Appeals Report

This is the latest information report summarising appeal decisions received between 1 July 2023 and 31 December 2023. Overall, 29.2% of appeals were allowed within the reported period.

Decision	Number of appeals	Percentage
Withdrawn	1	4.1%
Dismissed	16	66.7%
Allowed	7	29.2%
Total	24	100.0%

Data period: 01/07/2023 to 31/12/2023

The report identifies decisions made by the Planning Committee and highlights any decisions made contrary to officer's original recommendation.

Within the reported period, Planning Inspectors did not allow any appeals that were refused by Planning Committee contrary to officer's recommendation.

In cases where the Planning Inspector has allowed an appeal contrary to the Council formal decision, a summary of the Inspector's reasons for doing so have been provided.

Impact of nutrient neutrality on planning appeals

In July 2020, Natural England issued advice to the Council regarding the poor water quality at the Stodmarsh Lakes. This stipulated that qualifying developments within the Stour catchment area must achieve nutrient neutrality to ensure that there are no adverse effects on the protected habitats at the Lakes. As a result of the 'Stodmarsh issue' a number of developments have not been able to progress without identifying suitable nutrient mitigation.

The table below sets out broadly how housing appeals within the borough, affected by nutrient neutrality, are being determined. It also provides a comparison for housing appeals that are located outside the catchment area and which are not required to achieve nutrient neutrality.

Breakdown of housing appeal decisions compared by location within or outside the Stour catchment

Decision	Housing appeals within the Stour catchment	Housing appeals outside the Stour catchment	
Allowed	3 (37.5%)	1 (20%)	
Dismissed	5 (62.5%)	4 (80%)	

Live planning appeals

As of 1 January 2024, the Council are currently involved with 25 appeals on planning applications; and 4 appeals on enforcement notices. These figures relate to valid appeals, which have received a start date from the Planning Inspectorate. The table

Information Report for Planning Committee – Appeal Decisions Received between 01 July 2023 and 31 December 2023

below presents this information by the different appeal categories, based on the format of the appeal.

Breakdown of current live appeals by format

	Written Representations	Hearings	Inquiries
Planning applications	24	1	0
Enforcement Notices	3	1	0

Appeals Summary

Table A: Appeals Allowed

#	Application reference	Location	Proposal summary	LPA Decision Level
1	21/01442/AS	Monkery Bottom, Faversham Road, Charing, Ashford, TN27 0NR	Retrospective application for siting of additional, third mobile/caravan.	Delegated refusal
1 conť d	The Inspector co	e of the Kent Downs Area of Outstan	ssues for the appeal – the effect of the developme ding Beauty (AONB) and the effect of the develop	
	Inspector consid form of develope <i>Objectives</i>), EN	dered that the additional caravan wo ment. It was therefore concluded tha V1 (<i>Biodiversity</i>), ENV3b (<i>Landscap</i> a). The Inspector also gave substant	create significant harm on the AONB or the ancie uld not be visually intrusive and would not constitu at the scheme is compliant with Local Plan Policies <i>e Character and Design in the AONBs</i>) and HOU1 tial weight to the unmet need for Gypsy & Travelle	ite an urbanising s SP1 (<i>Strategic</i> l6 (<i>Traveller</i>
	Overall, the Insp	pector concluded that the scheme wa	as in accordance with the Development Plan and v	was allowed.
	Stodmarsh N/A			
2	19/01004/AS	Chequer Tree Paddock, Colliers Hill, Mersham, Ashford, TN25 7HT	Retrospective change of use of land to a private gypsy and traveller caravan site consisting of a single pitch containing 1 no. mobile home, 1 no. dayroom, 1 no. touring caravan and associated works	Delegated refusal
2 conť d	Brief Summary	of Inspector's reasons	·	

#	Application reference	Location	Proposal summary	LPA Decision Level			
		The Inspector considered that there were 6 main issues for the appeal, including the effect of the development on the character and appearance, nutrient neutrality, and the need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.					
	The Inspector considered that the development, with suitable landscaping mitigation, would have less than moderate harm on the landscape character of the area. It was concluded that the scheme would be compliant with Local Plan Policies SP1 (<i>Spatial Objectives</i>), SP6 (<i>Promoting High Quality Design</i>), ENV3a (<i>Landscape Character and Design</i>) and HOU16 (<i>Traveller Accommodation</i>). The Inspector also gave substantial weight to the unmet need for Gypsy & Traveller accommodation and stated that it had not been reasonably established that there were suitable alternative sites available.						
	Overall, the Insp allowed.	pector concluded that the proposal	accords with the Development Plan as a whole a	and the appeal was			
			retrospective and the development was on the sit at there would be no impact on the Stodmarsh Lak	•			
3	22/00859/AS	22 Scotton Street, Wye, Ashford, Kent, TN25 5BZ	(Retrospective) Proposed damp proof works to include: kitchen - chemical damp proof course into lower mortar bed, damp proof membrane to walls, batten to membrane, plasterboard to battens. Lounge - chemical damp proof course into lower mortar bed, damp proof membrane to walls, batten to membrane, plasterboard to battens, cut out and replace floorboards.	Delegated refusal			
3 conť	Brief Summary of Inspector's reasons The Inspector considered that the main issue for the appeal was whether the works preserved the listed building.						
d		It was concluded that public benefit of securing the building's optimum viable use as a residential dwelling outweighed the less than substantial harm that has been caused to the significance of the building by the retrospective works.					

#	Application reference	Location	Proposal summary	LPA Decision Level				
		pector considered that the proposals f Heritage Assets), and the appeal w	were in accordance with Local Plan Policy ENV1 /as allowed.	3 (Conservation and				
	Stodmarsh N/A							
4	PA/2022/2440	The Cloth Hall, Water Lane, Smarden, Ashford, TN27 8QB	Proposed single-storey extension	Delegated refusal				
4	This is the Liste	d Building Consent associated with t	he PA/2022/2142 planning application (see below	<i>.</i> /).				
cont' d	The Inspector c		t on the character and appearance of the Smarder					
	Area, so the vie	The Inspector considered that the extension would be positioned in a location which is not prominent in the Conservation Area, so the views into the Conservation Area would remain unaffected. Therefore, the Inspector concluded that the proposal would preserve the Grade II* listed building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.						
	High Quality De	It was concluded that the development would accord with Local Plan Policies SP1 (<i>Strategic Objectives</i>), SP6 (<i>Promoting High Quality Design</i>), HOU8 (<i>Residential Extensions</i>), ENV13 (<i>Conservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets</i>), and ENV14 (<i>Conservation Areas</i>). On this basis, the appeal was allowed.						
	Stodmarsh N/A							
5	PA/2022/2142	The Cloth Hall, Water Lane, Smarden, Ashford, TN27 8QB	Proposed single-storey extension	Delegated refusal				
5	This is the planr	This is the planning application associated with the PA/2022/2440 Listed Building Consent (see above).						
conť d	Brief Summary of Inspector's reasons The Inspector considered that the main issues for the appeal included whether the proposal would preserve the special interest of the Grade II* listed building and the impact on the character and appearance of the Smarden Conservation Area.							

#	Application reference	Location	Proposal summary	LPA Decision Level			
	Area, so the vie	The Inspector considered that the extension would be positioned in a location which is not prominent in the Conservation Area, so the views into the Conservation Area would remain unaffected. Therefore, the Inspector concluded that the Aroposal would preserve the Grade II* listed building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.					
	It was concluded that the development would accord with Local Plan Policies SP1 (<i>Strategic Objectives</i>), SP6 (<i>Promoting High Quality Design</i>), HOU8 (<i>Residential Extensions</i>), ENV13 (<i>Conservation and Enhancement of Heritage Assets</i>), and ENV14 (<i>Conservation Areas</i>). On this basis, the appeal was allowed.						
	Stodmarsh N/A						
6	PA/2022/2851	Land East of Ashford Road Kingsnorth Ashford	Outline application for up to 15 dwellings, a replacement Medical Centre and Pharmacy, together with all necessary infrastructure	Non determination			
6 conť d	This developme would have gra		on appeal. If the Council had been able to dete o the scheme achieving nutrient neutrality. Stoc				
	Character and appearance The Inspector comments that the development would erode the undeveloped green characteristics of the site and the ga between Kingsnorth and the development at the South of Ashford Garden Community. This harm was considered a moderate and that the development would be contrary to Local Plan Policies SP1 (<i>Strategic Objectives</i>), SP2 (<i>The Strategic Approach to Housing Delivery</i>), SP6 (<i>Promoting High Quality Design</i>), SP7 (<i>Separation of Settlements</i>), S4 (<i>Land North Steeds Lane and Magpie Hall Road</i>), HOU5 (<i>Residential windfall development in the countryside</i>) and EMP1 (<i>Ne Employment Uses</i>)						
	 <i>Employment Uses</i>). Medical Centre & Pharmacy The pressing need for a new primary health care facility was identified by the Inspector and afforded significant weight. Members proposed a condition to require confirmation that funding was in place and a contract let for the construction of the medical centre and pharmacy prior to commencement of construction of the proposed housing. At the appeal hearing, 						

#	Application reference	Location	Proposal summary	LPA Decision Level	
	the appellant did not agree with this condition and instead proposed a clause in their Unilateral Undertaking to require access and services to this part of the site to be provided and the transfer of the medical centre and pharmacy land to the partners of Kingsnorth Medical Practice prior to the construction of any dwellings. The Inspector agreed with the appellant's position stating that <i>"although this would not confirm the funding nor the contract for construction, nevertheless, no other body could develop the land. This provides a strong likelihood that the Medical Centre and Pharmacy would be delivered. Therefore this would be a significant benefit. As such, the UU is a suitable way to secure this requirement and therefore the condition suggested in this regard would not be necessary".</i>				
	Developer contributions The Inspector considered that the developer contributions for allotments, arts and creative, children's and young people's play space, indoor and outdoor sports provision, informal/natural green space, strategic parks, community learning, youth services, library services, social care and primary and secondary education were necessary. However, it was considered that contributions for the voluntary sector and waste were unnecessary.				
	considered that sufficiently robu (SuDS). It was	the land uses stated by the applican st. Mitigation was proposed in the for agreed to secure the mitigation using	riate Assessment. As part of the Inspector's asses It were correct and that the approach to nutrient ca orm of on-site Greenspace and Sustainable Urban g planning conditions and overall, the Inspector co ot have a harmful effect on the Stodmarsh sites.	Iculations was Drainage Systems	
	Conclusion The Inspector identified harm from the character and appearance of the development. However, the Inspector gave significant weight to the medical centre and the pressing need for a new primary healthcare facility, the lack of the Council's five-year housing land supply, and the benefits of the affordable housing. Overall, the Inspector considered that the adverse impacts would not significantly outweigh the benefits and decided that the appeal should be allowed.				
7	15/00856/AS	Land at Pound Lane, Magpie Hall Road, Bond Lane and, Ashford Road, Kingsnorth, Kent	Outline application for a development comprising of up to 550 dwellings in a mix of size, type and tenure. Provision of local	Non determination	

#	Application reference	Location	Proposal summary	LPA Decision Level
			recycling facilities. Provision of areas of formal and informal open space. Installation of utilities, infrastructure to serve the development including flood attenuation, surface water attenuation, water supply, wastewater facilities, gas supply, electricity supply (including sub-station, telecommunications infrastructure and renewable energy). Transport infrastructure including highway improvements in the vicinity of Ashford Road/Magpie Hall Road/Steeds Lane, Pound Lane and Bond Lane, plus an internal network of roads and junctions, footpaths and cycle routes. New planting and landscaping both within the proposed development and on its boundaries as well as ecological enhancement works. Associated groundworks. **SUBJECT TO AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT*	
7 conť d	This developm would have gra main issues for	nted planning permissic the appeal as the effect	ns n-determination appeal. If the Council had been able to dete on, subject to the scheme achieving nutrient neutrality. The Ins on local highways, effect on ecology, nutrient neutrality, and th	pector identified the
	Highways and The Inspector of	••	lopment was acceptable in terms of highway safety and ecolog	JY.
	Stodmarsh			

#	Application reference	Location	Proposal summary	LPA Decision Level
	Inspector heard and residents of Mitigation was p through a comb	evidence on the existing land use cl n the appellant's classifications. The proposed in the form of an onsite Wa ination of planning conditions and wi	nt as part of the appeal decision. During the appeal lassifications, following concerns raised by Kingsn e Inspector considered that the classifications were astewater Treatment Works and SuDS, which were ithin the Section 106 agreement. Overall, the Insp lity and would not have an adverse impact on the S	orth Parish Council e appropriate. e to be secured pector concluded
	The Inspector s IMP1 (<i>Infrastruc</i> propose only 10	<i>cture Provision</i>) and IMP2 (<i>Deferred</i>) % affordable housing. The Inspecto	bach to viability and planning obligations through L <i>Contributions</i>). The development raised viability is or agreed to include a viability review mechanism t ery of community infrastructure) at a later stage of	ssues and sought to to review the
	open space, pla	-	e appeal, which seeks to secure the following cont contributions, as well as 5 self-build plots. Howeve nsidered necessary.	-
	despite some ha	arm, in terms of heritage, landscape ng housing provision. It was conclud	ent is an important component of the Local Plan ho and visual impacts, these would be outweighed by ded that the proposal is in accordance with the De	y the significant

Table B: Appeals Dismissed

#	Application reference	Location	Proposal	Stodmarsh	LPA's Decision Level
1	21/00655/AS	Smeeth Hill House, Hythe Road, Smeeth, Ashford, Kent, TN25 6ST	Retrospective application for stationing of a static caravan (mobile home) for residential annexe use by the groundsman for a temporary period of 3 years and installation of septic tank (permanent).	Yes	Delegated refusal
2	22/00909/AS	2A Hollington Place, Ashford, Kent, TN24 8UN	Demolition of existing building.	No	Delegated refusal
3	22/00099/AS	Tayes Barn, Silks Farm, Amage Road, Wye, Ashford, TN25 5DE	Proposed replacement of existing wooden front door and window unit which is in a state of disrepair with a black aluminium glazed unit.	No	Delegated refusal
4	21/01135/AS	Land west of Viaduct Terrace, Warehorne Road, Warehorne, Kent	Erection of 6 dwellings and one block of 6 apartments with associated parking.	No	Planning Committee
5	21/00174/AS	Buildings A and B, Rook Toll, Faversham Road, Boughton Aluph, Kent	Works of conversion to facilitate change of use to create two dwellings following prior approval granted under application reference 19/00191/AS (Notification for prior approval for a change of use from premises in light	Yes	Delegated refusal

Information Report for Planning Committee – Appeal Decisions Received between 01 July 2023 and 31 December 2023

#	Application reference	Location	Proposal	Stodmarsh	LPA's Decision Level
			industrial use class B1(c) and land within its curtilage to two dwelling houses).		
6	21/02181/AS	Hill Foxes, Ravensdane Wood, Stalisfield Church Road, Charing, Ashford, TN27 0NJ	Demolition of existing concrete barn and garage; erection of part one storey/part two storey dwelling and associated works and access.	No	Delegated refusal
7	PA/2022/2085	Costa Cottage, Bromley Green Road, Ruckinge, Ashford, TN26 2EQ	Proposed detached double garage.	No	Delegated refusal
8	22/00085/AS	1 Durrant Green, Ashford Road, High Halden, Ashford, Kent, TN26 3BU	Proposed dwelling & detached garage.	No	Delegated refusal
9	22/00884/AS	Orlestone Rise, Ruckinge Road, Hamstreet, Ashford, Kent, TN26 2NW	Construction of a single detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space.	No	Delegated refusal
10	21/02142/AS	Land north of 14 and 15, Kirkwood Avenue, Woodchurch	Erection of 3 bungalows and the provision of new public amenity space, together with associated access, parking and landscaping.	No	Delegated refusal

#	Application reference	Location	Proposal	Stodmarsh	LPA's Decision Level
11	PA/2022/2390	Mai Barn, Romden Road, Smarden, Ashford, TN27 8QZ	Retrospective erection of oak framed garden room (revision to lapsed planning permission 15/00743/AS).	No	Delegated refusal
12	PA/2022/2929	Beult Barn, Ashford Road, Great Chart, Ashford, TN23 3DH	Erection of 3 dwellings.	Yes	Delegated refusal
13	PA/2023/0555	Mersham Manor Church Close, TN25 6NR	Variation of condition 5 and removal of Condition 6 on planning permission 22/00602/AS (Variation of condition 9 (approved plans) on planning permission 19/01602/AS to alter the materials, height and footprint of the annexe) to alter approved drawings retaining oak effect joinery.	No	Delegated refusal
14	PA/2022/2065	Lodge Farm, Bowl Road, Charing, TN27 0HB	Removal of Condition 3 of planning permission 15/01636/AS to allow use of ancillary accommodation as a single independent dwelling.	Yes	Appeal on non- determination
15	PA/2022/2068	Bridgewood Farm, Watery Lane, Westwell, TN25 4JJ	Change of use of the land for the stationing of 3 mobile homes for Gypsy / Traveller occupation. Occupation ancillary to the existing site permitted under application 12/00932/AS.	Yes	Delegated refusal
16	PA/2023/0957	25 Cheesemans Green Lane, Kingsnorth, Ashford, TN25 7EX	Vehicle crossover, parking, and single storey side extension to form garage.	Yes	Delegated Refusal