

The South East Plan provided policies relating to the built environment, in particular BE1 – Management for an Urban Renaissance and BE6 – Management of the Historic Environment. These policies have been used for Development Management purposes.

Part A - General Design Principles

Development Management has used planning policy to ensure appropriate design in developments since the adoption of the 1998 Isle of Thanet Local Plan. Policy D1 of the Thanet Local Plan 2006 is the most recent and is still used. This has in recent years been backed up with the South East Plan policy BE1.

Planning applications were assessed to see which policies were used between 21/03/2009 and 01/04/2010. Of the 499 applications assessed, 357 were determined using policy D1, and 241 using SEP policy BE1. Planning Inspectors have also dismissed appeals on the strength of policy D1.

This high usage of design policies highlights their importance and the need for such policy to inform and uphold development management decisions.

Policy D1 reads as follows:

Policy D1 - Design Principles

- 1. All new development is required to provide high quality and inclusive design, sustainability, layout and materials.**
- 2. A new development proposal will only be permitted if it:**
 - A. Respects or enhances the character or appearance of the surrounding area, particularly in scale, massing, rhythm, and use of materials appropriate to the locality;**
 - B. Is compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces and does not lead to unacceptable loss of amenity through overlooking, noise or vibration, light pollution, overshadowing, loss of natural light, or sense of enclosure;**
 - C. Incorporates where practicable a high degree of permeability for pedestrians and cyclists and also considers access for public transport;**
 - D. Incorporates provision for disabled access;**
 - E. Retains open spaces, gaps in development, mature trees, other vegetation and any other features that contribute to biodiversity and the quality of the local environment;**
 - F. Incorporates new landscaping as an integral part (as set out in policy D2);**
 - G. Incorporates, where appropriate, wildlife habitats, wildlife corridors and initiatives for their long term management;**
 - H. Incorporates measures to prevent crime and disorder, promotes public safety and security and the perception of public safety and security;**
 - I. Incorporates, where practical and appropriate, high quality integrated public art which is relevant to the site and locality;**
 - J. Provides safe and satisfactory means of pedestrian and, where provided, vehicle access;**
 - K. Provides for clothes drying facilities and refuse disposal¹ or dustbin storage; and**
 - L. Incorporates sustainable drainage systems.**

The Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document (2009) included Policy DCS22 which was a draft policy to update and replace Policy D1 – policy DCS22 can be found in Appendix 1.

Policy DCS22 was well supported in the consultation responses, however concerns were raised regarding its proposal to request compliance with the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 by 2013, although compliance with Level 3 was supported.

The quality of Thanet's public realm is important to help create positive channels for development energy. There has been wide use of Saved Policy D1 in decisions and at appeals, it is therefore considered necessary to include design issues in planning policy.

Green Infrastructure

Green Infrastructure (GI) and relevant policy options is dealt with in the Natural Environment topic paper. However, some aspects of GI relate to the protection of existing GI features and provision of GI in new development which can contribute to the quality of a development.

New GI features can be created through landscaping, and through design – there is potential for the creation of wildlife corridors and stepping stones in new developments. Landscaping can soften the impact of new buildings, lend a sense of maturity to new development, and help to establish a sense of place. It also has a crucial role in terms of wildlife habitat creation and improving the biodiversity of urban areas. However, landscaping should always form an integral part of the design. It should not consist of 'offcuts' of leftover land, or be used simply to camouflage poor design.

The Thanet Local Plan (2006) includes a policy relating to Landscaping as follows:

Policy D2 - Landscaping

The following elements will be required as part of landscaping proposals for any new development:

- 1. The enhancement of the development site in its setting;**
- 2. The retention (and protection during site works) of as many of the existing trees, hedges and other habitat features on site as possible;**
- 3. On sites of one hectare or more, the setting aside of 10% of the development site for the planting of native tree species, either within or at the boundary of the development site;**
- 4. The maximising of nature conservation opportunities where development is proposed in proximity to existing open space or wildlife habitats, and**
- 5. Where both appropriate and possible, the provision of landscaping in advance of new development to facilitate the assimilation of new development into the landscape.**

The District Council will require to be satisfied that the developer has made adequate arrangements to ensure continued maintenance of landscaping, and may seek to secure arrangements for this purpose by entering into a planning agreement.

Private open space is an important part of a quality development. Residential gardens not only contribute towards the green infrastructure network, but are also considered to be a feature of a high quality development, and are often marketed as such – camera shots are taken to include garden areas as space is often associated with quality:

'5 bedroom detached house for sale'

The Ridings, Cliftonville, Palm Bay, Kent - ...'Panoramic sea and cliff tops views make this exceptional family home an absolute must for viewing'



Source: <http://www.rightmove.co.uk/new-homes-for-sale/property-25018959.html>

The issue of publicly accessible open space is dealt with in the Natural Environment topic paper, however it is appropriate to consider a policy option requiring private open space, residential gardens, landscaping and planting in new developments to improve the quality of a development.

Crime and Disorder

Thanet suffers higher crime rates than the average for the Kent police area, with a crime rate of 76.49% compared to an average of 58.29% (as at June 2012, www.police.uk).

The Thanet Corporate Plan 2012-2016 refers to a budget consultation carried out at the end of 2011 to find out peoples views on living in Thanet and what peoples priorities were for Council service. When asked what was most important in making somewhere a good place to live, 73% identified 'Feeling safe from crime and anti-social behaviour' – this was the response with the highest percentage.

Design policies can help achieve a safer environment. Designing out crime is not just about fitting security measures and a defensive approach, but is about creating a 'good place'. The Kent Design Initiative has produced a document called 'Design for Crime Prevention – A Kent Design Guide for Developers, Designers & Planners' (November 2012) which was brought together by Kent Police and urban designers from various Kent districts and Kent County Council.

The guide identifies seven attributes which are not a set of rules to be applied to all situations, but should be used upon analysis of the local situation. The attributes are as follows:

1. Access and Movement – places with well defined routes, spaces and entrances that provide for convenient movement without compromising security
2. Structure Places – that are structured so that different uses do not cause conflict
3. Surveillance – Places where all publicly accessible spaces are over-looked
4. Ownership – places that promote a sense of ownership, respect, territorial responsibility and community
5. Physical protection – places that include necessary, well-designed security features

6. Activity – places where the level of human activity is appropriate to the location and creates a sense of safety at all times
7. Management and Maintenance – places that are designed with management and maintenance in mind, to discourage crime in the present and future.

It is considered appropriate for planning policy to address measures to prevent crime and disorder as it is an issue that is a high priority both to the Council and Thanet's residents.

Advertisements

The NPPF states that advertisements should be controlled efficiently and effectively and only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account cumulative impacts. This paper discusses whether an advertisements policy should be included in the Local Plan.

The 2006 Local Plan includes the following policy:

Policy D5 - Advertisements

Applications for advertisements will be considered in relation to their effects upon amenity and public safety. Regard will be paid to the surrounding location, manner of illumination (if proposed), material composition, design and relationship to the land, building or structure to which they are to be affixed. Advertisements should not dominate but should be in balance with the character, townscape and architecture of the buildings on which they are situated.

In and adjoining conservation areas the District Council will require that the design and siting of advertisements does not detract from, and preferably makes a positive contribution to, the character and/or appearance of the area.

The current development management procedures consider all of the issues raised in this policy. KCC Highways are consulted about applications for advertisements which may have impacts on the highway. There is a significant number of commercial premises in conservation areas in Thanet's historic town centres which may be subject to additional specifications for advertisements, for example, lower levels of illumination.

Part B - Areas of High Townscape Value

Both the Isle of Thanet Local Plan of 1998 (Policy CB11), and the Thanet Local Plan of 2006 (Policy D7) have identified Areas of High Townscape Value (AHTV) as areas which are considered to possess certain characteristics meriting special recognition. These characteristics vary between areas, but mainly include the separation between buildings, the open form of development and the contribution made by landscaping.

Policy D7 was saved by the Secretary of State on the basis that it supplements policy D1. The current AHTV policy in the Thanet Local Plan reads as follows and identifies the following sites:

Policy D7 - Areas of High Townscape Value

The following areas as defined on the proposals map are designated as areas of high townscape value:

1. Callis Court Road, Broadstairs;
2. Holly Lane, Northdown;
3. Canterbury Road, Westgate;
4. Palm Bay Avenue, Cliftonville;
5. North Foreland, Broadstairs;
6. Royal Esplanade/Prince Edward's Promenade, Ramsgate;
7. South Cliff Parade and Western Esplanade, Broadstairs; Kingsgate Avenue, Broadstairs;
8. Park Avenue, Broadstairs ;
9. Sea Road, Westgate;
10. Area including Shakespeare Road, Constable Road, Wilkie Road, Nasmyth Road, Colman's Stairs Road & Spencer Road, Birchington; and
11. Cliff Road & The Parade (part), Birchington.

Within such areas, and sites immediately adjoining, the conservation or enhancement of the local character will be the primary planning aim. In furtherance of this aim, development will be allowed only where the design, scale of development, separation between buildings, use of materials and landscaping are complementary to the special character of the area.

During the consultations for the Thanet Local Plan 2006, additional areas were suggested to be designated as AHTVs:

Cliff Road/The Parade was considered appropriate to include in the AHTV designation. The reasoning for this states that the area consists of large properties of mixed design quality, overlooking public open space and the sea. Further development of new plots are limited, unless current properties are demolished, as the most obvious opportunities for development have been taken already. The area is similar to Palm Bay AHTV in quality but with the addition of a crescent shape. A number of roads were added to the Shakespeare Road allocation as they share very similar characteristics.

An area bounded by Grenham Road-Darwin Road-Beach Avenue-Sea Road-Berkeley Road, including Semaphore Road, Herschell Road and Dallinger Road was considered to have a mix of designs, and did not have a sufficiently identifiable, uniform appearance to warrant and AHTV designation. An area to the north side of Alpha Road was also not included. It was cited as a reason for needing the AHTV policy since there are a number of attractive large properties, but also a number of insensitive flat and housing developments (probably 1960s/70s) on what were probably gardens of the larger properties.

In 2010 a request was received for Manor Drive, Birchington, to be designated as an AHTV. A character analysis of the area was carried out and concluded that the area '*...lacks townscape*

quality because it does not have any sense of place in terms of focal points, variety of spacing and form and lack of mature treescape, which you would find in a true garden suburb'. It was recommended that any planning applications for that area are assessed against policy D1, particularly section 2 which states:

A new development proposal will only be permitted if it:

A) Respects or enhances the character or appearance of the surrounding area, particularly in scale, massing, rhythm and use of materials appropriate to the locality;

B) Is compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces and does not lead to unacceptable loss of amenity through overlooking, noise or vibration, light pollution, overshadowing, loss of natural light, or sense of enclosure.

A number of applications within the designated AHTVs have been assessed to gauge the usage of the policy and designation. The applications assessed, and a comment on the decisions can be found in Appendix 2. Several applications within the AHTVs were granted permission as the applications were considered to be in conformity with policy D7 and contributed to or enhanced the characteristics of the AHTV. The design of the proposed development was considered to be of a sufficient standard to be worthy of being located in an AHTV. These have not been included in the table in Appendix 2 as they were also considered to conform to Policy D1 and could have been granted permission just on that policy – compliance with Policy D7 supported those decisions. There were no instances of an application being granted solely on Policy D7.

Many of the applications assessed were refused planning permission on the strength of policy D7 on the basis that the design of the proposal would not relate well to the surrounding area, or that the proposal would be overly dominant, or that the proposal would reduce separation distances between the application site and neighbouring properties (or other features of the AHTV – one application was refused as it would be on a quarter-moon shaped green space at a junction which was a common feature at other junctions in the AHTV), so would not respect the character of the AHTV. One application was refused on policy D7 due to the creation of a significant hardstanding for parking which was not considered appropriate in the AHTV.

Some of these applications were dismissed at appeal and in most cases the Inspector recognised the importance of the AHTVs and the impact the proposed development would have on the character of the area. One application was refused due to the height, bulk and relationship of the proposed development with neighbouring properties, but was allowed at appeal. The Inspector considered there to be little consistency with surrounding properties, that the proposed building would be comparable in height with adjacent properties and a similar distance from each side boundary, so would not be atypical to the area.

Another application was refused, revised and re-submitted and granted permission as the proposed development as resubmitted would not be considered detrimental to the character of the AHTV. The AHTV was used in this instance to permit a lower density development than that prescribed in PPS3 (which was national planning policy at that time) as a lower density was more appropriate in the context of the AHTV.

There was also an application within an AHTV which was refused and dismissed at appeal using only policy D1.

This assessment of applications has shown that D7 has been used to ensure good design which compliments the surroundings of the application site, to refuse developments which would be detrimental to the AHTV – mainly in terms of space between developments and scale of development, and has been applied for alternative uses. Planning permission has been granted within AHTVs suggesting that the policy is not overly restrictive.

It is clear that AHTV designations have been used to ensure that new developments have been of a high quality and appropriate to their surroundings. The sentiments of the AHTV policy also compliment the sentiments of Green Infrastructure in providing landscaping and potential new habitats, and green corridors. However, there may be other areas in the district worthy of an AHTV designation that are not currently designated, and it could be argued that the issues relevant to development within AHTVs should be considered anyway as a matter of course through the decision making process. It is appropriate to consider whether the existing AHTVs are still appropriate and relevant, and whether new AHTVs should be designated.

Part C -Housing Density

Density is a measure of the number of dwellings which can be accommodated on a site or in an area. Housing density can affect the streetscene in a number of ways including:

- The space between buildings
- Amenity and privacy access
- Parking
- Provision/retention of trees and shrubs
- Surface water run off

Previous National Planning Policy (PPS3) set a national indicative minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare. However this was deleted in June 2010 when PPS3 was reissued.

Regional Planning Policy in the South East Plan set a regional target of 40 dwellings per hectare, but this plan is expected to be revoked.

The NPPF states that local planning authorities should set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances, and that this should be guided by design policies.

Housing densities have been addressed in planning policy since the Thanet Urban Local Plan 1984. Each of the policies relating to density and the supporting text can be found in Appendix 3.

Plan	Densities set	Commentary from Plan
Thanet Urban Local Plan 1984	Policy H8 - Net densities of between 10-15 dwellings per acre on new housing sites, and net densities of between 70-80 habitable rooms per acre for new flat development comprising self contained units	Substantial savings in land can be made by modest increases in density. Maximum permissible density will depend on the nature of the development and established character of the locality
Isle of Thanet Local Plan 1998	None set – 'be of a density, layout, scale, mass and design...appropriate to the development itself and compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces'	Density of new development should be compatible with that of adjoining development – this does not mean that existing densities should be adhered to with mathematical precision
Thanet Local Plan 2006	Less than 30 dwellings per hectare net on any site will require special justification. In town and district centres and other locations with good public transport accessibility, special justification would be required for less than 50 units per hectare	PPS3 gave a national indicative minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare, South East Plan set a regional target of 40 dwellings per hectare over the plan period

To give an idea of the context of housing densities, the table below shows the densities achieved by different types of housing form:

Dwelling type	Dwellings per hectare
Detached houses	10
Semi-detached houses on street	16
Semi-detached houses on cul-de-sac	31
Terraced houses – medium frontage	53
Terraced houses – wide frontage	44
Flats – 4 storey perimeter blocks	155
Flats – 4 storey cluster blocks	67

Source: Llewelyn-Davies, 2000, cited in <http://cibworld.xs4all.nl/dl/publications/Pub281/14Chapter-10.pdf>

Higher density developments could have positive or negative impacts:

Positive:

- Conserves land by reducing the loss of open countryside/Greenfield land
- Will likely be located in a built-up urban area so will be well served by public transport, with many journeys achievable by foot or bicycle, thus reducing the need for car travel
- Cost of services such as water, gas, electricity and waste disposal reduces
- Creates vitality and diversity

Negative:

- Large numbers of flatted developments could lead to transient community (as has happened in Cliftonville)
- Large numbers of flatted development result in poor quality developments, properties owned by absent landlords so poorly maintained
- Lack of open spaces/landscaping
- Will likely be located in more rural areas so potential for traffic congestion due to reliance on private car

Thanet has some areas which are already densely developed. Some areas such as Cliftonville have seen several conversions of large buildings (often previously used as hotels) into flatted accommodation which has, in some areas, had a detrimental impact due to poor quality developments, absent landlords, and a transient population. It could be argued that setting a lower density in such areas could reduce the proliferation of flats. However, due to the nature of sites available for development in these areas, it could be impossible to develop anything other than at a high density. It could be difficult, for example, to require a lower density development in an area characterized by 4 storey buildings due to the practicalities and viability of sub-dividing that property, and replacing that property with a building of a lower height would be out of character with the existing streetscene.

Other areas of the district, such as AHTVs, benefit from lower density developments due to the character and appearance of the area – it could be considered appropriate to limit the density of new developments in these areas.

The Kent Design Guide suggests densities for different types of area as set out in the table below:

Type of Area	Suggested Density (units per hectare)	Comment	Local Context
Traditional Urban Areas	50-70	Densities are relatively high, and different uses are typically closely integrated	Generally developed to high densities with a high concentration of flats
Coastal Towns	70-120	Densities are usually as high as other central urban areas and often much higher around the central seafront	Thanet has high density development around the coast – often a high concentration of flats due to conversion of large buildings eg former hotels
Suburban and	30-50	Density needs to remain	Subject to high development

urban fringe		compact to avoid urban sprawl but form needs to scale down so that the urban fringe blends easily into the countryside	pressure in Thanet. Some areas, including at the coastal edges, are low density and spacious and considered important in terms of townscape
Rural areas and villages	50-70	Usually built to very high densities concentrated on a few streets or around a village square, green or other public space where the community can congregate for special events	Thanets villages are generally low density but high quality desirable locations.

The potential policy options for housing density in Thanet include:

- Zoning areas of Thanet with specific density requirements
- Ensure that new developments reflect the density of the surrounding area
- Continue the current requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare, and of 50 dwellings per hectare in town and district centres and other location with good public transport

Part D - Development on Garden Land

In June 2010, national planning policy was changed removing private residential gardens from the definition of previously developed land. This gave the Council more flexibility to be able to refuse the inappropriate development of garden land which could result in 'town cramming', and protect the character of residential neighbourhoods.

The NPPF states that Local planning authorities should: '*consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area*'

In Thanet, applications have been refused for development on garden land due to the impact it would have on the character and appearance of the streetscene. Some parts of the district enjoy a high quality environment, with spacious surroundings, and a development within a garden could have a detrimental effect. Residential gardens also form part of Thanets green infrastructure – the district is deficient in areas of open space (discussed in more detail in the Natural Environment paper) so development of garden sites may not be appropriate, and may be unnecessary, if there is still a supply of housing sites available. There could also be instances where a development within a garden could be beneficial to the streetscene, where the property would be a frontage development.

Sites identified through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment that comprise garden land can be allocated where this is considered appropriate. However 'windfall' sites on garden land would not contribute to the supply of available sites in any windfall allowance that is established.

Planning applications for housing development on garden land have been assessed from June 2010, when the national planning policy was changed. Between 1st June 2010 and 3rd January 2013 there were 421 applications for residential development. A table listing the applications along with a comment from the officers report can be found in Appendix 4. There were 46 applications for residential development on garden land - 17 applications were granted, 29 were refused.

Some of the applications that were refused permission were refused solely on the basis that the development site is not previously developed land so the principle of development is not acceptable as it would be contrary to policy H1 which states that 'residential development on non allocated sites will be permitted only on previously developed land within existing built-up confines'.

The main issues considered in determining the garden land applications were the visual impact the proposed development would have on the character of the surrounding area, and the quality of the existing space proposed for development. For some of the applications that were granted, it was considered that the proposed development would sit comfortably in its proposed location, and would improve the appearance of the area either by making a positive contribution to the existing streetscene or improving an area of open space with little amenity value. For some of the applications refused, it was considered that the proposed development would appear cramped, overbearing or incongruous with the existing street scene, or that the proposed site formed an important open space that contributed significantly to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

It is considered appropriate to identify any particular circumstances where housing development on private residential gardens should be restricted in Thanet.

Part E - Sustainable Design and Construction

The government is currently undertaking a review of all of the standards that can currently be applied to home building through the planning process, eg, the Code for Sustainable Homes, Secured by Design, Lifetime Homes, Standards and Quality in Development and the Homes and Communities Agency's House Quality Indicators. The aim of the review is to rationalise the number of codes, standards, rules, regulations and guidance that add cost and complexity to the house-building process. The findings of the review are expected to be submitted to ministers by the end of April 2013. In the meantime, the Council will continue to work with the Code for Sustainable Homes and Lifetime Homes.

The Councils Corporate Plan aims to increase the proportion of developments which are based on sustainable energy and energy efficient buildings. The Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document included a standard for the Code for Sustainable Homes in its general design policy. The Code for Sustainable Homes is the national standard for the sustainable design and construction of new homes. The Code aims to reduce our carbon emissions and create homes that are more sustainable. There are 6 code levels which new developments can aim to achieve and relate to the minimum percentage reduction in emissions – Level 1 is a 10% reduction and Level 6 would be a zero carbon home.

The government's strategy for housing an ageing population requires all homes to be built to the Lifetime Homes standards by 2012. The National Strategy for Housing in an Ageing Society aims to ensure that all public housing would be built to Lifetime Homes standards by 2011, aspiring to all new housing to be built to the standards by 2013. These are a set of 16 standards that will ensure that the homes we are building today are flexible and adaptable to meet the changing needs of the people that live in them. The Thanet Local Plan 2006 included a policy (H8 – which was saved) requiring 15% of residential units to be designed as Lifetime Homes. This policy was carried forward into the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation (Policy DCS30) with at least 20% of market units and 100% of affordable units on development of over 15 units to be developed to Lifetime Standards. The policy was well supported in the consultations, with two responses suggesting it should go further.

The NPPF requires that local authorities must consider the cumulative impact of standards and policies for development, to ensure that the implementation of the plan is not put at serious risk as a result of economic viability. In this respect, the Council commissioned an Economic Viability Assessment of development to inform its review of the SHLAA. Part of this assessment included an assessment of the impact upon viability of providing homes to sustainable and lifetime standards and to support mixed communities.

The Code for Sustainable Homes levels are set out below

Level	% energy efficiency higher than Part L1A of the Building Regulations	Daily water usage (litres)per person
1	10	120
2	18	120
3	25	105
4	44	105
5	100	80
6	Zero carbon	80

The table below summarises the findings, based on a recommended provision of affordable housing at 30%:

Code Level	Viable
3	Yes
3 + water requirement at level 5	Yes
4	Yes

4 + water requirement at level 5	Affordable housing provisions would need to be reduced from 30% to 20% for development to be viable
5	Affordable housing provisions would need to be reduced from 30% to 10% for development to be viable

The assessment also considered the viability of building to Lifetime Homes standards. It concludes that this would not have a significant impact on overall project costs because the requirements of the revised Part M of Building Regulations requires many of the same considerations to be addressed as a matter of course, therefore it would not have a significant negative impact on scheme viability. However it is an issue that needs to be kept under review in terms of practicalities, costs and impacts.

The evidence indicates that for viability reasons, it would be unrealistic to request new developments to be built at the highest code levels in order to improve quality, as this would likely detract developers. Further viability tests may be carried out as necessary. However a requirement for new developments to meet a Code for Sustainable Homes standard may be appropriate to increase the sustainability and energy efficiency of buildings, and help to mitigate against the effects of climate change.

Appendix 1 – Policy DCS22 from the Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation Document

Policy DCS22

New development will be of a high quality inclusive design and employ sustainable construction methods and layout. It should: -

- **relate to the surrounding development form and layout and strengthen links to the adjacent areas**
- **be well-designed, respect and where possible enhance the character, context and identity of its location: particularly in scale, massing, rhythm, and use of materials appropriate to the locality;**
- **be compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces and not lead to unacceptable loss of amenity through overlooking, noise or vibration, light pollution, overshadowing, loss of natural light, or sense of enclosure;**
- **incorporate where practical a high degree of permeability for pedestrians and cyclists and also consider access for public transport and provide safe and satisfactory means of pedestrian and vehicle access including provision for disabled access;**
- **retain and enhance features that contribute to biodiversity and the quality of the local environment including open spaces, gaps in development, mature trees, and other vegetation**
- **incorporate new landscaping as an integral element, including, where appropriate, wildlife habitats, wildlife corridors and initiatives for their long term management;**
- **incorporate measures to prevent crime and disorder, promote public safety and security and the perception of public safety and security;**
- **incorporate, where practical and appropriate, high quality integrated public art which is relevant to the site and locality;**
- **provide for discreetly located service areas for development including cycle stores, clothes drying facilities and refuse disposal/dustbin storage;**
- **incorporate sustainable drainage systems.**
- **incorporate challenging sustainable design and construction standards contributing towards achieving zero carbon emissions, improving water efficiency and minimizing waste.**

New homes will be expected to be built to a minimum of code level 3 under the Code for Sustainable Homes. This expectation will rise to a minimum of Code level 4 by 2013. Other development will be expected to achieve a minimum BREEAM score of “Good”.

Note to policy. Satisfactory provision for refuse disposal means a carry distance for refuse not to exceed 25 metres.

Appendix 2 - AHTV ASSESSMENT

Application Ref	House No.	Proposal	Comment
Holly Lane			
TH/09/0742	7	Erection of 2 storey side extension and single storey rear extension following demolition of garage	Permission refused using D1(E) referring to the retention of open spaces and gaps – report states that existing open space to the side of the dwelling positively contributes to the character of the area and its loss would be to the detriment of the streetscene and character of the area in general
TH/09/0241	52	Erection of 2 storey side extension to side and rear	Permission refused using D7 – report states that the extension is considered to be substantial in scale and to be of a design which does not relate well to the existing building. The proposal would be dominant and obtrusive and reduce the gap between the application site and neighbouring property so would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the AHTV
OL/TH/06/0979	36	Erection of a 5 bed 2 storey detached house and garage extension including means of access and siting	Refused using D7 – report states that whilst proposed property would not be overly dominant on the street scene, the separation distance to the boundaries does not respect the character of the AHTV. Application was dismissed on appeal – the Inspector refers to the distinctive character and appearance of the AHTV
Palm Bay Avenue			
TH/11/0680	4	Erection of 1no. detached dwelling	Refused using D7 – report states that the dwelling would be set forward of the well defined building lines and would be of a scale, siting and design which fails to respect the character of the properties in the avenue. It would create an uncharacteristic, cramped appearance within the street scene. Dismissed at Appeal – Inspector considered the development would be seriously harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would fail to compliment the AHTV.
TH/08/1401	20	Retrospective application for inclusion of land into residential curtilage, and retention of wall, fence and creation of vehicular access and gates	Refused using D7 – area characterised by quarter-moon shaped incidental open spaces at the corner of road junctions. This application results in the loss of this feature and is therefore detrimental to the AHTV designation.
TH/08/1288	25	Outline application for the erection of a three storey	Refused using D7 – height, bulk and relationship with neighbouring properties means it will be out of keeping with the form

Application Ref	House No.	Proposal	Comment
		building comprising of 3 No. self contained flats with associated parking, following the demolition of existing building including scale, layout and access	and rhythm of development and detrimental to AHTV. Allowed at Appeal – Inspector considered there to be little consistency with surrounding properties, the proposed building would be comparable in height with adjacent properties and a similar distance from each side boundary and would not be atypical to the area. Therefore would not cause harm to the AHTV.
North Foreland			
TH/12/0034	18	Erection of first floor extension incorporating 3no dormer windows and rear balcony, 2 storey front extension incorporating double garage and 2no dormer windows and raised decking to rear	Refused using D7 – proposal increases maximum ridge height and bulk of the dwelling, which, combined with the proximity of this dwelling with its neighbour, would be detrimental to the AHTV.
TH/10/0563 TH/10/0121	6	Erection of 14no two and three storey dwellings, creation of vehicular access and provision of parking and landscaping following the demolition of the existing building	Refused on D7 – the application proposes a 'gatehouse' which would reduce the space between buildings, creating a cramped and awkward relationship which would not sit comfortably with the size and scale of the principle building. The scheme would result in the loss of openness and would fail to achieve a logical and cohesive layout and form of development. New application whilst being both broader and higher than the existing building, is set back from the road thus retaining the openness, maintaining the visual character of the site and contributing to the AHTV. This application also permits a lower density development than that prescribed in PPS3 due to the special circumstances of the site being an AHTV and its attractive and open character.
TH/09/0097	16	Erection of a detached dwelling	Refused on D7 – development would fill one of the last remaining open spaces in the AHTV. Dismissed at appeal as the proposal is for a large dwelling on one of the smaller sites in the area and its design and separation
Royal Esplanade			
TH/11/1027	24	Erection of 1No three storey detached dwelling	Refused on D7 – site is a corner plot comprising garden land which provides a sense of openness of merit to the character and appearance of the area.
South Cliff Parade/Western Esplanade			

Application Ref	House No.	Proposal	Comment
TH/12/0210	9	Outline permission for a 3 storey building containing 5 no self contained flats following demolition of existing building, including access, layout and scale	Refused on D7 – height and depth of the building means it will be highly visible and would create significant harm to the AHTV.
Park Avenue			
TH/08/0340	60	Erection of a two storey detached dwelling following demolition of no 60s existing conservatory	Proposed dwelling would be located in existing open space between two bungalows – this would not conserve the separation space and would be detrimental to the AHTV. Dismissed at appeal – Inspector considered that whilst a degree of loss of openness could be acceptable, the scheme proposed would not improve the character and quality of the area. Also concluded that there was no evidence for the need of housing on that site sufficient to outweigh the harm it would do to the AHTV.
TH/07/1605	9	Erection of a two storey side extension	Site in AHTV but refused using policy D1 as the development would comprise a cramped and congested form of development by reducing the degree of separation resulting in a dominant and incongruous form of development to the detriment of the open character of the area. Dismissed at appeal – Inspector considered proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policy D1 which seeks to ensure that all development respects its setting.
TH/07/0345	34	Erection of a single garage to side together with roof windows	Refused on D7 – garage proposed has a flat roof – there are no other garages of this design in the areas therefore would not be complementary to the character of the AHTV.
The Parade			
TH/08/0440	Wyndcliffe	Change of use and conversion of single dwelling to 4 no 2bed self contained flats with erection of single storey side and rear extensions and 2 storey side extension	Refused on D7 - Proposal involves an extensive area of hardstanding to accommodate necessary parking provision, and the extension would be detrimental to the openness of the site.

Appendix 3 - Density Policies from current and previous local plans

Thanet Urban Local Plan – 1984

Para 2.18

Substantial savings in land can be made possible by quite modest increases in density. Although the maximum permissible density will always depend on the nature of the development, and the established character of the locality, the following policy approach is appropriate:

Policy H8

The District Council wishes to encourage

- A) Net densities of between 10-15 dwellings per acre on new housing sites; and**
- B) Net densities of between 70-80 habitable rooms per acre for new flat development comprising self contained units**

Provided that the proposed housing or flat development meets the following relevant criteria:

- i) The development is of a high architectural and environmental standard**
- ii) The proposed density is not gained at the expense of other residential standards**
- iii) The proposed development has adequate regard to site characteristics and the existing pattern of development within the area**
- iv) The dwellings proposed are varied both in architectural style and size**
- v) That where appropriate a combined vehicle and pedestrian highway, designed to encourage low vehicle speeds and pedestrian safety is proposed**
- vi) Where the open space and provision of landscaping is an essential part of the proposal and is conceived as an integral part of the scheme from the outset of the design work**
- vii) In flat developments, the provision of areas or facilities for dustbin storage, refuse collection and clothes drying is satisfactory**
- viii) Off-street parking provision and servicing arrangement comply with KCC or Thanet town centre standards**

Proposals for flat development to a higher density will require exceptional justification having regard to the extent to which the proposal meets the stated criteria, likely impact on the area and the individual merits of the proposed scheme.

Isle of Thanet Local Plan - 1998

Para 6.12

While the density of new development should be compatible with that of adjoining development, this does not mean that existing densities should be adhered to with mathematical precision. Carefully considered variety in design and density can enhance identity and character.

Policy CB1

The District Council will seek to ensure that all development is of a high standard of design and reflects the principles set out above.

New development proposals will be expected to:

- (1) Respect and preferably enhance the merits of local environmental character**
- (2) Be of a density, layout, scale mass and design, including materials, appropriate to the development itself and compatible with neighbouring buildings and spaces**
- (3) Avoid the loss of open areas, gaps, vegetation and features which contribute to the quality of the local environment and**

(4) Incorporate landscaping to a high standard as an integral part of design

Thanet Local Plan 2006

Para 3.42

The Council wishes to see efficient use of housing land. It envisages that densities of 50 or more dwellings per hectare net may be achieved through quality residential and mixed-use developments especially in accessible locations such as the town centres and adjoining quality transport corridors. Developments of less than 30 dwellings per hectare net on any site will usually require special justification. No specific densities are prescribed in this Plan as compatibility with the character of the locality, securing a mix of housing types to meet local demand, achieving attractive living environments through quality design and optimising use of land will influence design and layout. However, this plan places emphasis on making best use of land, and optimum densities will be expected on all sites through good design.

Policy H1 - Residential Development Sites

Permission for new residential development will be granted only on sites allocated for such purposes on the proposals map or on other sites where there is no conflict with structure plan or other local plan policies.

Residential development on non-allocated sites will be permitted only on previously developed land within existing built-up confines, (as defined on the proposals map – policies CC1 & R1), unless specifically permitted by other local plan policies. All proposals for residential development will be required to meet the criteria in policies H2 – H5.

Alternative development on sites allocated for residential purposes will not be permitted unless there is an overriding local need which cannot be met on an alternative site.

The council will seek to make efficient use of housing land. Developments of less than 30 dwellings per hectare net on any site will require special justification. In town and district centres and other locations with good public transport accessibility, special justification would be required for densities of less than 50 units net per hectare.

Permission for new residential development will be granted or renewed only where:

- **It is demonstrated that adequate infrastructure and access will be in place to serve each unit ready for occupation, and**

Satisfactory details are provided showing how any physical conditions affecting the site, including land instability and contamination, will be overcome

Appendix 4 - Assessment of planning applications for development on garden land

Application Number	Address	Proposal	Decision	Comment
F/TH/10/0307	1A Minster Road, Ramsgate	Erection of a detached dwelling	Granted	Development site is in rear garden of 1A Minster Road and deemed acceptable as it is on previously developed land and within the urban confines
The following applications were determined using central governments revised policy statement, redefining garden land as non-previously developed. The effect of this is that applications that involve the subdivision and development of existing gardens fall outside the provisions of Thanet Local Plan Policy H1 which permits new housing only on allocated sites, or land that is previously developed.				
F/TH/10/0638	11 Canterbury Road, Westgate on Sea	Erection of a four storey block of 10 flats and two detached dwellings to the rear following the demolition of the existing building	Refused	The propose two detached dwellings would be located in the rear part of the plot which is currently garden land to the bungalow, the flatted accommodation would occupy the front garden to the existing bungalow – contrary to policy H1 as no longer pdl
F/TH/10/0797	107 London Road, Ramsgate	Erection of detached bungalow with accommodation in roof space	Granted	Site is part of rear back garden to 107 which is not pdl. However, two extant planning permissions for a detached bungalow on the site could make this proposal an acceptable departure from local plan policy H1.
F/TH/10/0746	105 Grange Road, Ramsgate	Erection of three storey building to accommodate 6 self contained flats, and erection of 2-storey dwelling, with associated parking and amenity space, following the demolition of the existing dwelling	Refused	Site currently occupied by a bungalow and associated garden land therefore contrary to policy H1 as no longer pdl.
F/TH/10/0966	Abbey Lodge, Priory Road, Ramsgate	Change of use of existing building to 3no 2 bed dwellings together with the erection of a terrace of 3 no 2 bed dwellings	Granted	Application expands beyond existing footprint onto garden land which is no longer pdl. Degree of encroachment would be modest involving around 1.5 meters forward, front and back. Removal of a garage which is not to be redeveloped

Application Number	Address	Proposal	Decision	Comment
		and alterations to access following the demolition of abbey Cottage		compensates for encroachment of replacement building, therefore an acceptable departure to policy H1.
F/TH/10/1002	47 Lanthorne Road, Broadstairs	Erection of detached dwelling with associated parking	Refused	Application site in side garden of no.47. Contrary to policy H1 as no longer pdl. Would also be detrimental to the AHTV within which the site is located.
F/TH/10/0991	1A Avenue Road, Ramsgate	Erection of detached dwelling	Refused	Application site in private garden – no longer considered pdl so contrary to policy H1. Also out of character with street scene and would result in loss of space which would be harmful to conservation area and setting of adjacent listed building.
F/TH/10/1059	1 Minster Road, Ramsgate	Erection of 2No detached dwellings	Granted	Application site in private garden – no longer considered pdl so contrary to policy H1. However considered that the development would make a positive contribution to the street scene.
F/TH/10/1095	77 St Peters Road, Margate	Erection of a two storey dwelling	Granted	Application site in private garden – no longer considered pdl so contrary to policy H1. However site is currently used as informal parking area which does not enhance the character of the area. Plot would comfortably accommodate house of similar size an type to neighbouring properties and would make a positive contribution to the character of the area.
F/TH/11/0800	22 Clements Road, Ramsgate	Extension of time for erection of a 3 bed detached dwelling	Granted	Application in garden of no.22. . Proposal would improve the appearance of existing dwelling at no.20 which currently appears incongruous and without context within the streetscene due to its siting away from established building line on the street. Proposal will therefore improve the appearance of the streetscene.
F/TH/11/0063	Land adjacent 25 Coxes Avenue, Ramsgate	Erection of detached bungalow following demolition of existing garage	Refuse	Proposed development would comprise a cramped form of development on previously undeveloped land – contrary to H1.
F/TH/11/0119	13 Fitzroy Avenue,	Erection of 1 dwelling	Refused	Site forms part of rear garden of no 13. Proposal would sever

Application Number	Address	Proposal	Decision	Comment
	Ramsgate			approx two thirds of existing garden and would appear discordant and obtrusive in the street scene.
F/TH/11/0187	42 West Dumpton Lane, Ramsgate	Erection of 1 dwelling	Granted	Site is a residential garden. Proposed dwelling would be located roughly in the middle of the plot, behind a boundary flint wall and would be screened from the street by mature trees. It is therefore considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Proposal considered to be of high quality design and accommodation.
F/TH/11/0191	St Georges, Cliff Promenade, Broadstairs	Erection of a detached dwelling following demolition of existing	Granted	Proposed build form expands onto garden land which is no longer pdl. Proposal would add interest to the street and would not detract from the character and appearance of the area. Also retains separation between buildings and contributes to the character of the AHTV
F/TH/11/0061	115 Canterbury Road, Wesgate	Erection of 2 storey dwelling following demolition of existing garage	Refused	Development would be located in rear garden of 115. The openness of the site would be lost as a result of the development. It is not considered that the proposed dwelling would benefit the character or appearance of the area nor improve the quality of the urban environment
F/TH/11/0269	Land adjacent to 25 Coxes Avenue	Erection of detached bungalow following demolition of existing garage	Refused by officer but granted by planning committee	
F/TH/11/0252	6 Dane Park Road, Ramsgate	Outline – erection of 4 dwellings following demolition of existing building including access and layout	Refused	Increase in footprint from the 4 dwellings would result in significant loss of garden land so contrary to policy H1. Proposed dwellings would barely have any amenity space and is cramped. Dwellings would be tall and thin which do not match the design of other properties in the area.
F/TH/11/0532	5 Westfield Road, Margate	Erection of 2 storey detached dwelling	Granted	Development on garden land. Planning permission for identical development already been granted and lapsed. Role of site as open space in the streetscene

Application Number	Address	Proposal	Decision	Comment
				has limited value – its loss is outweighed by the benefit of providing family accommodation that meets local housing requirements
F/TH/11/0518	16 Luton Avenue, Broadstairs	Erection of detached two storey dwelling with 1 lean to roof. Dormer window to rear roof slope, with provision of associated car parking and formation of vehicular access from Luton Avenue	Officer report was to grant permission, Refused at Planning Committee, Allowed at Appeal	Officer report stated that although site is on land no longer considered pdl, existing site offers little benefit and proposal is acceptable. Refused at planning committee and allowed at appeal. Inspector noted an identical application had been granted on the site but had expired. Considered that the scheme would cause no detriment to the local area.
F/TH/11/0274	38 The Warren Drive, Westgate	Erection of single storey dwelling	Refused	With the exception of the footprint of existing dwelling, site is private garden so scheme is contrary to policy H1. Proposed bungalow would be smaller than the footprint and overall scale than the bungalows along the row, and would appear contrived and cramped in its context. It would appear incongruous in the streetscene, cramped and congested whilst causing a loss of open space which has value in the area.
F/TH/11/0666	21 Tivoli Road, Margate	Erection of 2 storey attached dwelling with garage	Granted	Previous application for identical proposal granted and lapsed – site no longer considered pdl. Proposal considered to be in keeping with existing build form and pattern of development in the area. Existing vacant site does not play an important role as a gap in the streetscene to justify its retention.
F/TH/11/0680	Rear of 37 Palm Bay Avenue, Margate	Erection of detached dwelling	Refused and dismissed at appeal	Site no longer considered pdl. Proposed development would fail to relate to the character of the area and would cause significant harm to the AHTV. The Inspector agreed with this.
OL/TH/11/0753	St Anthony, 6 Berkeley Road, Birchington	Erection of a two storey dwelling	Refused	Proposal would involve developing on garden land so contrary to policy H1. Proposed dwelling would not benefit the streetscene due to the loss of the sense of openness, and

Application Number	Address	Proposal	Decision	Comment
				would appear cramped and incongruous which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
F/TH/11/0798	Land adj 3 Rose Cottages, the Length, St Nicholas at Wade	Erection of a detached dwelling	Refused	Site in garden so not pdl. Proposed dwelling has poor relationship with existing development in the surrounding area and contrary to the established pattern of development.
F/TH/11/0867	14 Northdown Avenue, Margate	Erection of an attached two storey dwelling	Refused	Site comprises garden land, with the exception of the footprint of the garage to no 14. Proposed building does not relate to main buildings or to other buildings in the streetscene due to its proportions and gable design
F/TH/11/1027	24 Royal Esplanade, Ramsgate	Erection of 1 three storey detached dwelling	Refuse	Site comprises garden land of 24 Eastern Esplanade. This garden land provides a sense of openness which is of merit to the character and appearance of the area – proposal would be detrimental to this and the ahtv.
OL/TH/11/1036	43 West Dumpton Lane, Ramsgate	Erection of two dwellings	Refuse	Site in garden land. The two dwellings would result in the loss of openness which plot currently lends to surrounding area and would have a detrimental impact.
F/TH/12/0112	Land rear of 85-87 College Road, Margate	Erection of 1 no 3 bed detached two storey dwelling	Refuse	Proposed dwelling would be located within rear garden of no 87, and its garden would be part of the existing garden to no 85. It is considered that the depths of the rear gardens to surrounding properties positively contribute to the overall character of the area, allowing separation between buildings as they turn a corner. The proposal would fail to respect the spatial character of the area, forming a cramped and congested appearance.
F/TH/12/0136	63 St Peters Road, Margate	Erection of 2 dwellings	Refuse	The neighbouring properties are three groups of semi detached houses, each stepped progressively back from the street and from the neighbouring group. The proposed dwellings would not follow this pattern, would result in the loss of open space and appear cramped.
F/TH/12/0127	24	Erection of 3no	Refused	Reason for refusal – land no

Application Number	Address	Proposal	Decision	Comment
	Rosemary Gardens, Broadstairs	2-storey dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping, following demolition of existing dwelling	but allowed on Appeal	longer pdl, unsustainable to use non pdl land when other more sustainable sites are available. Inspector considered the undeveloped nature of the majority of the lands is at odds with the general character and appearance of the area and serves little purpose as an area of openness as it is largely unseen from the neighbourhood and has little public amenity value in its own right
F/TH/12/0072	Lincoln Cottage, Northdown Hill, Broadstairs	Erection of 4no detached dwellings with detached garages	Refused	Site lies within the designated countryside, the green wedge and is on garden land to the rear of Lincoln cottage. Proposed development would be visible from Northdown Hill when approaching the site from either direction. Given the existing open nature of the site, and the open countryside surrounding it, a development of the height and density proposed would appear out of keeping with the existing character of the area.
F/TH/12/0162	198 Monkton Street, Monkton	Erection of dwelling	Refused – allowed at appeal	Site is side garden land of 198 Monkton Street. The site lends a degree of separation between no 198 and no 200 which is characteristic of the village setting and of merit to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Proposed dwelling would result in the loss of a significant element of this space to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Inspector concluded that the NPPF heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development – appeal site is near facilities and public transport links, and proposal would not harm character and appearance of surrounding area.
F/TH/12/0168	14 Northdown Avenue, Margate	Erection of an attached two storey dwelling	Refused	Site is garden land partially occupied by an attached garage. Building that currently occupies the site contributes positively to the street scene, however proposed dwelling does not relate to the main building or

Application Number	Address	Proposal	Decision	Comment
				other buildings due to its proportions and gable design. It would appear to be an awkward layout and cramped.
F/TH/12/0193	St Anthony, 6 Berkely Road, Birchington	Change of use from 1 dwelling to 2 dwellings, together with the erection of a single storey side extension and associated landscaping	Refused	Previous application for a dwelling on this site refused because the dwelling would reduce the separation between buildings and create a cramped and congested form of development. This application is not considered would significantly harm the character or appearance of the area, however it also would not offer any material benefit to the character or appearance of the area, therefore the character and appearance of the scheme does not outweigh the loss of non previously developed land.
F/TH/12/0094	20 The Chase, Montefiore Avenue, Ramsgate	Erection of an attached dwelling	Refused but allowed on Appeal.	Proposed dwelling would be on side garden of no. 20. Proposed dwelling would maintain certain elements such as layout, form and maximum height with the existing dwellings. However development proposed 2no dormer windows the size, scale and bulk of which would be a dominant and alien feature along the street, and detrimental to the streetscene. Planning Inspector considered that the loss of garden land would amount to 10-20% of the total area identified in the proposal, the existing garden does not make a significant contribution to the neighbourhood character so its loss would not result I harm to the character and appearance of the area. He considered that the dormer windows would not appear cluttered or over large when viewed in the context of the terrace as a whole.
F/TH/12/0180	17 Highbury Gardens, Ramsgate	Erection of two storey dwelling	Refused	Site comprises the side and part of the rear garden of no17. No.17 mirrors the house opposite with the same amount of space between properties which gives a sense of openness and allows views which the proposal would obscure.

Application Number	Address	Proposal	Decision	Comment
				Proposal would be nearer the road than any other neighbouring property and would be cramped, prominent and intrusive.
F/TH/12/0228	59 Southwood Road, Ramsgate	Erection of 4no dwellings following demolition of existing	Refused	Permission for 4 dwellings previously allowed on appeal in Nov 2009. Since change in govt definition of pdl, the footprint of the bungalow can be considered as pdl but the associated gardens cannot. Principle of development is therefore unacceptable.
F/TH/12/0204	62 Bellevue Road, Ramsgate	Erection of 1 detached dwelling fronting Avenue Road	Refused	Scheme is not considered to adversely affect living conditions of neighbouring property occupiers or highway safety, site is not previously developed land and there is no overriding justification for the scheme which would warrant the release of non previously developed land.
F/TH/12/0339	11 Canterbury Road, Westgate	Erection of 2no 2 storey detached dwellings to rear of site	Refused	Previous application dismissed at appeal. Proposals in this application would be readily apparent from adjoining properties and views from Canterbury Road. Proposal would consolidate backland development and introduce an extensive area of hardstanding to an area which is currently garden land. Scheme would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
F/TH/12/0157	88 Park Lane, Birchington	Erection of 2no dwellings, conversion of existing building to 1no dwelling together with access, car parking and landscaping	Refused	The development of part of the rear garden would create a pattern of development out of character with and harmful to the visual amenity of the area. Principle of development is unacceptable as it comprises the erection of a new dwelling on non-previously developed land.
OL/TH/12/0219	9 Western Esplanade, Broadstairs	Outline permission for erection of a 3 storey building containing 5no self contained flats following demolition of existing building	Refused	Area has strong character of large detached buildings with generous open space to their fronts and reasonable degree of separation to their sides. Properties are typically wider than they are tall. Proposed development would be 3 storeys in height and located in a

Application Number	Address	Proposal	Decision	Comment
				relatively narrow plot. Scale and layout of proposed development would create significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, failing to conserve or enhance AHTV. Principle of development also unacceptable.
F/TH/12/0356	Land rear of 85-87 College Road, Margate	Erection of 1 no 3 bed detached 2 storey dwelling	Refused	Application refused earlier in 2012 – applicant contends that the site includes areas of hardstanding and is not the principle garden space for the property. However the site does form part of the curtilage of the property and is reasonable considered to form its garden being closely associated with the dwelling and including paths linking to the dwelling. Therefore the principle of the proposed development is unacceptable.
F/TH/12/0481	Land adjacent to 22 Clements Road, Ramsgate	Erection of a 2 storey dwelling	Granted	Site forms part of the side garden to 22 Clements Road. Although proposal is contrary to local plan policy as it would be developing non-previously developed land, it would improve the appearance of the streetscene when compared to the existing situation where no.20 does not integrate as successfully into the current pattern of development.
OL/TH/12/0333	Royal Exchange, Millers Lane, Monkton	Erection of a detached dwelling	Refused	Proposal would result in the loss of a wooded area which contributes to the visual amenity of the streetscene and the transition from the village setting to the open countryside. Proposed scheme would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area.
F/TH/12/0624	Land adjacent 33 Grosvenor Place, Margate	Erection of 2 storey dwelling	Refused	Release of non-previously developed land and highways safety due to lack of parking
F/TH/12/0703	Land rear of 77 St Peters Road, Margate	Erection of 2 storey dwelling	Granted	Proposed development is a departure from local plan policy H1 in developing non previously developed land. However it would enhance the area by continuing the pattern of residential development and positively contribute to the

Application Number	Address	Proposal	Decision	Comment
				character of the area.