



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 5-6, 11-13, 24 November 2025

Site visit made on 13 November 2025

by Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/W/25/3368475

Land adjacent to St Augustine's Cross and north and south of Cottington Road, Cliffsend, Kent CT12 5LJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Richborough against the decision of Thanet District Council.
 - The application reference is OL/TH/24/1473.
 - The development proposed is erection of up to 200 dwellings (Class C3) with car parking and all ancillary enabling works including associated highway, drainage and landscape works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. With the parties' agreement, I have edited the description of development in the banner heading above to remove superfluous text.
3. The application was submitted in outline with all matters except access reserved for future consideration. Whilst the 2 main accesses into the development have been presented in detail, the locations of other accesses are shown on a separate layout and access parameter plan (the parameter plan). I have therefore treated the parameter plan as showing a mixture of details both for approval and intended to guide future discharge of the reserved matters.
4. The parameter plan was directly modelled on a detailed indicative framework plan, which at the time of its production had failed to take account of known archaeological constraints on site. Whilst a plan showing a revised indicative layout was presented during the Inquiry to show how an archaeological exclusion zone could be fitted into the northern part of the site, the parameter plan itself remains unmodified and thus out of date. This is a matter that would therefore require careful clarification by condition.
5. The indicative layout otherwise provides a reasonable guide to the scheme likely to be presented in clearance of the reserved matters. Indeed, given the quantum and density of the proposed development, as too agreed height restrictions, there appears limited scope for significant variation within the proposed parameters.
6. Insofar as indicative landscaping plans have also been provided, both at application stage and within proofs, none are up to date or wholly consistent with the other plans provided. This is a matter whose implications I shall consider further below.

7. The application was partly refused on the basis that no surveys for bats and breeding birds, and no archaeological assessment/field evaluation had been undertaken; that no mitigation of the scheme's likely significant effects on habitats sites had been secured; and that a legal agreement securing affordable housing and contributions towards infrastructure had not been provided. Following the provision of bat and bird surveys with the appeal; archaeological excavations undertaken during the course of the inquiry; related agreements reached on exclusion zones and drainage; and the provision of a Section 106 agreement (the S106), the Council has withdrawn its objections. I shall therefore return these matters below only to the extent that they may remain relevant.

Main Issue

8. The main issue is effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area including its effects on the significance of a designated heritage asset and the landscape.

Reasons

Background

9. Policy SP01 of the Thanet Local Plan 2020 (the Local Plan) sets out the district's spatial strategy, which establishes a broadly permissive approach to development within the 'village confines' of Cliffsend. This is reiterated within Policy H01 of the Local Plan which sets out housing allocations. Neither policy explicitly restricts development outside the village confines, but the intention to primarily direct development to within urban areas and defined settlements is nonetheless clearly indicated.
10. The site occupies a location outside the confines of Cliffsend. Within this context Policy SP24 of the Local Plan seeks to restrict development within the countryside subject to a number of exceptions. As the development would not meet any of these exceptions it both would conflict with Policy SP24, and be contrary to the strategy set out within Policies SP01 and H01 of the Local Plan.
11. The village confines identified by Policies SP01 and H01 act to constrain development at a time when the district's supply of deliverable housing sites (5YHLS) is acknowledged by the Council to be no more than 3.7 years, and claimed by the appellant to be as low as 2.77 years. Wherever the supply falls within this range a shortfall exists, and this has been a persistent feature since the Local Plan was adopted. It is furthermore of note that the Council has never passed the Housing Delivery Test, and has been slow to initiate a required review of the Local Plan. These considerations combine to limit the weight that can be attached to the policy conflicts identified above. It appears that for this reason they were not referenced within the decision notice, albeit both parties acknowledge that a conflict with the development plan would exist on the above basis.
12. Managing patterns of growth to achieve a sustainable distribution of development otherwise remains an objective consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, whilst the Council has voiced some concerns over the quality, range and accessibility of local services and facilities, it has not sought to object to the scheme on this basis. Nor does it consider that the function and role of Cliffsend relative to other centres would change as a result of the development. No harm would therefore arise in these regards. The only

remaining areas of dispute centre on matters of character and appearance which, whilst partly grounded in the attributes of the countryside location, are the subject of other policies.

Character and appearance

13. The appeal site is made up of 2 irregularly shaped fields in active agricultural use. These are located just beyond the western edge of Cliffsend, generally falling to the north and south of Cottington Road. The northern field partly wraps around existing development accessed from Cottington Road, as does the far eastern portion of the southern field. Both fields otherwise have open boundaries along the road. Whilst much of the site can therefore be clearly viewed from the road, those parts of the northern field which cannot, are visible from the public footpath which runs through it. A similarly open boundary exists between the west end of the southern field and the plot of land on which St Augustine's Cross stands. Viewed within the context of adjacent space, this plot is more less perceived as a component of the site.
14. The outer perimeters of the site, as too those of the plot on which the cross stands, are generally enclosed. On the south side of the site this is principally by an overgrown hedge which separates the site from a golf course, and on the north side of the site by property boundaries and a substantial railway embankment. Development similarly abuts the eastern end of the southern part of the site. The site is therefore generally well contained. Both the irregular developed edge of Cliffsend and railway have a physical and visual presence whose prominence varies across the site. The site nonetheless retains the character of a vestigial piece of open countryside. This impression is not significantly diminished by the need to pass beneath both the railway line and the A256 when travelling further west along Cottington Road.

(a) St Augustine's Cross

(i) Significance

15. St Augustine's Cross is a Grade II listed building. At its most elementary, the cross is a piece of C19th sculptural masonry modelled on surviving Anglo-Saxon crosses. The quality of its composition, execution and religious iconography, which are intended to be appreciated in the round, impart strong artistic interest. The finer details can only be viewed close up. But though modest in scale and lacking a commanding presence, the overall form of the cross is appreciable in views across and from within the site. More so given that it is a signposted attraction and a subject of pilgrimage that visitors thus look for and expect to see. The cross otherwise plays an important role in informing local identity and distinctiveness as a local landmark, and as a marker of a key historic event.
16. The cross was erected both to commemorate the meeting of St Augustine with King Aethelberht of Kent in 597 AD, and to mark the place where it was believed to have occurred. This was previously marked by a tree recorded as 'St Augustine's Oak' on early editions of the Ordnance Survey, which grew nearby within the southern part of the site. The meeting, recorded in the C8th by the Venerable Bede, was a seminal event in the religious history of what was later to become England. Having been sent by the Pope to convert the Anglo-Saxon population to Christianity, the meeting, at which St Augustine preached to King Aethelberht, marked a return of Christianity, and the beginnings of its foundation as the accepted faith of the Anglo-Saxon population. This is presently recognised in the incorporation of the cross

within the Augustine Camino and the Way of St Augustine, which draw both domestic and international pilgrims. It is presumably also the reason why the cross was considered important enough to have been taken into the custody of the state as part of the national heritage collection. Within this context it is currently managed by English Heritage, and freely accessible to members of the public.

17. The significance of the cross is not therefore solely expressed in its fabric and the C19th act of Victorian commemoration that it represents, even if this does form the focus of the brief 1990s list description. Though it clearly embodies late C19th cultural and religious values, the cross draws a far more critically important part of its significance from the place and the event which historically occurred within it. Indeed, it was ultimately erected, and is viewed, understood and venerated with reference to each.
18. Insofar as *place* can be equated with *setting* in this case, this can be understood as being the general locale within which the meeting occurred. This lacks any current physical definition aside from later boundaries. The site of St Augustine's Oak is itself located within open space undifferentiated from that of the wider landscape of the site. As established above, the cross is viewed within the same context.
19. The relationship between the cross and its immediate surroundings appears much the same as in the 1880s. That said, it was not provided with a specifically designed setting. The surrounding landscape has also undergone broader change since the both the 6th and 19th centuries.
20. Archaeological investigations nonetheless appear to have confirmed that openness, or the absence of development, is an enduring feature of the southern part of the site. Combined with an understanding of coastal change over the past 1500 years, a compelling image is painted of the meeting between St Augustine and King Aethelberht as having occurred above a coastal inlet towards the southwest of a small settlement linked to the coast by a Roman track. That settlement was identified in excavations on an adjacent site, whilst the track has been confirmed as running through the northern field. This adds context to the account of the meeting provided by Bede, and despite change and modern sources of intrusion, the landscape remains open enough and retains enough physical clues for this time depth to be perceived. As this contributes to an understanding of historic context and sense of place, it positively contributes to contemplation of the event that the cross commemorates, and that pilgrims and other visitors come to celebrate.

(ii) Assessment

21. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Within this context the Framework notes that any harm to or loss of significance, including from development within its setting, should require clear and convincing justification. The standard and quality of evidence presented to support the proposed development, which both parties agree would give rise to harm, is a key consideration in this case, particularly given its outline nature.
22. The proposed development would effectively move the perceived edge of the settlement westwards to the railway embankment, absorbing the cross into the urban townscape of Cliffsend. This would have an obviously transformative effect

on the character of the site, and the immediate surroundings of the cross would no longer resemble those present when it was erected. More than this, the development would have a transformative effect in terms of place, formalising, defining and shaping the physical and visual setting of the cross. In thus moulding the way in which the cross and its setting were experienced, the development would also affect the ability to perceive and engage with the past, and therefore to contemplate the spiritual importance of the event that the cross commemorates.

23. Within this context the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) submitted in support of the scheme acknowledged design opportunities to strengthen understanding of the meaning the cross and its history. However, in seeking to categorise the meeting between St Augustine and King Aethelberht as 'folklore' and 'legend' it adopted a generally sceptical tone. This was not shared by the appellant's heritage witness, albeit he had no involvement at application stage. As the HIA was produced in advance of the archaeological excavations later conducted on site its appreciation of place and setting was not fully informed and was otherwise limited. Though the potential to replant a tree in the historic location of St Augustine's Oak was recognised, the contribution made by the setting of the cross to its significance was largely dismissed. Consequently, the approach taken in defining the parameters of the development was somewhat unenlightened, guided simply by drawing a circle around the cross labelled 'heritage conservation zone'.
24. Whilst a large proportion of this zone falls off-site, the approach appears arbitrary in the absence of any proper rationalisation grounded in an understanding and appreciation of place and setting. Aside from some uncertainty over its exact dimensions, the zone would not in any case see the exclusion of development. Though part of the zone falling within the southern part of the site would be largely retained as open space, the zone would include the main access into the northern part of the site, substantial widening of Cottington Road, as too other site access and drainage infrastructure, together with what some of the indicative plans show as visitor parking and play areas.
25. A failure to clearly demonstrate how acknowledged design opportunities could be taken in a way that would successfully integrate the cross, conserve its significance and sensitively shape the place runs through the appellant's evidence. Whilst the Design and Access Statement's consideration of heritage is brief and contains some notable errors, it physically excludes and makes no mention either of the cross or retained space in the section explaining how the adjacent 'character zone' could be treated. The lack of coherent vision is further underlined by the landscape visualisations provided to the inquiry which suggest that the space between the development and cross would be heavily planted in an apparent attempt to hide the development; a measure which would be unlikely to succeed, and which would also compromise the growth and appearance of the replanted oak tree.
26. Given the extent and modest dimensions of the open space retained between the cross and the development, it would inevitably be perceived as a subordinate component of the urban layout. This would be the case however it was landscaped. The adjoining plot containing the cross would be perceived in much the same way. The space would be strongly defined by the residential development which would abut its east side, and which, given its likely height and positioning on higher ground, would appear both physically and visually dominant. The ability to appreciate and engage with the time depth of the landscape setting would be severely compromised given that much would be obscured or effaced, as would

- space for contemplation, given the significantly increased proximity of development and level of intrusion.
27. Scope to replant the oak tree represents a key opportunity, and the parties acknowledged that such a tree might in time become known as 'St Augustine's Oak'. It would thus presumably become a focus for pilgrimage. In this way such a tree could better reveal the significance of the cross by marking what was historically understood to have been the meeting place between St Augustine and King Aethelberht. However, though this could play an important role in helping to better define both place and setting, my findings above indicate that the quality of each would be harmed rather than enhanced by the development. In this regard, the proposal appears little more than a tokenistic gesture, its implications and broader importance having received little detailed consideration in advance of questioning at the inquiry.
 28. Aside from the suggestion that the oak would form part of a belt of trees screening the development, and its incorrect positioning on the otherwise out-dated landscape plan submitted in support of the scheme, the tree would stand far closer to the development than the cross. Whilst scope for it to fully mature within the space available is unclear, as noted above, the indicative plans otherwise suggest that visitor parking would be provided close by. Retention of the tree would itself be secured for only 30 years as part the mandatory BNG requirements of the scheme, after which date its fate would be uncertain. Even with interpretation in place, the content of which remains similarly unknown, it would be challenging for any visitor to detach themselves from the overwhelmingly urban identity of the space within which the tree would stand, and relative to which it would appear progressively cramped as it grew. The tree could therefore be a relatively short-lived feature of the development which, whilst present, would serve to emphasise the poorly defined parameters of the scheme and the ill effects of failed place making. In this regard it would do very little to successfully enhance appreciation of the significance of the cross.
 29. The appellant has additionally suggested that the route of the Roman track through the northern part of the site, which would be largely conserved unseen within the exclusion zone squeezed into the layout, would enhance appreciation of the significance of the cross. This was notwithstanding the appellant's general dismissal of the ability to engage with the historic time depth of the landscape within the site and its setting. Again, the archaeological evidence appears to indicate that the land between the road and the meeting place was largely open during the C6th. Though now severed by Cottington Road, the land again remains open, whereas it would be largely developed as part of the scheme. This would greatly limit the extent to which any visitor could in future connect the track with the cross and the oak or picture the landscape of which the track formed part, even with the assistance of 'innovative' interpretation – whatever that might be. It remains the case the retention of the track played no role in shaping the proposal or informing the parameters of the scheme given that it was only agreed between the parties mid-way through the inquiry.
 30. The provision of 'safe routes' to the cross for visitors and parking have also been promoted as heritage benefits. I have however been provided with no evidence which indicates that access to the cross is unacceptably hazardous at present, and a layby already provides informal free parking directly adjacent. As the new routes would either run through the development, or along a 3-metre-wide

pedestrian/cycle way provided along Cottington Road, they would emphasise the urbanisation of the setting. Indeed, the route along Cottington Road would itself be provided alongside a carriageway widened to 5.5 metres, meaning that the cross would in future be viewed and accessed on the main approach from the east along an 8.5-metre-wide road corridor. This feature was conspicuously absent from the related landscape visualisation presented to the inquiry. I acknowledge that this heavily engineered solution was welcomed by the Highways Authority, notwithstanding the lack of existing context in either direction beyond the site. It would nonetheless represent a radical, and wholly insensitive treatment of the approach to the cross which, in combination with the similarly broad access proposed into the northern part of the site within the conservation zone, would serve to overwhelm a large part of its immediate setting with highways infrastructure. This would further exacerbate the adverse effects identified above.

31. Parking, as noted above, is also shown within the conservation zone close to the replanted oak. As access would be along what is labelled as a private drive on one plan, the extent to which the proposal and its deliverability were fully thought through is open to question. How this parking would be managed within a residential context and in coordination with English Heritage's management of the cross is also unknown. As an otherwise doubtful benefit, I have furthermore been presented with no means by which the provision of visitor parking space would be properly secured in clearance of the reserved matters.
32. In summary, and to the extent that it is relevant to this matter, the quality of evidence submitted to support the proposal is poor and the proposed parameters ill conceived, reflecting the lack of a detailed understanding of context, place and setting, and the role these play in the significance of the cross and its appreciation. This partly stems from a lack of proper front loading. Insofar as indicative proposals have been presented, these are tokenistic in their response, incoherent in terms of strategy and detail, and lacking in any clear vision or rationale. The scheme cannot as such be considered to have been 'heritage-led' as was asserted at the inquiry.
33. What amount to fundamental design failings cannot be properly addressed by imposition of conditions deferring their resolution to a later stage. Indeed, whilst the scheme may be outline, the provision of a masterplan and design principles document would not alter the parameters of the development, nor the limited scope they allow for variation. This is further underlined by reference to the Design and Access Statement within the proposed condition dealing with design principles, some of the shortcomings of which have been highlighted previously.
34. My findings above indicate the likelihood of highly adverse effects on both the significance of the cross and the ability to appreciate its significance. This can be characterised as an effect falling within the 'upper range' of less than substantial harm. In view of the expectations of statute, such harm attracts considerable importance and weight. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the Framework it is necessary to weigh this harm against the public benefits of the scheme.

(iii) Balance

35. Insofar as heritage benefits have been advanced in favour of the scheme, including the planting of an oak tree, I have assessed these above and attach no more than limited weight to them as considerations in favour of the scheme.

36. The scheme would be required to meet mandatory BNG standards. It would remain to be seen whether these were exceeded. However, whilst I observed parakeets during my site visit, it is highly improbable that hummingbirds and exotic butterflies would become future features of the site. Both are nonetheless depicted within the biodiversity section of the Design and Access Statement. Setting this somewhat fantastical vision aside, meeting mandatory BNG standards would constitute a generic benefit to which I attach limited weight.
37. Future occupants might make use of the very limited range of small-scale local services in Cliffsend. This might in turn help to support local vitality. Any potential contribution would however be constrained by the capacity of the services in question to cater for new business, which appears unlikely to be significant. On that basis I attach limited weight to the related benefits.
38. It is claimed that the scheme would improve the edge of Cliffsend. However, as already established, the edge would more or less by default become that of the existing railway embankment which would become an abrupt point of transition. This would not represent any obvious improvement and is not therefore a consideration to which I attach any weight.
39. The S106 would secure a number of contributions which would see the public footpath through the site upgraded and a toilet amongst other unspecified improvements provided at the village hall. However, in the absence of the development there would be no inherent need to upgrade the footpath, and whilst as a section off-site has been blocked by fly tipped garden waste, other powers exist to address this. The extent to which the works might otherwise assist in improving access to the railway station is unclear. The distance that residents within the broader area would still need to walk to get there could remain off putting. Improvements to the village hall would presumably also be of some broader benefit, but the need for improvement would reflect the larger population that the facility would be expected to service. This would be similarly true of other contributions secured by the S106 in relation to education and health. Whilst the S106 would also secure provision of on-site public open space and play areas, aside from that provided adjacent to the cross, it appears unlikely that these facilities would see much use by non-residents. The above considerations therefore attract no more than limited weight.
40. Characterised as falling within the 'small and medium site' category by the appellant, the development has been chiefly promoted on the basis of the social and economic benefits that would be generated by provision of market and affordable housing within an accessible location. This would help to address a pressing local need for each. Within that context, subject to the development later being shown to be deliverable, it could also make a numerically important contribution towards addressing the persistent shortfall in the Council's 5YHLS noted above. Given the national objective of significantly boosting the supply of new homes, I attach significant weight to the benefits.
41. Within this context the appellant has placed heavy emphasis on the 12 December 2024 Written Ministerial Statement (WMS), which set out the Government's goal of delivering 1.5 million new homes. However, whilst the WMS's criticism of inadequate local plan coverage might well be applicable to the Council, the WMS also sought to make absolutely clear that the measures it outlined were not a green light for low-quality development. Nor did it accept that there is an inherent trade-off

between supply and quality. In this regard I cannot ignore the design failings of the scheme. As emphasised out by the Framework, good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. It follows that poorly designed development is not publicly beneficial. It remains the case that the benefits of housing provision could be similarly generated by a more well informed and sensitive scheme.

42. Indeed, as beneficial as the development might be in a quantitative sense, even if the shortfall in 5YHLS is as low as is claimed by the appellant, I am satisfied that the collective weight of the above benefits would not outweigh or serve to convincingly justify the harm likely to be caused to the significance of the cross as a listed building and designated heritage asset.
43. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the appellant has failed to demonstrate that the development could be delivered without causing unacceptable harm to the significance of St Augustine's Cross. The development would as such fail to preserve its setting, conflicting with Policy HE03 of the Local Plan which generally defers to the Framework. Though Policy SP36 of the Local Plan, which was also cited by the Council, sets out a list of actions rather than criteria against which to assess a scheme, the development would also frustrate the objective it sets out of protecting the historic environment from inappropriate development.

(b) Landscape

44. Policy SP26 of the Local Plan generally seeks to secure development proposals that conserve and enhance Thanet's local distinctiveness. It states that development proposals should demonstrate how they respect and respond to the character, key sensitivities, qualities and guidelines of the relevant landscape character area as detailed in the Thanet Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD). The supporting text usefully explains that the policy aims to safeguard and enhance the open and historic character of Thanet's countryside and landscape. Some overlap therefore exists between this matter and that considered above.
45. The site falls within the locally identified Watsum North Slopes Landscape Character Area (the LCA). This is large in size, and is defined and named with reference to the former Watsum Channel which historically lay towards the south. The Thanet Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD), notes that the landscape holds strong cultural associations, including links to the historical landing sites of St Augustine in the adjacent Pegwell Bay Landscape Character Area. Within this context it further notes St Augustine's Cross amongst the key characteristics of the LCA, and lists conservation and enhancement of cultural heritage and assets, including their landscape setting, as one of the guidelines intended to deliver the landscape strategy for the LCA. Insofar as the subdivision of character areas was strongly influenced by historic geography, they serve to further underline the time depth which both exists, and which remains capable of perception within the modern landscape.
46. As set out above, the site is well enclosed. Visual linkage between it and the broader landscape of the LCA is limited, being principally constrained by the railway embankment. This does not however alter the fact that the site hosts a feature identified amongst the LCA's key characteristics. Nor does the otherwise 'ordinary' character of the fields which make up the site. Moreover, the noted links between the LCA and Pegwell Bay Landscape Character Area are only superficially

obscured by the overgrown hedge along the southern edge of the site. It appears that this linkage would be more visually apparent were the hedge simply trimmed, particularly in winter.

47. The cross would clearly continue to exist post-development. But given that it would be absorbed within the urban area of Cliffsend, it would thereafter be viewed as a feature of the townscape rather than the landscape. Though the conservation zone drawn around the cross was additionally intended to serve as a landscape buffer and component of an improved settlement edge, for many of the reasons already explored above, it would be ineffective, being a relatively small, urbanised space providing little sense of landscape context. Similar would be true of the bands of open space provided around the peripheries of the site.
48. Whilst perception of the effects of the development beyond the boundaries of the site and from within the broader LCA would be limited, the quality of the contribution made by the site to the wider LCA would be substantially diminished. This would include erosion of the noted linkage between the LCA and Pegwell Bay Landscape Character Area. The development would not therefore respect and respond to the character, key sensitivities, qualities and guidelines of the LCA set out within the SPD, or conserve and enhance Thanet's local distinctiveness.
49. In such circumstances Policy SP26 provides an exception for development proposals essential for the social and economic well-being of the area. Generally speaking, provision of housing is essential, it is required locally, and it contributes to social and economic well-being. However, considered in such a simplistic way the exception would render the policy both largely ineffective. Indeed, insofar as the policy wording identifies the 'proposal', it is apparent that whilst all the above may be generally true of housing, there is no essential need either to provide it on the site or in accordance with the parameters proposed. As such, I cannot conclude that the scheme before me passes the exception. The development would therefore conflict with Policy SP26.
50. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the appellant has failed to demonstrate that the development could be delivered without causing unacceptable harm to the LCA. It would therefore conflict with Policy SP26 of the Local Plan as set out above, and Policy QD02 of the Local Plan whose headline objective is for all new development to promote or reinforce the local character of the area.

Other Matters/Considerations

51. The appellant has referenced a press release indicating that housing developments near railway stations will in future be given a 'default yes'. But the details of such a measure, if introduced, remain unclear, and have yet to be consulted on, let alone adopted. I cannot therefore attach any weight to this as a consideration in favour of the scheme.
52. The development would have a likely significant effect on the integrity of the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area given increased recreational pressure. To this end the submitted S106 would secure a contribution towards delivery of the Council's Strategic Access, Management and Monitoring Plan. Had I been otherwise minded to allow the appeal this would have been a matter requiring further attention. However, as I am dismissing it for other reasons no further consideration is necessary.

Conclusion

53. For the reasons set out above the effects of the development would be unacceptable, giving rise to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no other considerations which alter or outweigh these findings. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Webb

INSPECTOR

Counsel for the appellant, King's Chambers

(Heritage) TCMS

(Landscape) Tyler Grange

(Housing Land Supply) Emery Planning

(Planning) Lichfields

(Legal) Richborough

Counsel for the LPA, Francis Taylor Building

(Heritage) Bridges Associates

(Planning/character and appearance) VLH Associates

(Housing land supply) Thanet DC

Thanet DC

Westgate and Garlinge Action Group Against Housing Development on Farmland

Former local resident

Cliffsend Parish Councillor

Parish and District Councillor

Parish and District Councillor

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

ID1. Appellant opening.

ID2. LPA opening.

ID3. Scott schedule of disputed 5YHLS sites.

ID4. Draft agenda for housing land supply round table.

ID5. Interested party photos of Foads Hill.

ID6. Landscape SOCG.

ID7. Heritage SOCG.

ID8. Decision notice OL/TH/18/0261

ID9. Archaeology SOCG.

ID10. Archaeology exclusion zone plan.

ID11. Illustrative site layout plan Ref. SL - 01 B Rev. 9.

ID12. Draft S106 (12 Nov).

ID13. Schedule of conditions (13 Nov).

ID14. Schedule of conditions (20 Nov).

ID15. Draft S106 - clean (20 Nov).

ID16. Draft S106 – track changes (20 Nov).

ID17. Schedule of conditions (21 Nov).

ID18. LPA closing

ID19. Appellant closing.