

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 March 2026 12:58  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: Parish council reps DOV/25/00112  
**Attachments:** Consultee Comment-RINGWOULD WITH KINGSDOWN PARISH COUNCIL.pdf

Shall I just send this to [REDACTED] or do I need to provide some additional wording.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[REDACTED]  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

---

**From:** SupportAssistants <SupportAssistants@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Sent:** 24 March 2026 12:16  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Parish council reps DOV/25/00112

Hi [REDACTED]

Please find attached.

Kind regards,



[REDACTED]  
**Support Officer**  
**Development Management**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16  
3PJ  
Email: [developmentmanagement@dover.gov.uk](mailto:developmentmanagement@dover.gov.uk)  
Web: <http://dover.gov.uk>  
Tel: [REDACTED]

Please consider the Environment before printing this email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR, your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>. This explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 March 2026 10:09  
**To:** SupportAssistants <SupportAssistants@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Subject:** Parish council reps DOV/25/00112

Good morning,

Is there any chance you could pull both of the Kingsdown Parish Council reps together in one PDF so that we are able to circulate these to members of planning committee please?

Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[REDACTED]  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Web: [dover.gov.u](http://dover.gov.u)

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.  
If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.  
Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.  
All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.  
Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.  
This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.  
If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.  
Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.  
All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.  
Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.  
This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.  
If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.  
Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.  
All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.  
Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

## Objection

We have listened to our Parishioners with regards to the proposed Woodhill Farm development of 70 homes (SAP34 in Dover District Local Development Plan (DDLDP)).

### Number of dwellings and sustainability

There is primarily concern in the parish regarding the number of dwellings proposed. In Regulation 18, a capacity of 90 was suggested which was then reduced in Regulation 19 to 50. At the time this was because the HELAA assessment highlighted concerns around highways and the access primarily. The “indicative” capacity of 50 in SAP34 of the DDLDP has been increased to 70 in this application with the only justification being that it would make better use of the land. While the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does promote making effective use of land generally, it also states the need to safeguard and improve the environment, and ensure safe and healthy living conditions (Para. 124). The design and access statement mentions that the proposals are in keeping with densities and urban grain in the local area, however Glen Rd. has a very low housing density with a mixture of bungalows and family homes enjoying spacious gardens. This is at odds with the proposal. Paragraph 129 of the NPPF, states housing density, should maintain the character and setting of an area (including residential gardens). Additionally it highlights the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.

The Ringwould with Kingsdown Design Codes and Guidelines (page 62) highlights that any new development should be appropriate for its location and surroundings. This site lies adjacent to the urban area, (where there would normally be a presumption against any development all) where you would normally expect a much lower density of development, with larger houses set in spacious grounds and substantial soft landscaping. The proposed high density suburban housing would be totally out of context with its surroundings.

Dark skies are an important part of our nocturnal landscape (DDLDP PM1). Kingsdown has low radiance levels generally, therefore any development here would need to demonstrate that full consideration had been given to its position in a dark skies zone.

When our Parishioners took part in the LDP consultation process they understood that a capacity of 50 was being proposed. The inspector also examined SAP34 as 50. We were all therefore dismayed to find in the final plan the wording “indicative” around site allocations in the LDP. This makes a mockery of the consultation process.

We feel that 70 dwellings would put a strain on our limited infrastructure. Kingsdown is categorised (we would argue wrongly) as a Local Centre in the new LDP, however we do not service any smaller settlements around us. We do not have a doctors surgery, a dentist or a supermarket, or an adequate bus service. The few buses we have a day do not pass this site along Ringwold Rd. Stagecoach as part of the LDP consultation process, advised that development of this site would not result in additional bus services being added.

We feel that the proposed plans do not constitute sustainable development as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The site is on the edge of the built settlement, with inadequate bus links to adjoining towns and villages and no train station – the closest being Walmer and Martin Mill. It is very difficult to safely walk or cycle to these from this site. National Cycle route 1 follows the coast at Kingsdown but is difficult to join safely from this site. Residents of the proposed development would therefore be dependent on their cars to reach facilities in neighbouring Deal and Dover, contrary to DDLDP policy SP1 and SP2.

The removal of good grade agricultural land (best and most versatile) from vital food production and compromising the setting of the Kent Downs National Landscape are also arguments against these plans achieving sustainability and contrary to SP4.

We were pleased to note that our Housing Needs assessment had been referenced by the applicant. We have a declining but ageing population and a large proportion of detached and 4+ bedroom homes (detached 63.6% in Kingsdown, 22.9% nationally, 4+ beds 32.7% Kingsdown, 21.1% nationally). Over 40% of the population is 60+ yrs in the local census, up from 29% in the 2011 census. Any development of this site would need to reflect this demographic. We would like to see the affordable / 1st time buyer / shared ownership housing achieved on site and at an early stage in the build.

## Design

The recent development (Wellington Paddocks) on the edge of the Parish comprises unimaginative generic boxes which could be on any Kent housing estate. They also represent a current trend for plastic composite weatherboarding. We feel that the same could be true of the designs shown in this application. These concerns are shared by many of our parishioners. Such generic house designs do not reflect the context of the site in Kingsdown. It would look like any other housing estate in East Kent. Kingsdown has a rich vernacular. Our conservation area has fishermen's cottages and flint faced walls, there are bungalows and large detached homes along Glen Rd., with a variety of roof heights and materials.

The landscape buffer along the north-eastern boundary of the site between the existing houses in Glen Road and the proposed dwellings has raised some safety and security

concerns. Whilst largely welcomed, it could pose a crime risk for both the existing and the proposed dwellings, allowing access to gardens. We feel that this landscape buffer should be incorporated into the rear gardens of any proposed dwellings along this boundary. This could be maintained in perpetuity with the use of a covenant on the dwellings when they are sold.

The term 'landscape led design' does not seem to be the driving force of this application, as suggested by the applicants. Instead there seems to be a lot of emphasis on the provision of parking which dominates the design to the detriment of the overall feel of the site and the setting of the KDNL. Car ports are not a local feature.

There are too many blank walls fronting public spaces and footpaths, these should be avoided, thus improving natural surveillance.

To combat fuel poverty and maximise fuel sourcing and efficiency any new build project should include solar panels, heat pumps, maximum insulation and make best use of solar gain. This is in line with DDLP policy SP1.

## Highways and access

There are also still major concerns around the safety of the access. Discussions with Kitewood which included their Highways Consultant have raised further questions. It was indicated that the works to straighten and widen the access could be completed without closing the road and with traffic control measures in place ie traffic lights. However, this is unlikely as the road approaching the access from both sides is not wide enough for two lanes of traffic, 2 HGV's cannot pass safely. Residents have measured the road width on entering Kingsdown and found that it is not wide enough for 2 cars to pass safely, which would indicate that traffic lights would not be a safe option here. The council considers that Ringwould Rd would have to indeed be closed during the works to widen the road.

Closing Ringwould Road for any length of time is not really an option for Kingsdown. We have 3 routes into the village; Ringwould Rd., Glen Road and the Cliffe Road along the seafront. Cliffe Road leads to Upper Street and The Rise which are both narrow and unsuitable for HGV's. Additionally, the Rise and Upper St. do not have footpaths / short sections only for pedestrians and we have already had the fatality of a pedestrian in Upper St. Safety for all householders would be compromised during any closure of Ringwould Rd. as emergency vehicles would struggle to access the village from the other 2 routes.

The Highways Consultant for Kitewood also showed us data for a traffic survey carried out in September when schools return after the holidays. We consider that this is not representative of the high volume of traffic which can be seen along Ringwould Rd. in summer months when the holiday park and campsite are busy. We consider that an additional survey in summer would be advisable. Comparisons are made for traffic data

between this site and 2 villages in Norfolk. These do not seem to be representative or relevant. The Parish Council would like to see another road survey done this summer before any development is considered.

Ringwould Rd. is a narrow country lane with SLOW painted on it at intervals, signage showing 20mph as you enter Kingsdown and 50mph as you leave. As typified in the KDNL and Ripple F3 of the DD LCA (2020) it is winding and characterful and forms an attractive approach to the village with natural traffic calming due to the nature of the blind bends. The road is particularly narrow close to the proposed site, and there is already considerable vehicular conflict on the road when there are 2 HGV's trying to pass.

Where Ringwould Rd. forms a junction with the A258 there are signs restricting vehicular access to 7.5T. It is a serious concern for residents that additional traffic will cause severe traffic congestion and more vehicular conflict along this narrow lane.

The proposed alterations to the entrance although in the interests of safety and visibility would detract from the character and appearance of the area, particularly from the entrance to the village, and the setting of the KDNL. Kingsdown relies heavily upon tourism in the summer months and as such this gateway is important to our rural economy.

There are also conflicts around the various users of the access. ER5 crosses this point, there is also the entrance to the Kingsdown play area car park and a field access opposite this which need careful consideration. All are very close to the entrance of the site.

We read with interest the comments from KCC PROW around ER5 and are pleased that they share our concerns and those of the parishioners. A safe crossing for pedestrians using ER5 and horses (and cyclists) joining ER21 will be very difficult to safely achieve. ER5 is very well used to link the play area with the village and school. It is clear that PROW have serious concerns about the feasibility of achieving the link to the village through improvements to ER5 which is a requirement of development through SAP34.

We welcome the proposed additional footpath to connect the site to existing footpaths on Glen Road. However, we feel that not enough detail has been shown for the Glen Rd path, and have reservations as to the safety of the crossing diagonally across the road to the footpath opposite.

We are also concerned that the extension of the 20mph zone on approach to the entrance does not go far enough. ER20 crosses Ringwould Rd. at a point which is hard to see traffic. There are also large tractors exiting the farm road at this point. An extended 20mph zone beyond this point would go some way to improving safety.

No mention is made of the impact to the junction of Ringwould Rd with the A258 other than to say the perceived increase in traffic would not have an impact. However, there are already issues in trying to safely join the A258, this would only exacerbate the problem. We consider that more investigations are needed by KCC highways to gauge the safety of this extra traffic

post development and site traffic during the construction of any development. Worryingly, crash map data for the past 25 years omits a fatality on Ringwould Rd.

Recently, concerns have been raised that a site nearby; SAP15 (Rays Bottom) which is situated on one of the access roads into Kingsdown – Liverpool Rd / Glen Rd is currently at the public engagement stage and presumably a planning application will be submitted soon after. Parishioners are worried that if both sites were granted planning and started to be built out simultaneously we would have 2 out of 3 of the routes into the village compromised by site traffic and potential road closures. This could have serious safety implications with regards to pedestrians and emergency services, as well as increased damage to buildings and property and is unacceptable. The Parish council are involved with preparing a Highways Improvement Plan with KCC at the moment. This document is focused on 2 main problems, speeding by all vehicles and damage to the conservation area around Upper St. by HGV's. We would ask that further investigations be carried out and that careful planning is needed to ensure that any development coming forward does not cause safety issues for all in the Parish.

We feel very strongly that wider highways issues have not been properly addressed. We are also very concerned that at the time of submission there have been no comments from KCC Highways which is worrying in the extreme as this is such a complex and contentious site and safety is a primary concern for the entire community.

## Natural Environment

We read with interest the comments from the Kent Downs National Landscapes (KDNL) team. Many parishioners are concerned about the landscape impact of this development. Not only is the KDNL affected but also Ripple F3, identified in the DDC Landscape Character assessment (2020). This site is included in Ripple F3 and can be clearly seen from the A258 across the rolling chalk downland which typifies the region. Due to ash dieback decimating local woodland to the west, the site is becoming increasingly visible. The siting of dwellings parallel to ER21 makes these particularly visible in the landscape.

We agree with the KDNL team that the palette of materials should be toned down to darker colours and that natural screening should be allowed to grow up tall around the site. The topography of the site is such that bright building materials would be highly visible from the Kent Downs. We would also like to see screening planted as early as possible and a muted palette for roof materials as they will be highly visible from the open countryside to the western boundary. Whilst this would be an improvement to the scheme, it would not make the development as a whole, acceptable.

We would also draw attention to the new NL briefing of November 24 which talks about the importance of the setting of the NL. In this case the setting is further enhanced by being part of the Landscape Character Area Ripple F3 – so designated by DDC in 2020. The Parish Council consider that the proposals do not meet the requirements of policy NE2.

Although the applicants' surveys have made claims that the site is very low bar in terms of biodiversity the site borders to the south west an area which is biodiversity rich and used by feeding bats. The green area of the site borders this which is good. We would like to see bat boxes, swift bricks, hedgehog holes in fencing and also low light levels to allow bats to feed. Kingsdown radiance levels are very low around the edges of the built environment and dark skies are very important to us. Any development coming forward needs to take great care not to isolate this area and protect hedgerows and corridors to the wider countryside. We would like to see more monitoring for bats and migratory birds. These measures would be an improvement, however they would not mitigate the overall damage it would cause to the local environment and would not make the development as whole acceptable.

Dismissed appeal in Thanet

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/W/24/3351846 Land off Foxborough Lane, Minster, CT12 4AH – proposed 115 residential dwellings.

We would also like to draw the Planning Officers' attention to the above appeal launched by Gladmans. This was dismissed by the Planning Inspector on 10th February 2025.

We feel that the site has many of the same issues as SAP34 and should be taken into consideration. The issues which are comparable and were grounds for dismissal are as follows:

the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the landscape – the site is within the Wantsum North Slopes Landscape Character Area and the proposal was found to detract from it sufficiently to be grounds for dismissal;

the effect of the development upon the resource of best and most versatile agricultural land – there was insufficient argument to warrant removal of BMV land;

whether or not suitable and safe pedestrian access would be provided, to avoid residual highway effects – pedestrian safety would be compromised by the development and could not be mitigated for.

Conclusions

Considering the setting in relation to the KDNL and LCA Ripple F3, the loss of good quality farming land and the strain on local transport and infrastructure we consider that this application does not meet the sustainability criteria set out in the NPPF.

We note that DHA said in their public consultation document following conversations with DDC – “It was added that there was no in principle objection to the scale of development (total number of units) as long as it is technically supportable and does not give rise to unacceptable highways, amenity or other impacts”.

Many parishioners and the PC would argue that this will definitely cause unacceptable difficulties with highways and have significant impacts on amenities.

Based on all the above arguments Ringwoud with Kingsdown Parish Council considers that the proposals are in direct conflict with the relevant policies in the NPPF; the DDLP, and the advice given in the Kent Design Guide, and Building for a Healthy Life, by Homes England.

We therefore respectfully request that the Council refuses this application for the reasons given above.

# Comments for Planning Application 25/00112

## Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00112

Address: Land North West Of Kingsdown Recreation Ground Ringwold Road Kingsdown

Proposal: Erection of 70 dwellings including access, parking, landscaping, and associated infrastructure

Case Officer: [REDACTED]

## Customer Details

Name: \_ Ringwold with Kingsdown Parish Council

Address: Not Available

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Parish Council

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:25/00112 - Woodhill Farm

## Objection

We have listened to our Parishioners with regards to the proposed Woodhill Farm development of 70 homes (SAP34 in Dover District Local Development Plan (DDLDP)).

## Number of dwellings and sustainability

There is primarily concern in the parish regarding the number of dwellings proposed. In Regulation 18, a capacity of 90 was suggested which was then reduced in Regulation 19 to 50. At the time this was because the HELAA assessment highlighted concerns around highways and the access primarily. The "indicative" capacity of 50 in SAP34 of the DDLDP has been increased to 70 in this application with the only justification being that it would make better use of the land. While the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does promote making effective use of land generally, it also states the need to safeguard and improve the environment, and ensure safe and healthy living conditions (Para. 124). The design and access statement mentions that the proposals are in keeping with densities and urban grain in the local area, however Glen Rd. has a very low housing density with a mixture of bungalows and family homes enjoying spacious gardens. This is at odds with the proposal. Paragraph 129 of the NPPF, states housing density, should maintain the character and setting of an area (including residential gardens). Additionally it highlights the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.

The Ringwold with Kingsdown Design Codes and Guidelines (page 62) highlights that any new

development should be appropriate for its location and surroundings. This site lies adjacent to the urban area, (where there would normally be a presumption against any development at all) where you would normally expect a much lower density of development, with larger houses set in spacious grounds and substantial soft landscaping. The proposed high density suburban housing would be totally out of context with its surroundings.

Dark skies are an important part of our nocturnal landscape (DDLPM1). Kingsdown has low radiance levels generally, therefore any development here would need to demonstrate that full consideration had been given to its position in a dark skies zone.

When our Parishioners took part in the LDP consultation process they understood that a capacity of 50 was being proposed. The inspector also examined SAP34 as 50. We were all therefore dismayed to find in the final plan the wording "indicative" around site allocations in the LDP. This makes a mockery of the consultation process.

We feel that 70 dwellings would put a strain on our limited infrastructure. Kingsdown is categorised (we would argue wrongly) as a Local Centre in the new LDP, however we do not service any smaller settlements around us. We do not have a doctors surgery, a dentist or a supermarket, or an adequate bus service. The few buses we have a day do not pass this site along Ringwould Rd. Stagecoach as part of the LDP consultation process, advised that development of this site would not result in additional bus services being added.

We feel that the proposed plans do not constitute sustainable development as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The site is on the edge of the built settlement, with inadequate bus links to adjoining towns and villages and no train station - the closest being Walmer and Martin Mill. It is very difficult to safely walk or cycle to these from this site. National Cycle route 1 follows the coast at Kingsdown but is difficult to join safely from this site. Residents of the proposed development would therefore be dependent on their cars to reach facilities in neighbouring Deal and Dover, contrary to DDLDP policy SP1 and SP2.

The removal of good grade agricultural land (best and most versatile) from vital food production and compromising the setting of the Kent Downs National Landscape are also arguments against these plans achieving sustainability and contrary to SP4.

We were pleased to note that our Housing Needs assessment had been referenced by the applicant. We have a declining but ageing population and a large proportion of detached and 4+ bedroom homes (detached 63.6% in Kingsdown, 22.9% nationally, 4+ beds 32.7% Kingsdown, 21.1% nationally). Over 40% of the population is 60+ yrs in the local census, up from 29% in the 2011 census. Any development of this site would need to reflect this demographic. We would like to see the affordable / 1st time buyer / shared ownership housing achieved on site and at an early stage in the build.

## Design

The recent development (Wellington Paddocks) on the edge of the Parish comprises unimaginative generic boxes which could be on any Kent housing estate. They also represent a current trend for plastic composite weatherboarding. We feel that the same could be true of the designs shown in this application. These concerns are shared by many of our parishioners. Such

generic house designs do not reflect the context of the site in Kingsdown. It would look like any other housing estate in East Kent. Kingsdown has a rich vernacular. Our conservation area has fishermans' cottages and flint faced walls, there are bungalows and large detached homes along Glen Rd., with a variety of roof heights and materials.

The landscape buffer along the north-eastern boundary of the site between the existing houses in Glen Road and the proposed dwellings has raised some safety and security concerns. Whilst largely welcomed, it could pose a crime risk for both the existing and the proposed dwellings, allowing access to gardens. We feel that this landscape buffer should be incorporated into the rear gardens of any proposed dwellings along this boundary. This could be maintained in perpetuity with the use of a covenant on the dwellings when they are sold.

The term 'landscape led design' does not seem to be the driving force of this application, as suggested by the applicants. Instead there seems to be a lot of emphasis on the provision of parking which dominates the design to the detriment of the overall feel of the site and the setting of the KDNL. Car ports are not a local feature.

There are too many blank walls fronting public spaces and footpaths, these should be avoided, thus improving natural surveillance.

To combat fuel poverty and maximise fuel sourcing and efficiency any new build project should include solar panels, heat pumps, maximum insulation and make best use of solar gain. This is in line with DDLP policy SP1.

## Highways and access

There are also still major concerns around the safety of the access. Discussions with Kitewood which included their Highways Consultant have raised further questions. It was indicated that the works to straighten and widen the access could be completed without closing the road and with traffic control measures in place ie traffic lights. However, this is unlikely as the road approaching the access from both sides is not wide enough for two lanes of traffic, 2 HGV's cannot pass safely. Residents have measured the road width on entering Kingsdown and found that it is not wide enough for 2 cars to pass safely, which would indicate that traffic lights would not be a safe option here. The council considers that Ringwould Rd would have to indeed be closed during the works to widen the road.

Closing Ringwould Road for any length of time is not really an option for Kingsdown. We have 3 routes into the village; Ringwould Rd., Glen Road and the Cliffe Road along the seafront. Cliffe Road leads to Upper Street and The Rise which are both narrow and unsuitable for HGV's. Additionally, the Rise and Upper St. do not have footpaths / short sections only for pedestrians and we have already had the fatality of a pedestrian in Upper St. Safety for all householders would be compromised during any closure of Ringwould Rd. as emergency vehicles would struggle to access the village from the other 2 routes.

The Highways Consultant for Kitewood also showed us data for a traffic survey carried out in September when schools return after the holidays. We consider that this is not representative of the high volume of traffic which can be seen along Ringwould Rd. in summer months when the holiday park and campsite are busy. We consider that an additional survey in summer would be

advisable. Comparisons are made for traffic data between this site and 2 villages in Norfolk. These do not seem to be representative or relevant. The Parish Council would like to see another road survey done this summer before any development is considered.

Ringwould Rd. is a narrow country lane with SLOW painted on it at intervals, signage showing 20mph as you enter Kingsdown and 50mph as you leave. As typified in the KDNL and Ripple F3 of the DD LCA (2020) it is winding and characterful and forms an attractive approach to the village with natural traffic calming due to the nature of the blind bends. The road is particularly narrow close to the proposed site, and there is already considerable vehicular conflict on the road when there are 2 HGV's trying to pass.

Where Ringwould Rd. forms a junction with the A258 there are signs restricting vehicular access to 7.5T. It is a serious concern for residents that additional traffic will cause severe traffic congestion and more vehicular conflict along this narrow lane.

The proposed alterations to the entrance although in the interests of safety and visibility would detract from the character and appearance of the area, particularly from the entrance to the village, and the setting of the KDNL. Kingsdown relies heavily upon tourism in the summer months and as such this gateway is important to our rural economy.

There are also conflicts around the various users of the access. ER5 crosses this point, there is also the entrance to the Kingsdown play area car park and a field access opposite this which need careful consideration. All are very close to the entrance of the site.

We read with interest the comments from KCC PROW around ER5 and are pleased that they share our concerns and those of the parishioners. A safe crossing for pedestrians using ER5 and horses (and cyclists) joining ER21 will be very difficult to safely achieve. ER5 is very well used to link the play area with the village and school. It is clear that PROW have serious concerns about the feasibility of achieving the link to the village through improvements to ER5 which is a requirement of development through SAP34.

We welcome the proposed additional footpath to connect the site to existing footpaths on Glen Road. However, we feel that not enough detail has been shown for the Glen Rd path, and have reservations as to the safety of the crossing diagonally across the road to the footpath opposite. We are also concerned that the extension of the 20mph zone on approach to the entrance does not go far enough. ER20 crosses Ringwould Rd. at a point which is hard to see traffic. There are also large tractors exiting the farm road at this point. An extended 20mph zone beyond this point would go some way to improving safety.

No mention is made of the impact to the junction of Ringwould Rd with the A258 other than to say the perceived increase in traffic would not have an impact. However, there are already issues in trying to safely join the A258, this would only exacerbate the problem. We consider that more investigations are needed by KCC highways to gauge the safety of this extra traffic post development and site traffic during the construction of any development. Worryingly, crash map data for the past 25 years omits a fatality on Ringwould Rd.

Recently, concerns have been raised that a site nearby; SAP15 (Rays Bottom) which is situated on one of the access roads into Kingsdown - Liverpool Rd / Glen Rd is currently at the public engagement stage and presumably a planning application will be submitted soon after.

Parishioners are worried that if both sites were granted planning and started to be built out

simultaneously we would have 2 out of 3 of the routes into the village compromised by site traffic and potential road closures. This could have serious safety implications with regards to pedestrians and emergency services, as well as increased damage to buildings and property and is unacceptable. The Parish council are involved with preparing a Highways Improvement Plan with KCC at the moment. This document is focused on 2 main problems, speeding by all vehicles and damage to the conservation area around Upper St. by HGV's. We would ask that further investigations be carried out and that careful planning is needed to ensure that any development coming forward does not cause safety issues for all in the Parish.

We feel very strongly that wider highways issues have not been properly addressed. We are also very concerned that at the time of submission there have been no comments from KCC Highways which is worrying in the extreme as this is such a complex and contentious site and safety is a primary concern for the entire community.

## Natural Environment

We read with interest the comments from the Kent Downs National Landscapes (KDNL) team. Many parishioners are concerned about the landscape impact of this development. Not only is the KDNL affected but also Ripple F3, identified in the DDC Landscape Character assessment (2020). This site is included in Ripple F3 and can be clearly seen from the A258 across the rolling chalk downland which typifies the region. Due to ash dieback decimating local woodland to the west, the site is becoming increasingly visible. The siting of dwellings parallel to ER21 makes these particularly visible in the landscape.

We agree with the KDNL team that the palette of materials should be toned down to darker colours and that natural screening should be allowed to grow up tall around the site. The topography of the site is such that bright building materials would be highly visible from the Kent Downs. We would also like to see screening planted as early as possible and a muted palette for roof materials as they will be highly visible from the open countryside to the western boundary. Whilst this would be an improvement to the scheme, it would not make the development as a whole, acceptable.

We would also draw attention to the new NL briefing of November 24 which talks about the importance of the setting of the NL. In this case the setting is further enhanced by being part of the Landscape Character Area Ripple F3 - so designated by DDC in 2020. The Parish Council consider that the proposals do not meet the requirements of policy NE2.

Although the applicants' surveys have made claims that the site is very low bar in terms of biodiversity the site borders to the south west an area which is biodiversity rich and used by feeding bats. The green area of the site borders this which is good. We would like to see bat boxes, swift bricks, hedgehog holes in fencing and also low light levels to allow bats to feed. Kingsdown radiance levels are very low around the edges of the built environment and dark skies are very important to us. Any development coming forward needs to take great care not to isolate this area and protect hedgerows and corridors to the wider countryside. We would like to see more monitoring for bats and migratory birds. These measures would be an improvement, however they would not mitigate the overall damage it would cause to the local environment and would not make

the development as whole acceptable.

Dismissed appeal in Thanet

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/W/24/3351846 Land off Foxborough Lane, Minster, CT12 4AH - proposed 115 residential dwellings.

We would also like to draw the Planning Officers' attention to the above appeal launched by Gladmans. This was dismissed by the Planning Inspector on 10th February 2025.

We feel that the site has many of the same issues as SAP34 and should be taken into consideration. The issues which are comparable and were grounds for dismissal are as follows:

the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the landscape - the site is within the Wantsum North Slopes Landscape Character Area and the proposal was found to detract from it sufficiently to be grounds for dismissal;

the effect of the development upon the resource of best and most versatile agricultural land - there was insufficient argument to warrant removal of BMV land;

whether or not suitable and safe pedestrian access would be provided, to avoid residual highway effects - pedestrian safety would be compromised by the development and could not be mitigated for.

Conclusions

Considering the setting in relation to the KDNL and LCA Ripple F3, the loss of good quality farming land and the strain on local transport and infrastructure we consider that this application does not meet the sustainability criteria set out in the NPPF.

We note that DHA said in their public consultation document following conversations with DDC - "It was added that there was no in principle objection to the scale of development (total number of units) as long as it is technically supportable and does not give rise to unacceptable highways, amenity or other impacts".

Many parishioners and the PC would argue that this will definitely cause unacceptable difficulties with highways and have significant impacts on amenities.

Based on all the above arguments Ringwoud with Kingsdown Parish Council considers that the proposals are in direct conflict with the relevant policies in the NPPF; the DDLP, and the advice given in the Kent Design Guide, and Building for a Healthy Life, by Homes England.

We therefore respectfully request that the Council refuses this application for the reasons given above.

  
Parish Clerk

11 March 2025

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 March 2026 16:26  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: APPLICATION NO DOV/25/00112 - LAND NORTH OF KINGSDOWN RECREATION GROUND, RINGWOULD ROAD, KINGSDOWN  
**Attachments:** Consultee Comment-RINGWOULD WITH KINGSDOWN PARISH COUNCIL.pdf

FYI

Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[REDACTED]  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 March 2026 16:18  
**Cc:** clerk@ringwouldwithkingsdown-pc.gov.uk <clerk@ringwouldwithkingsdown-pc.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** APPLICATION NO DOV/25/00112 - LAND NORTH OF KINGSDOWN RECREATION GROUND, RINGWOULD ROAD, KINGSDOWN

Dear Planning Committee members

The Chairman has raised concerns that Ringwould with Kingsdown Parish Council's comments have been overly summarised in the committee report on the above application.

Please therefore find attached the parish council's comments in their entirety.

Regards



[REDACTED]  
**Democratic Services Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Fax: 01304 872452  
Email: [REDACTED]

Web: <http://dover.gov.uk>

Please consider the Environment before printing this email

We can send you updates on over 30 Topics  
Register with just your email address

[Register Now »](#)



**Keep Me  
Posted**

News and alerts by email

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Your attention is drawn to our Corporate Privacy Notice at <https://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy>; this explains how we will use and share your personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

25/00112 – Woodhill Farm

## Objection

We have listened to our Parishioners with regards to the proposed Woodhill Farm development of 70 homes (SAP34 in Dover District Local Development Plan (DDLDP)).

### Number of dwellings and sustainability

There is primarily concern in the parish regarding the number of dwellings proposed. In Regulation 18, a capacity of 90 was suggested which was then reduced in Regulation 19 to 50. At the time this was because the HELAA assessment highlighted concerns around highways and the access primarily. The “indicative” capacity of 50 in SAP34 of the DDLDP has been increased to 70 in this application with the only justification being that it would make better use of the land. While the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does promote making effective use of land generally, it also states the need to safeguard and improve the environment, and ensure safe and healthy living conditions (Para. 124). The design and access statement mentions that the proposals are in keeping with densities and urban grain in the local area, however Glen Rd. has a very low housing density with a mixture of bungalows and family homes enjoying spacious gardens. This is at odds with the proposal. Paragraph 129 of the NPPF, states housing density, should maintain the character and setting of an area (including residential gardens). Additionally it highlights the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.

The Ringwould with Kingsdown Design Codes and Guidelines (page 62) highlights that any new development should be appropriate for its location and surroundings. This site lies adjacent to the urban area, (where there would normally be a presumption against any development all) where you would normally expect a much lower density of development, with larger houses set in spacious grounds and substantial soft landscaping. The proposed high density suburban housing would be totally out of context with its surroundings.

Dark skies are an important part of our nocturnal landscape (DDLDP PM1). Kingsdown has low radiance levels generally, therefore any development here would need to demonstrate that full consideration had been given to its position in a dark skies zone.

When our Parishioners took part in the LDP consultation process they understood that a capacity of 50 was being proposed. The inspector also examined SAP34 as 50. We were all therefore dismayed to find in the final plan the wording “indicative” around site allocations in the LDP. This makes a mockery of the consultation process.

We feel that 70 dwellings would put a strain on our limited infrastructure. Kingsdown is categorised (we would argue wrongly) as a Local Centre in the new LDP, however we do not service any smaller settlements around us. We do not have a doctors surgery, a dentist or a supermarket, or an adequate bus service. The few buses we have a day do not pass this site along Ringwold Rd. Stagecoach as part of the LDP consultation process, advised that development of this site would not result in additional bus services being added.

We feel that the proposed plans do not constitute sustainable development as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The site is on the edge of the built settlement, with inadequate bus links to adjoining towns and villages and no train station – the closest being Walmer and Martin Mill. It is very difficult to safely walk or cycle to these from this site. National Cycle route 1 follows the coast at Kingsdown but is difficult to join safely from this site. Residents of the proposed development would therefore be dependent on their cars to reach facilities in neighbouring Deal and Dover, contrary to DDLDP policy SP1 and SP2.

The removal of good grade agricultural land (best and most versatile) from vital food production and compromising the setting of the Kent Downs National Landscape are also arguments against these plans achieving sustainability and contrary to SP4.

We were pleased to note that our Housing Needs assessment had been referenced by the applicant. We have a declining but ageing population and a large proportion of detached and 4+ bedroom homes (detached 63.6% in Kingsdown, 22.9% nationally, 4+ beds 32.7% Kingsdown, 21.1% nationally). Over 40% of the population is 60+ yrs in the local census, up from 29% in the 2011 census. Any development of this site would need to reflect this demographic. We would like to see the affordable / 1st time buyer / shared ownership housing achieved on site and at an early stage in the build.

## Design

The recent development (Wellington Paddocks) on the edge of the Parish comprises unimaginative generic boxes which could be on any Kent housing estate. They also represent a current trend for plastic composite weatherboarding. We feel that the same could be true of the designs shown in this application. These concerns are shared by many of our parishioners. Such generic house designs do not reflect the context of the site in Kingsdown. It would look like any other housing estate in East Kent. Kingsdown has a rich vernacular. Our conservation area has fishermen's cottages and flint faced walls, there are bungalows and large detached homes along Glen Rd., with a variety of roof heights and materials.

The landscape buffer along the north-eastern boundary of the site between the existing houses in Glen Road and the proposed dwellings has raised some safety and security

concerns. Whilst largely welcomed, it could pose a crime risk for both the existing and the proposed dwellings, allowing access to gardens. We feel that this landscape buffer should be incorporated into the rear gardens of any proposed dwellings along this boundary. This could be maintained in perpetuity with the use of a covenant on the dwellings when they are sold.

The term 'landscape led design' does not seem to be the driving force of this application, as suggested by the applicants. Instead there seems to be a lot of emphasis on the provision of parking which dominates the design to the detriment of the overall feel of the site and the setting of the KDNL. Car ports are not a local feature.

There are too many blank walls fronting public spaces and footpaths, these should be avoided, thus improving natural surveillance.

To combat fuel poverty and maximise fuel sourcing and efficiency any new build project should include solar panels, heat pumps, maximum insulation and make best use of solar gain. This is in line with DDLP policy SP1.

## Highways and access

There are also still major concerns around the safety of the access. Discussions with Kitewood which included their Highways Consultant have raised further questions. It was indicated that the works to straighten and widen the access could be completed without closing the road and with traffic control measures in place ie traffic lights. However, this is unlikely as the road approaching the access from both sides is not wide enough for two lanes of traffic, 2 HGV's cannot pass safely. Residents have measured the road width on entering Kingsdown and found that it is not wide enough for 2 cars to pass safely, which would indicate that traffic lights would not be a safe option here. The council considers that Ringwould Rd would have to indeed be closed during the works to widen the road.

Closing Ringwould Road for any length of time is not really an option for Kingsdown. We have 3 routes into the village; Ringwould Rd., Glen Road and the Cliffe Road along the seafront. Cliffe Road leads to Upper Street and The Rise which are both narrow and unsuitable for HGV's. Additionally, the Rise and Upper St. do not have footpaths / short sections only for pedestrians and we have already had the fatality of a pedestrian in Upper St. Safety for all householders would be compromised during any closure of Ringwould Rd. as emergency vehicles would struggle to access the village from the other 2 routes.

The Highways Consultant for Kitewood also showed us data for a traffic survey carried out in September when schools return after the holidays. We consider that this is not representative of the high volume of traffic which can be seen along Ringwould Rd. in summer months when the holiday park and campsite are busy. We consider that an additional survey in summer would be advisable. Comparisons are made for traffic data

between this site and 2 villages in Norfolk. These do not seem to be representative or relevant. The Parish Council would like to see another road survey done this summer before any development is considered.

Ringwould Rd. is a narrow country lane with SLOW painted on it at intervals, signage showing 20mph as you enter Kingsdown and 50mph as you leave. As typified in the KDNL and Ripple F3 of the DD LCA (2020) it is winding and characterful and forms an attractive approach to the village with natural traffic calming due to the nature of the blind bends. The road is particularly narrow close to the proposed site, and there is already considerable vehicular conflict on the road when there are 2 HGV's trying to pass.

Where Ringwould Rd. forms a junction with the A258 there are signs restricting vehicular access to 7.5T. It is a serious concern for residents that additional traffic will cause severe traffic congestion and more vehicular conflict along this narrow lane.

The proposed alterations to the entrance although in the interests of safety and visibility would detract from the character and appearance of the area, particularly from the entrance to the village, and the setting of the KDNL. Kingsdown relies heavily upon tourism in the summer months and as such this gateway is important to our rural economy.

There are also conflicts around the various users of the access. ER5 crosses this point, there is also the entrance to the Kingsdown play area car park and a field access opposite this which need careful consideration. All are very close to the entrance of the site.

We read with interest the comments from KCC PROW around ER5 and are pleased that they share our concerns and those of the parishioners. A safe crossing for pedestrians using ER5 and horses (and cyclists) joining ER21 will be very difficult to safely achieve. ER5 is very well used to link the play area with the village and school. It is clear that PROW have serious concerns about the feasibility of achieving the link to the village through improvements to ER5 which is a requirement of development through SAP34.

We welcome the proposed additional footpath to connect the site to existing footpaths on Glen Road. However, we feel that not enough detail has been shown for the Glen Rd path, and have reservations as to the safety of the crossing diagonally across the road to the footpath opposite.

We are also concerned that the extension of the 20mph zone on approach to the entrance does not go far enough. ER20 crosses Ringwould Rd. at a point which is hard to see traffic. There are also large tractors exiting the farm road at this point. An extended 20mph zone beyond this point would go some way to improving safety.

No mention is made of the impact to the junction of Ringwould Rd with the A258 other than to say the perceived increase in traffic would not have an impact. However, there are already issues in trying to safely join the A258, this would only exacerbate the problem. We consider that more investigations are needed by KCC highways to gauge the safety of this extra traffic

post development and site traffic during the construction of any development. Worryingly, crash map data for the past 25 years omits a fatality on Ringwould Rd.

Recently, concerns have been raised that a site nearby; SAP15 (Rays Bottom) which is situated on one of the access roads into Kingsdown – Liverpool Rd / Glen Rd is currently at the public engagement stage and presumably a planning application will be submitted soon after. Parishioners are worried that if both sites were granted planning and started to be built out simultaneously we would have 2 out of 3 of the routes into the village compromised by site traffic and potential road closures. This could have serious safety implications with regards to pedestrians and emergency services, as well as increased damage to buildings and property and is unacceptable. The Parish council are involved with preparing a Highways Improvement Plan with KCC at the moment. This document is focused on 2 main problems, speeding by all vehicles and damage to the conservation area around Upper St. by HGV's. We would ask that further investigations be carried out and that careful planning is needed to ensure that any development coming forward does not cause safety issues for all in the Parish.

We feel very strongly that wider highways issues have not been properly addressed. We are also very concerned that at the time of submission there have been no comments from KCC Highways which is worrying in the extreme as this is such a complex and contentious site and safety is a primary concern for the entire community.

## Natural Environment

We read with interest the comments from the Kent Downs National Landscapes (KDNL) team. Many parishioners are concerned about the landscape impact of this development. Not only is the KDNL affected but also Ripple F3, identified in the DDC Landscape Character assessment (2020). This site is included in Ripple F3 and can be clearly seen from the A258 across the rolling chalk downland which typifies the region. Due to ash dieback decimating local woodland to the west, the site is becoming increasingly visible. The siting of dwellings parallel to ER21 makes these particularly visible in the landscape.

We agree with the KDNL team that the palette of materials should be toned down to darker colours and that natural screening should be allowed to grow up tall around the site. The topography of the site is such that bright building materials would be highly visible from the Kent Downs. We would also like to see screening planted as early as possible and a muted palette for roof materials as they will be highly visible from the open countryside to the western boundary. Whilst this would be an improvement to the scheme, it would not make the development as a whole, acceptable.

We would also draw attention to the new NL briefing of November 24 which talks about the importance of the setting of the NL. In this case the setting is further enhanced by being part of the Landscape Character Area Ripple F3 – so designated by DDC in 2020. The Parish Council consider that the proposals do not meet the requirements of policy NE2.

Although the applicants' surveys have made claims that the site is very low bar in terms of biodiversity the site borders to the south west an area which is biodiversity rich and used by feeding bats. The green area of the site borders this which is good. We would like to see bat boxes, swift bricks, hedgehog holes in fencing and also low light levels to allow bats to feed. Kingsdown radiance levels are very low around the edges of the built environment and dark skies are very important to us. Any development coming forward needs to take great care not to isolate this area and protect hedgerows and corridors to the wider countryside. We would like to see more monitoring for bats and migratory birds. These measures would be an improvement, however they would not mitigate the overall damage it would cause to the local environment and would not make the development as whole acceptable.

Dismissed appeal in Thanet

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/W/24/3351846 Land off Foxborough Lane, Minster, CT12 4AH – proposed 115 residential dwellings.

We would also like to draw the Planning Officers' attention to the above appeal launched by Gladmans. This was dismissed by the Planning Inspector on 10th February 2025.

We feel that the site has many of the same issues as SAP34 and should be taken into consideration. The issues which are comparable and were grounds for dismissal are as follows:

the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the landscape – the site is within the Wantsum North Slopes Landscape Character Area and the proposal was found to detract from it sufficiently to be grounds for dismissal;

the effect of the development upon the resource of best and most versatile agricultural land – there was insufficient argument to warrant removal of BMV land;

whether or not suitable and safe pedestrian access would be provided, to avoid residual highway effects – pedestrian safety would be compromised by the development and could not be mitigated for.

Conclusions

Considering the setting in relation to the KDNL and LCA Ripple F3, the loss of good quality farming land and the strain on local transport and infrastructure we consider that this application does not meet the sustainability criteria set out in the NPPF.

We note that DHA said in their public consultation document following conversations with DDC – “It was added that there was no in principle objection to the scale of development (total number of units) as long as it is technically supportable and does not give rise to unacceptable highways, amenity or other impacts”.

Many parishioners and the PC would argue that this will definitely cause unacceptable difficulties with highways and have significant impacts on amenities.

Based on all the above arguments Ringwoud with Kingsdown Parish Council considers that the proposals are in direct conflict with the relevant policies in the NPPF; the DDLP, and the advice given in the Kent Design Guide, and Building for a Healthy Life, by Homes England.

We therefore respectfully request that the Council refuses this application for the reasons given above.

# Comments for Planning Application 25/00112

## Application Summary

Application Number: 25/00112

Address: Land North West Of Kingsdown Recreation Ground Ringwold Road Kingsdown

Proposal: Erection of 70 dwellings including access, parking, landscaping, and associated infrastructure

Case Officer: [REDACTED]

## Customer Details

Name: \_ Ringwold with Kingsdown Parish Council

Address: Not Available

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Parish Council

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment:25/00112 - Woodhill Farm

## Objection

We have listened to our Parishioners with regards to the proposed Woodhill Farm development of 70 homes (SAP34 in Dover District Local Development Plan (DDLDP)).

## Number of dwellings and sustainability

There is primarily concern in the parish regarding the number of dwellings proposed. In Regulation 18, a capacity of 90 was suggested which was then reduced in Regulation 19 to 50. At the time this was because the HELAA assessment highlighted concerns around highways and the access primarily. The "indicative" capacity of 50 in SAP34 of the DDLDP has been increased to 70 in this application with the only justification being that it would make better use of the land. While the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does promote making effective use of land generally, it also states the need to safeguard and improve the environment, and ensure safe and healthy living conditions (Para. 124). The design and access statement mentions that the proposals are in keeping with densities and urban grain in the local area, however Glen Rd. has a very low housing density with a mixture of bungalows and family homes enjoying spacious gardens. This is at odds with the proposal. Paragraph 129 of the NPPF, states housing density, should maintain the character and setting of an area (including residential gardens). Additionally it highlights the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.

The Ringwold with Kingsdown Design Codes and Guidelines (page 62) highlights that any new

development should be appropriate for its location and surroundings. This site lies adjacent to the urban area, (where there would normally be a presumption against any development at all) where you would normally expect a much lower density of development, with larger houses set in spacious grounds and substantial soft landscaping. The proposed high density suburban housing would be totally out of context with its surroundings.

Dark skies are an important part of our nocturnal landscape (DDLPM1). Kingsdown has low radiance levels generally, therefore any development here would need to demonstrate that full consideration had been given to its position in a dark skies zone.

When our Parishioners took part in the LDP consultation process they understood that a capacity of 50 was being proposed. The inspector also examined SAP34 as 50. We were all therefore dismayed to find in the final plan the wording "indicative" around site allocations in the LDP. This makes a mockery of the consultation process.

We feel that 70 dwellings would put a strain on our limited infrastructure. Kingsdown is categorised (we would argue wrongly) as a Local Centre in the new LDP, however we do not service any smaller settlements around us. We do not have a doctors surgery, a dentist or a supermarket, or an adequate bus service. The few buses we have a day do not pass this site along Ringwould Rd. Stagecoach as part of the LDP consultation process, advised that development of this site would not result in additional bus services being added.

We feel that the proposed plans do not constitute sustainable development as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The site is on the edge of the built settlement, with inadequate bus links to adjoining towns and villages and no train station - the closest being Walmer and Martin Mill. It is very difficult to safely walk or cycle to these from this site. National Cycle route 1 follows the coast at Kingsdown but is difficult to join safely from this site. Residents of the proposed development would therefore be dependent on their cars to reach facilities in neighbouring Deal and Dover, contrary to DDLDP policy SP1 and SP2.

The removal of good grade agricultural land (best and most versatile) from vital food production and compromising the setting of the Kent Downs National Landscape are also arguments against these plans achieving sustainability and contrary to SP4.

We were pleased to note that our Housing Needs assessment had been referenced by the applicant. We have a declining but ageing population and a large proportion of detached and 4+ bedroom homes (detached 63.6% in Kingsdown, 22.9% nationally, 4+ beds 32.7% Kingsdown, 21.1% nationally). Over 40% of the population is 60+ yrs in the local census, up from 29% in the 2011 census. Any development of this site would need to reflect this demographic. We would like to see the affordable / 1st time buyer / shared ownership housing achieved on site and at an early stage in the build.

## Design

The recent development (Wellington Paddocks) on the edge of the Parish comprises unimaginative generic boxes which could be on any Kent housing estate. They also represent a current trend for plastic composite weatherboarding. We feel that the same could be true of the designs shown in this application. These concerns are shared by many of our parishioners. Such

generic house designs do not reflect the context of the site in Kingsdown. It would look like any other housing estate in East Kent. Kingsdown has a rich vernacular. Our conservation area has fishermen's cottages and flint faced walls, there are bungalows and large detached homes along Glen Rd., with a variety of roof heights and materials.

The landscape buffer along the north-eastern boundary of the site between the existing houses in Glen Road and the proposed dwellings has raised some safety and security concerns. Whilst largely welcomed, it could pose a crime risk for both the existing and the proposed dwellings, allowing access to gardens. We feel that this landscape buffer should be incorporated into the rear gardens of any proposed dwellings along this boundary. This could be maintained in perpetuity with the use of a covenant on the dwellings when they are sold.

The term 'landscape led design' does not seem to be the driving force of this application, as suggested by the applicants. Instead there seems to be a lot of emphasis on the provision of parking which dominates the design to the detriment of the overall feel of the site and the setting of the KDNL. Car ports are not a local feature.

There are too many blank walls fronting public spaces and footpaths, these should be avoided, thus improving natural surveillance.

To combat fuel poverty and maximise fuel sourcing and efficiency any new build project should include solar panels, heat pumps, maximum insulation and make best use of solar gain. This is in line with DDLP policy SP1.

## Highways and access

There are also still major concerns around the safety of the access. Discussions with Kitewood which included their Highways Consultant have raised further questions. It was indicated that the works to straighten and widen the access could be completed without closing the road and with traffic control measures in place ie traffic lights. However, this is unlikely as the road approaching the access from both sides is not wide enough for two lanes of traffic, 2 HGV's cannot pass safely. Residents have measured the road width on entering Kingsdown and found that it is not wide enough for 2 cars to pass safely, which would indicate that traffic lights would not be a safe option here. The council considers that Ringwould Rd would have to indeed be closed during the works to widen the road.

Closing Ringwould Road for any length of time is not really an option for Kingsdown. We have 3 routes into the village; Ringwould Rd., Glen Road and the Cliffe Road along the seafront. Cliffe Road leads to Upper Street and The Rise which are both narrow and unsuitable for HGV's. Additionally, the Rise and Upper St. do not have footpaths / short sections only for pedestrians and we have already had the fatality of a pedestrian in Upper St. Safety for all householders would be compromised during any closure of Ringwould Rd. as emergency vehicles would struggle to access the village from the other 2 routes.

The Highways Consultant for Kitewood also showed us data for a traffic survey carried out in September when schools return after the holidays. We consider that this is not representative of the high volume of traffic which can be seen along Ringwould Rd. in summer months when the holiday park and campsite are busy. We consider that an additional survey in summer would be

advisable. Comparisons are made for traffic data between this site and 2 villages in Norfolk. These do not seem to be representative or relevant. The Parish Council would like to see another road survey done this summer before any development is considered.

Ringwould Rd. is a narrow country lane with SLOW painted on it at intervals, signage showing 20mph as you enter Kingsdown and 50mph as you leave. As typified in the KDNL and Ripple F3 of the DD LCA (2020) it is winding and characterful and forms an attractive approach to the village with natural traffic calming due to the nature of the blind bends. The road is particularly narrow close to the proposed site, and there is already considerable vehicular conflict on the road when there are 2 HGV's trying to pass.

Where Ringwould Rd. forms a junction with the A258 there are signs restricting vehicular access to 7.5T. It is a serious concern for residents that additional traffic will cause severe traffic congestion and more vehicular conflict along this narrow lane.

The proposed alterations to the entrance although in the interests of safety and visibility would detract from the character and appearance of the area, particularly from the entrance to the village, and the setting of the KDNL. Kingsdown relies heavily upon tourism in the summer months and as such this gateway is important to our rural economy.

There are also conflicts around the various users of the access. ER5 crosses this point, there is also the entrance to the Kingsdown play area car park and a field access opposite this which need careful consideration. All are very close to the entrance of the site.

We read with interest the comments from KCC PROW around ER5 and are pleased that they share our concerns and those of the parishioners. A safe crossing for pedestrians using ER5 and horses (and cyclists) joining ER21 will be very difficult to safely achieve. ER5 is very well used to link the play area with the village and school. It is clear that PROW have serious concerns about the feasibility of achieving the link to the village through improvements to ER5 which is a requirement of development through SAP34.

We welcome the proposed additional footpath to connect the site to existing footpaths on Glen Road. However, we feel that not enough detail has been shown for the Glen Rd path, and have reservations as to the safety of the crossing diagonally across the road to the footpath opposite. We are also concerned that the extension of the 20mph zone on approach to the entrance does not go far enough. ER20 crosses Ringwould Rd. at a point which is hard to see traffic. There are also large tractors exiting the farm road at this point. An extended 20mph zone beyond this point would go some way to improving safety.

No mention is made of the impact to the junction of Ringwould Rd with the A258 other than to say the perceived increase in traffic would not have an impact. However, there are already issues in trying to safely join the A258, this would only exacerbate the problem. We consider that more investigations are needed by KCC highways to gauge the safety of this extra traffic post development and site traffic during the construction of any development. Worryingly, crash map data for the past 25 years omits a fatality on Ringwould Rd.

Recently, concerns have been raised that a site nearby; SAP15 (Rays Bottom) which is situated on one of the access roads into Kingsdown - Liverpool Rd / Glen Rd is currently at the public engagement stage and presumably a planning application will be submitted soon after.

Parishioners are worried that if both sites were granted planning and started to be built out

simultaneously we would have 2 out of 3 of the routes into the village compromised by site traffic and potential road closures. This could have serious safety implications with regards to pedestrians and emergency services, as well as increased damage to buildings and property and is unacceptable. The Parish council are involved with preparing a Highways Improvement Plan with KCC at the moment. This document is focused on 2 main problems, speeding by all vehicles and damage to the conservation area around Upper St. by HGV's. We would ask that further investigations be carried out and that careful planning is needed to ensure that any development coming forward does not cause safety issues for all in the Parish.

We feel very strongly that wider highways issues have not been properly addressed. We are also very concerned that at the time of submission there have been no comments from KCC Highways which is worrying in the extreme as this is such a complex and contentious site and safety is a primary concern for the entire community.

## Natural Environment

We read with interest the comments from the Kent Downs National Landscapes (KDNL) team. Many parishioners are concerned about the landscape impact of this development. Not only is the KDNL affected but also Ripple F3, identified in the DDC Landscape Character assessment (2020). This site is included in Ripple F3 and can be clearly seen from the A258 across the rolling chalk downland which typifies the region. Due to ash dieback decimating local woodland to the west, the site is becoming increasingly visible. The siting of dwellings parallel to ER21 makes these particularly visible in the landscape.

We agree with the KDNL team that the palette of materials should be toned down to darker colours and that natural screening should be allowed to grow up tall around the site. The topography of the site is such that bright building materials would be highly visible from the Kent Downs. We would also like to see screening planted as early as possible and a muted palette for roof materials as they will be highly visible from the open countryside to the western boundary. Whilst this would be an improvement to the scheme, it would not make the development as a whole, acceptable.

We would also draw attention to the new NL briefing of November 24 which talks about the importance of the setting of the NL. In this case the setting is further enhanced by being part of the Landscape Character Area Ripple F3 - so designated by DDC in 2020. The Parish Council consider that the proposals do not meet the requirements of policy NE2.

Although the applicants' surveys have made claims that the site is very low bar in terms of biodiversity the site borders to the south west an area which is biodiversity rich and used by feeding bats. The green area of the site borders this which is good. We would like to see bat boxes, swift bricks, hedgehog holes in fencing and also low light levels to allow bats to feed. Kingsdown radiance levels are very low around the edges of the built environment and dark skies are very important to us. Any development coming forward needs to take great care not to isolate this area and protect hedgerows and corridors to the wider countryside. We would like to see more monitoring for bats and migratory birds. These measures would be an improvement, however they would not mitigate the overall damage it would cause to the local environment and would not make

the development as whole acceptable.

## Dismissed appeal in Thanet

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2260/W/24/3351846 Land off Foxborough Lane, Minster, CT12 4AH - proposed 115 residential dwellings.

We would also like to draw the Planning Officers' attention to the above appeal launched by Gladmans. This was dismissed by the Planning Inspector on 10th February 2025.

We feel that the site has many of the same issues as SAP34 and should be taken into consideration. The issues which are comparable and were grounds for dismissal are as follows:

the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the landscape - the site is within the Wantsum North Slopes Landscape Character Area and the proposal was found to detract from it sufficiently to be grounds for dismissal;

the effect of the development upon the resource of best and most versatile agricultural land - there was insufficient argument to warrant removal of BMV land;

whether or not suitable and safe pedestrian access would be provided, to avoid residual highway effects - pedestrian safety would be compromised by the development and could not be mitigated for.

## Conclusions

Considering the setting in relation to the KDNL and LCA Ripple F3, the loss of good quality farming land and the strain on local transport and infrastructure we consider that this application does not meet the sustainability criteria set out in the NPPF.

We note that DHA said in their public consultation document following conversations with DDC - "It was added that there was no in principle objection to the scale of development (total number of units) as long as it is technically supportable and does not give rise to unacceptable highways, amenity or other impacts".

Many parishioners and the PC would argue that this will definitely cause unacceptable difficulties with highways and have significant impacts on amenities.

Based on all the above arguments Ringwoud with Kingsdown Parish Council considers that the proposals are in direct conflict with the relevant policies in the NPPF; the DDLP, and the advice given in the Kent Design Guide, and Building for a Healthy Life, by Homes England.

We therefore respectfully request that the Council refuses this application for the reasons given above.

  
Parish Clerk

11 March 2025

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 March 2026 17:33  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: 25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown

**Follow Up Flag:** Flag for follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

FYI - I have sent this to Cllr [REDACTED] as he has been asking. I'll keep it for committee incase it comes up.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[REDACTED]  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 March 2026 16:33  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: 25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown

Hi [REDACTED]

Recommending specific projects that this S106 contribution could be used for comes with the caveat that the updated Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Facility Strategy is underway now, so emerging themes and priority projects are currently in draft and have not yet been signed off by the sport NGBs nor has the Strategy gone to Cabinet for formal adoption. (Sign off and adoption will all happen over the next few months).

That being said, I can provide the following:

Natural pitches

- Ringwould with Kingsdown Parish Council have informally in the past indicated that the Kingsdown Recreation Field adjacent to the play area could be used for more formal / club sports. I understand it is currently used informally for football, and with the primary school right next door, could present an opportunity to develop sports provision here. This would be

something that would need to be discussed/planned with the Parish Council and local sports club(s) who may be interested.

- If the Natural Grass Pitches S106 contribution could not be used at Kingsdown Rec for a feasible project, the next nearest pitch facilities which are well used and could benefit from potential pitch and pavilion/changing room investment are:
  - Gun Meadow (Deal & Victoria Barnes Cricket Club)
  - Marke Wood Recreation Ground (Cinque Ports FC on site)
  - The Drill Field (Deal and Betteshanger Rugby Club)

#### Artificial pitches

- The nearest artificial pitches which could benefit from S106 funding towards development or maintenance are:
  - Freeman's Way Deal
  - Goodwin Academy Deal

I hope this helps, do come back to me if you need anything further,

██████████

██████████

**Principal Open Spaces Officer**

Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ

Phone: ██████████

Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

---

**From:** ██████████  
**Sent:** 23 March 2026 17:59  
**To:** ██████████ ██████████  
**Subject:** Re: 25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown

Hi ██████████

Both please, it's for committee on Thursday.

Kind regards,

██████████

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** ██████████  
**Sent:** Monday, March 23, 2026 3:52:58 PM  
**To:** ██████████ > ██████████  
**Subject:** Re: 25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown

Hi ██████████

Is this for natural pitches, artificial pitches, or both?

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
**Principal Open Spaces Officer**

Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ  
Phone: [REDACTED]  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 March 2026 13:39  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: 25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown

Hi [REDACTED]

The intended recipient projects are set out on page 3 of [REDACTED] original comment, but more up-to-date specifics might be available from [REDACTED] (Principal Open Spaces Officer). I've cc'd her in just in case.

Best wishes,

[REDACTED]  
*Trainee Planning Officer (Planning Policy)*  
**Planning Policy and Projects | Planning and Development**  
Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ  
Dept. Tel: 01304 872244  
Personal Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
[Planning Department Website](#)



---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 March 2026 11:12  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: 25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown

Hi [REDACTED]

I have been asked by a Cllr if we have anymore detail regarding the 75k requested for the playing pitches at the above site. Are you able to give me any more details on the location of the pitches/facilities where the funding would go ?

Kind regards

[Redacted]

Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[Redacted]  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [Redacted]  
Email: [Redacted]  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 10 March 2026 12:04  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: 25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown

Hi [Redacted]

The identified projects remain the same as in [Redacted] original consultation comments, it's just the required contributions which were updated based on the change to dwelling mix.

I've attached his original comments as a word document for reference, with the updated contribution amounts in tracked changes, plus text about the Thanet Coast & Sandwich Bay SPA SAMMS payment which was missed originally. The text for sports halls and swimming pools is on page 4. The TCSB SPA SAMMS text is on page 6.

Hope this helps, any other questions feel free to shoot me an email or a teams message.

Best wishes,

[Redacted]  
*Trainee Planning Officer (Planning Policy)*  
**Planning Policy and Projects | Planning and Development**  
Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield, Dover CT16 3PJ  
Dept. Tel: 01304 872244  
Personal Tel: [Redacted]  
Email: [Redacted]  
[Planning Department Website](#)



---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 10 March 2026 11:43  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: 25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown

FYI  
Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[REDACTED]  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Web: [dover.gov.u](http://dover.gov.u)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 10, 2026 11:43  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown

Morning [REDACTED]

Please may I check the original policy comments requested money for Tides. The most recent comments shows calculations below, but no justification for which projects, could you send me the justification for my committee report please? The deadline is this week.

## Results

Date generated: 19/02/2026

Swimming Pools	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Square meters	1.58
Lanes	0.03
Pools	0.01
vpwpp	10
Cost	£36,806

Sports Halls	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Courts	0.03
Halls	0.01
vpwpp	10
Cost	£28,316

Artificial Grass Pitches	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Pitches	0
vpwpp	3
Cost if 3G	£4,893
Cost if Sand	£4,424

Outdoor Tennis Courts	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Courts	0.02
vpwpp	3
Cost	£2,279

Indoor Bowls Centres	
Demand adjusted by	0%
Rinks	0
Centres	0
vpwpp	0
Cost	£1,485

Kind regards

█  
Please note: I do not work Fridays.



█  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: █  
Email: █  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.  
Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.  
All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.  
Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.  
This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.  
Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.  
All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.  
Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.  
This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.  
Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.  
All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.  
Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.  
This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.  
Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.  
All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.  
Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.  
This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.  
Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.  
All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.  
Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@dhaplanning.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 26 March 2026 19:44  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]

See below they can over run the pavement

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 11, 2026 2:31:14 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Subject:** RE: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground

Afternoon [REDACTED]

Further to the below, we note that the response cross references the Kent Design Guide which suggests a 50 unit threshold, although this is assessed on a site-by-site basis.

The proposals offer a split access route for fire tenders as soon as possible after entry to the site (at the 2<sup>nd</sup> bend, where vehicles will have only passed four dwellings, there is a fire access route controlled by bollards which provides an alternative route around the site for emergency vehicles only).

In addition to this, for the short section of road before the road splits, fire and rescue vehicles can mount/drive along the pavement to avoid any obstructions with a total width of 9.5m available in this section (i.e. there is no tree planting that could preclude this, and this can be confirmed through the submission of landscape details which are to be conditioned). In addition, Kent County Council are content with the suggested areas of adoption, including the carriageway and can introduce the necessary parking controls (i.e. double yellow lines) as required. This is a common emergency access solution.

The proposals were subject to pre-application discussions with KCC Highways, which have also commented on the application raising no objection in respect of emergency vehicle access. This matter is also comprehensively addressed in the submitted Transport Assessment (TA) accompanying the application, see Section 4.6.

If you need any further information, then please do let me know.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]  
**Director**

Office: [REDACTED]  
Mobile: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dhaplanning.co.uk

[Have a site to discuss? Give us a call or visit our interactive map to get started](#)



**Inspiring. Planning. Delivering.**

Proudly supporting



**Kent**  
01622 776226

**Gatwick**  
01293 221320

**London**  
020 3005 9725

**Leeds**  
0113 323 6669

[www.dhaplanning.co.uk](http://www.dhaplanning.co.uk)

DHA Planning Ltd. Registered in England. Registration No. 2683290

This message is confidential to the intended recipient. It does not constitute a legally binding document on the sender or recipient. If you have received this message in error please forward it to: [info@dhaplanning.co.uk](mailto:info@dhaplanning.co.uk). Please note that incoming and outgoing emails are liable to be monitored. WARNING: Although DHA has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses or other malicious software are present, DHA cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this Email or attachments however caused. The recipient should therefore check this Email and any attachments for the presence of viruses or other malicious software.

**CYBERCRIME ALERT: BEWARE OF FRAUDSTERS - REMAIN VIGILANT** - Please note that our bank account details WILL NOT change during the course of a transaction, and we will NOT notify you of a change of our bank details via email. Please be careful to check account details with us in person if in any doubt. We will not accept responsibility if you transfer money into an incorrect account. **IF YOU ARE ADVISED THAT OUR BANK DETAILS HAVE CHANGED, PLEASE CONTACT OUR KENT OFFICE IMMEDIATELY.**

---

**From:** [REDACTED] [@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>  
**Sent:** 11 March 2026 12:09  
**To:** [REDACTED] [@dhaplanning.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@dhaplanning.co.uk)>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] [@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>  
**Subject:** DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground

[External email - This message originated from outside DHA – prior to opening any attachments or opening links, please ensure their authenticity with the sender]

Morning [REDACTED]

I am finalising the committee report and have come across comments from Kent Fire and Rescue setting out ' However, where this application is for 70-dwellings, under the Kent Design Guide there is guidance for a secondary emergency access point in the form of a pedestrianised footpath, or cycle lane in developments in excess of 50 dwellings, therefore this should be taken into consideration due to exceeding this figure'.

I appreciate you have provided a secondary pedestrian access but this does not appear wide enough for access for a fire appliance to be able to access.

This is a query raised by a local Cllr and I have had to ask Kent Fire and Rescue for their stance. Have you got any additional information you are able to provide?

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

Please note: I do not work Fridays.



**Principal Planning Officer**

Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,

Dover CT16 3PJ

Tel: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]@[dover.gov.uk](mailto: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk)

Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

**From:** [REDACTED]@kent.fire-uk.org> on behalf of Fire Engineering Team <FET@kent.fire-uk.org>  
**Sent:** 02 April 2026 10:18  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]

Hello [REDACTED]

Your ref: DOV/25/00012

Our ref: CAS-349888 (New), CAS-346013 (Previous)

Thank you for both emails.

I have read your original, and the subsequent response by the applicant below.

In terms of secondary access, this should be provided as an additional route into the site specifically, not once already within the site if I am reading this correctly. If the main access route in is blocked for any reason, then the proposed secondary access would be essentially redundant.

Does the client have any documentation to demonstrate the available secondary access point. I have also tried to access the portal to source the Transport Statement (Section 4.6 as referred to), but the portal only comes up with the following:

[T1 - Yew - reduce to same height as remainder of hedge; T2 - Yew - reduce by 1 metre and reshape, both situated with area.](#)

Eastry Court Church Street Eastry Sandwich CT13 0HL

Ref. No: TC/25/00012 | Received: Wed 22 Jan 2025 | Validated: Thu 23 Jan 2025 | Status: Decided

[Formation of a vehicular access \(existing wall to be demolished\)](#)

244A Folkestone Road Dover CT17 9JP

Ref. No: 25/00012 | Received: Mon 06 Jan 2025 | Validated: Mon 10 Mar 2025 | Status: Decided

In terms of KCC Highways, from our experience they would not generally comment on matters relating to emergency service access.

Kind regards,

**Fire Engineering Team**



Kent Fire &  
Rescue Service

together

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 March 2026 15:29  
**To:** Fire Engineering Team  
**Subject:** Fw: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

**EXTERNAL EMAIL - Do not click links or open attachments if you do not recognise the sender.**

Good afternoon,

Further to my previous email, please see the response from the applicant.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[REDACTED]  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 March 2026 14:31  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground  
**[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]**

Afternoon [REDACTED]  
Further to the below, we note that the response cross references the Kent Design Guide which suggests a 50 unit threshold, although this is assessed on a site-by-site basis.  
The proposals offer a split access route for fire tenders as soon as possible after entry to the site (at the 2<sup>nd</sup> bend, where vehicles will have only passed four dwellings, there is a fire access route controlled by bollards which provides an alternative route around the site for emergency vehicles only).

In addition to this, for the short section of road before the road splits, fire and rescue vehicles can mount/drive along the pavement to avoid any obstructions with a total width of 9.5m available in this section (i.e. there is no tree planting that could preclude this, and this can be confirmed through the submission of landscape details which are to be conditioned). In addition, Kent County Council are content with the suggested areas of adoption, including the carriageway and can introduce the necessary parking controls (i.e. double yellow lines) as required. This is a common emergency access solution.

The proposals were subject to pre-application discussions with KCC Highways, which have also commented on the application raising no objection in respect of emergency vehicle access. This matter is also comprehensively addressed in the submitted Transport Assessment (TA) accompanying the application, see Section 4.6.

If you need any further information, then please do let me know.

Kind Regards

**Director**

Office:

Mobile:

Email: [\[REDACTED\]@dhaplanning.co.uk](mailto: [REDACTED]@dhaplanning.co.uk)

[Have a site to discuss? Give us a call or visit our interactive map to get started](#)

 [DHA Interactive Map](#)



Inspiring. Planning. Delivering.

Proudly supporting



**Kent**  
01622 776226

**Gatwick**  
01293 221320

**London**  
020 3005 9725

**Leeds**  
0113 323 6669

[www.dhaplanning.co.uk](http://www.dhaplanning.co.uk)

DHA Planning Ltd. Registered in England. Registration No. 2683290

*This message is confidential to the intended recipient. It does not constitute a legally binding document on the sender or recipient. If you have received this message in error please forward it to: [info@dhaplanning.co.uk](mailto:info@dhaplanning.co.uk). Please note that incoming and outgoing emails are liable to be monitored. WARNING: Although DHA has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses or other malicious software are present, DHA cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this Email or attachments however caused. The recipient should therefore check this Email and any attachments for the presence of viruses or other malicious software.*

**CYBERCRIME ALERT: BEWARE OF FRAUDSTERS - REMAIN VIGILANT** - Please note that our bank account details WILL NOT change during the course of a transaction, and we will NOT notify you of a change of our bank details via email. Please be careful to check account details with us in person if in any doubt. We will not accept responsibility if you transfer money into an incorrect account. IF YOU ARE ADVISED THAT OUR BANK DETAILS HAVE CHANGED, PLEASE CONTACT OUR KENT OFFICE IMMEDIATELY.

**From:** [REDACTED] [@DOVER.GOV.UK](mailto:[REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK)>

**Sent:** 11 March 2026 12:09

**To:** [REDACTED] [@dhaplanning.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@dhaplanning.co.uk)>

Cc: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>

Subject: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground

[External email - This message originated from outside DHA – prior to opening any attachments or opening links, please ensure their authenticity with the sender]

Morning [REDACTED]

I am finalising the committee report and have come across comments from Kent Fire and Rescue setting out ' However, where this application is for 70-dwellings, under the Kent Design Guide there is guidance for a secondary emergency access point in the form of a pedestrianised footpath, or cycle lane in developments in excess of 50 dwellings, therefore this should be taken into consideration due to exceeding this figure'.

I appreciate you have provided a secondary pedestrian access but this does not appear wide enough for access for a fire appliance to be able to access.

This is a query raised by a local Cllr and I have had to ask Kent Fire and Rescue for there stance. Have you got any additional information you are able to provide?

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]  
Kind regards  
[REDACTED]

Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[REDACTED]  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk  
Web: [dover.gov.u](http://dover.gov.u)

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

---

This e-mail has been scanned for malicious content.

For more information about Kent Fire & Rescue Service visit: <https://www.kent.fire-uk.org>

Kent Fire & Rescue Service logs, records and reserves the right to analyse and act upon activity and communication on its Information Systems (including external systems such as external e-mail, emergency telephony etc), to meet our statutory responsibilities, protect systems from abuse, secure the effective operation of systems and any other lawful purpose.

**From:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Sent:** 02 April 2026 11:10  
**To:** [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fw: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@kent.fire-uk.org> on behalf of Fire Engineering Team  
<FET@kent.fire-uk.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 2, 2026 10:17:52 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Subject:** RE: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]

Hello [REDACTED]

Your ref: DOV/25/00012

Our ref: CAS-349888 (New), CAS-346013 (Previous)

Thank you for both emails.

I have read your original, and the subsequent response by the applicant below.

In terms of secondary access, this should be provided as an additional route into the site specifically, not once already within the site if I am reading this correctly. If the main access route in is blocked for any reason, then the proposed secondary access would be essentially redundant.

Does the client have any documentation to demonstrate the available secondary access point. I have also tried to access the portal to source the Transport Statement (Section 4.6 as referred to), but the portal only comes up with the following:

[T1 - Yew - reduce to same height as remainder of hedge; T2 - Yew - reduce by 1 metre and reshape, both situated with area.](#)

Eastry Court Church Street Eastry Sandwich CT13 0HL

Ref. No: TC/25/00012 | Received: Wed 22 Jan 2025 | Validated: Thu 23 Jan 2025 | Status: Decided

[Formation of a vehicular access \(existing wall to be demolished\)](#)

244A Folkestone Road Dover CT17 9JP

Ref. No: 25/00012 | Received: Mon 06 Jan 2025 | Validated: Mon 10 Mar 2025 | Status: Decided

In terms of KCC Highways, from our experience they would not generally comment on matters relating to emergency service access.

Kind regards,

**Fire Engineering Team**

Kent Fire & Rescue Service | T: 01622 692121 | Fire Engineering Team



---

**From:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Sent:** 11 March 2026 15:29  
**To:** Fire Engineering Team <FET@kent.fire-uk.org>  
**Subject:** Fw: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

**EXTERNAL EMAIL - Do not click links or open attachments if you do not recognise the sender.**

Good afternoon,

Further to my previous email, please see the response from the applicant.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[REDACTED]  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 March 2026 14:31  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground

**[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]**

Afternoon [REDACTED]

Further to the below, we note that the response cross references the Kent Design Guide which suggests a 50 unit threshold, although this is assessed on a site-by-site basis. The proposals offer a split access route for fire tenders as soon as possible after entry to the site (at the 2<sup>nd</sup> bend, where vehicles will have only passed four dwellings, there is a fire access route controlled by bollards which provides an alternative route around the site for emergency vehicles only).

In addition to this, for the short section of road before the road splits, fire and rescue vehicles can mount/drive along the pavement to avoid any obstructions with a total width of 9.5m available in this section (i.e. there is no tree planting that could preclude this, and this can be confirmed through the submission of landscape details which are to be conditioned). In addition, Kent County Council are content with the suggested areas of adoption, including the carriageway and can introduce the necessary parking controls (i.e. double yellow lines) as required. This is a common emergency access solution.

The proposals were subject to pre-application discussions with KCC Highways, which have also commented on the application raising no objection in respect of emergency vehicle access. This matter is also comprehensively addressed in the submitted Transport Assessment (TA) accompanying the application, see Section 4.6.

If you need any further information, then please do let me know.

Kind Regards

**Director**

Office:

Mobile:

Email: [\[REDACTED\]@dhaplanning.co.uk](mailto: [REDACTED]@dhaplanning.co.uk)

Have a site to discuss? Give us a call or visit our interactive map to get started

 **DHA Interactive Map**



Inspiring. Planning. Delivering.

Proudly supporting



**Kent**  
01622 776226

**Gatwick**  
01293 221320

**London**  
020 3005 9725

**Leeds**  
0113 323 6669

[www.dhaplanning.co.uk](http://www.dhaplanning.co.uk)

DHA Planning Ltd. Registered in England. Registration No. 2683290

*This message is confidential to the intended recipient. It does not constitute a legally binding document on the sender or recipient. If you have received this message in error please forward it to: [info@dhaplanning.co.uk](mailto:info@dhaplanning.co.uk). Please note that incoming and outgoing emails are liable to be monitored. WARNING: Although DHA has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses or other malicious software are present, DHA cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this Email or attachments however caused. The recipient should therefore check this Email and any attachments for the presence of viruses or other malicious software.*

**CYBERCRIME ALERT: BEWARE OF FRAUDSTERS - REMAIN VIGILANT** - Please note that our bank account details WILL NOT change during the course of a transaction, and we will NOT notify you of a change of our bank details via email. Please be careful to check account details with us in person if in any doubt. We will not accept responsibility if you transfer money into an incorrect account. IF YOU

ARE ADVISED THAT OUR BANK DETAILS HAVE CHANGED, PLEASE CONTACT OUR KENT OFFICE IMMEDIATELY.

**From:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>

**Sent:** 11 March 2026 12:09

**To:** [REDACTED]@dhaplanning.co.uk>

**Cc:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>

**Subject:** DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground

[External email - This message originated from outside DHA – prior to opening any attachments or opening links, please ensure their authenticity with the sender]

Morning [REDACTED]

I am finalising the committee report and have come across comments from Kent Fire and Rescue setting out ' However, where this application is for 70-dwellings, under the Kent Design Guide there is guidance for a secondary emergency access point in the form of a pedestrianised footpath, or cycle lane in developments in excess of 50 dwellings, therefore this should be taken into consideration due to exceeding this figure'.

I appreciate you have provided a secondary pedestrian access but this does not appear wide enough for access for a fire appliance to be able to access.

This is a query raised by a local Cllr and I have had to ask Kent Fire and Rescue for there stance. Have you got any additional information you are able to provide?

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[REDACTED]  
**Principal Planning Officer**

Dover District Council

Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,

Dover CT16 3PJ

Tel: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk

Web: [dover.gov.u](http://dover.gov.u)

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

---

This e-mail has been scanned for malicious content.

For more information about Kent Fire & Rescue Service visit: <https://www.kent.fire-uk.org>

Kent Fire & Rescue Service logs, records and reserves the right to analyse and act upon activity and communication on its Information Systems (including external systems such as external e-mail, emergency telephony etc), to meet our statutory responsibilities, protect systems from abuse, secure the effective operation of systems and any other lawful purpose.

**From:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Sent:** 02 April 2026 13:49  
**To:** Fire Engineering Team  
**Subject:** Re: DOV/25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your comments. I have attached the link for the website so you are able to view the documents. The proposed development has been reduced from 70 dwellings to 64 dwellings.

[25/00112 | Full planning application for the erection of 64 dwellings including access, parking, landscaping, and associated infrastructure | Land North West Of Kingsdown Recreation Ground Ringwould Road Kingsdown](#)

The application was heard at planning committee and has a resolution to grant planning permission, subject to sprinklers if this is not captured under building control.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[REDACTED]  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@kent.fire-uk.org> on behalf of Fire Engineering Team  
<FET@kent.fire-uk.org>  
**Sent:** 02 April 2026 10:17  
**To:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Subject:** RE: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]

Hello [REDACTED]

Your ref: DOV/25/00012

Our ref: CAS-349888 (New), CAS-346013 (Previous)

Thank you for both emails.

I have read your original, and the subsequent response by the applicant below.

In terms of secondary access, this should be provided as an additional route into the site specifically, not once already within the site if I am reading this correctly. If the main access route in is blocked for any reason, then the proposed secondary access would be essentially redundant.

Does the client have any documentation to demonstrate the available secondary access point. I have also tried to access the portal to source the Transport Statement (Section 4.6 as referred to), but the portal only comes up with the following:

[T1 - Yew - reduce to same height as remainder of hedge; T2 - Yew - reduce by 1 metre and reshape, both situated with area.](#)

Eastry Court Church Street Eastry Sandwich CT13 0HL  
Ref. No: TC/25/00012 | Received: Wed 22 Jan 2025 | Validated: Thu 23 Jan 2025 | Status: Decided

[Formation of a vehicular access \(existing wall to be demolished\)](#)

244A Folkestone Road Dover CT17 9JP  
Ref. No: 25/00012 | Received: Mon 06 Jan 2025 | Validated: Mon 10 Mar 2025 | Status: Decided

In terms of KCC Highways, from our experience they would not generally comment on matters relating to emergency service access.

Kind regards,

**Fire Engineering Team**

Kent Fire & Rescue Service | T: 01622 692121 | Fire Engineering Team



**From:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Sent:** 11 March 2026 15:29  
**To:** Fire Engineering Team <FET@kent.fire-uk.org>  
**Subject:** Fw: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

**EXTERNAL EMAIL - Do not click links or open attachments if you do not recognise the sender.**

Good afternoon,

Further to my previous email, please see the response from the applicant.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

Please note: I do not work Fridays.



**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 March 2026 14:31  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground  
**[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]**

Afternoon [REDACTED]  
Further to the below, we note that the response cross references the Kent Design Guide which suggests a 50 unit threshold, although this is assessed on a site-by-site basis.  
The proposals offer a split access route for fire tenders as soon as possible after entry to the site (at the 2<sup>nd</sup> bend, where vehicles will have only passed four dwellings, there is a fire access route controlled by bollards which provides an alternative route around the site for emergency vehicles only).  
In addition to this, for the short section of road before the road splits, fire and rescue vehicles can mount/drive along the pavement to avoid any obstructions with a total width of 9.5m available in this section (i.e. there is no tree planting that could preclude this, and this can be confirmed through the submission of landscape details which are to be conditioned). In addition, Kent County Council are content with the suggested areas of adoption, including the carriageway and can introduce the necessary parking controls (i.e. double yellow lines) as required. This is a common emergency access solution.  
The proposals were subject to pre-application discussions with KCC Highways, which have also commented on the application raising no objection in respect of emergency vehicle access. This matter is also comprehensively addressed in the submitted Transport Assessment (TA) accompanying the application, see Section 4.6.  
If you need any further information, then please do let me know.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]  
**Director**  
Office: [REDACTED]  
Mobile: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dhaplanning.co.uk

Have a site to discuss? Give us a call or visit our interactive map to get started





Inspiring. Planning. Delivering.

Proudly supporting



**Kent**  
01622 776226

**Gatwick**  
01293 221320

**London**  
020 3005 9725

**Leeds**  
0113 323 6669

[www.dhaplanning.co.uk](http://www.dhaplanning.co.uk)

DHA Planning Ltd. Registered in England. Registration No. 2683290

*This message is confidential to the intended recipient. It does not constitute a legally binding document on the sender or recipient. If you have received this message in error please forward it to: [info@dhaplanning.co.uk](mailto:info@dhaplanning.co.uk). Please note that incoming and outgoing emails are liable to be monitored. WARNING: Although DHA has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses or other malicious software are present, DHA cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this Email or attachments however caused. The recipient should therefore check this Email and any attachments for the presence of viruses or other malicious software.*

**CYBERCRIME ALERT: BEWARE OF FRAUDSTERS - REMAIN VIGILANT** - Please note that our bank account details WILL NOT change during the course of a transaction, and we will NOT notify you of a change of our bank details via email. Please be careful to check account details with us in person if in any doubt. We will not accept responsibility if you transfer money into an incorrect account. IF YOU ARE ADVISED THAT OUR BANK DETAILS HAVE CHANGED, PLEASE CONTACT OUR KENT OFFICE IMMEDIATELY.

**From:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>

**Sent:** 11 March 2026 12:09

**To:** [REDACTED]@dhaplanning.co.uk>

**Cc:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>

**Subject:** DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground

[External email - This message originated from outside DHA – prior to opening any attachments or opening links, please ensure their authenticity with the sender]

Morning [REDACTED]

I am finalising the committee report and have come across comments from Kent Fire and Rescue setting out ' However, where this application is for 70-dwellings, under the Kent Design Guide there is guidance for a secondary emergency access point in the form of a pedestrianised footpath, or cycle lane in developments in excess of 50 dwellings, therefore this should be taken into consideration due to exceeding this figure'.

I appreciate you have provided a secondary pedestrian access but this does not appear wide enough for access for a fire appliance to be able to access.

This is a query raised by a local Cllr and I have had to ask Kent Fire and Rescue for there stance. Have you got any additional information you are able to provide?

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

Please note: I do not work Fridays.



**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

---

This e-mail has been scanned for malicious content.

For more information about Kent Fire & Rescue Service visit: <https://www.kent.fire-uk.org>

Kent Fire & Rescue Service logs, records and reserves the right to analyse and act upon activity and communication on its Information Systems (including external systems such as external e-mail, emergency telephony etc), to meet our statutory responsibilities, protect systems from abuse, secure the effective operation of systems and any other lawful purpose.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Sent:** 14 April 2026 13:18  
**To:** Fire Engineering Team; [REDACTED]@kent.fire-uk.org  
**Subject:** Re: DOV/25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

Good afternoon [REDACTED]

Thank you for your email.

The sprinkler systems will not be on all the 64 dwellings, unless required under building regulations.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]  
Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[REDACTED]  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk  
Web: [dover.gov.u](http://dover.gov.u)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]@kent.fire-uk.org> on behalf of Fire Engineering Team  
<FET@kent.fire-uk.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2026 12:27  
**To:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Subject:** RE: DOV/25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]

Afternoon [REDACTED]

I hope you're well.

No problem at all. Thanks for the letting me know regarding the reduction in houses, although the number still remains above the 50-dwelling threshold, meaning our original letter would technically remain valid. However, this was highlighted as a consideration and ultimately yourselves as the authority having jurisdiction are responsible for the decision if you deem this number acceptable for a single main access route.

In terms of the proposed resolution to grant planning, is the intention for sprinklers to be installed within all 64-dwellings? If this is the case, I will add this to our internal system for information under our new ref: CAS-351660.

Kind regards,

**Fire Engineering Team**

Kent Fire & Rescue Service | T: 01622 692121 | Trainee Fire Engineer | Fire Engineering Team



**From:** [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>  
**Sent:** 02 April 2026 13:49  
**To:** Fire Engineering Team <FET@kent.fire-uk.org>  
**Subject:** Re: DOV/25/00112 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

**EXTERNAL EMAIL - Do not click links or open attachments if you do not recognise the sender.**

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your comments. I have attached the link for the website so you are able to view the documents. The proposed development has been reduced from 70 dwellings to 64 dwellings.

[25/00112 | Full planning application for the erection of 64 dwellings including access, parking, landscaping, and associated infrastructure | Land North West Of Kingsdown Recreation Ground Ringwould Road Kingsdown](#)

The application was heard at planning committee and has a resolution to grant planning permission, subject to sprinklers if this is not captured under building control.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

Please note: I do not work Fridays.



[REDACTED]  
**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

**From:** [REDACTED] on behalf of Fire Engineering Team  
**Sent:** 02 April 2026 10:17  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

**[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]**

Hello [REDACTED]

Your ref: DOV/25/00012

Our ref: CAS-349888 (New), CAS-346013 (Previous)

Thank you for both emails.

I have read your original, and the subsequent response by the applicant below.

In terms of secondary access, this should be provided as an additional route into the site specifically, not once already within the site if I am reading this correctly. If the main access route in is blocked for any reason, then the proposed secondary access would be essentially redundant.

Does the client have any documentation to demonstrate the available secondary access point. I have also tried to access the portal to source the Transport Statement (Section 4.6 as referred to), but the portal only comes up with the following:

[T1 - Yew - reduce to same height as remainder of hedge; T2 - Yew - reduce by 1 metre and reshape, both situated with area.](#)

Eastry Court Church Street Eastry Sandwich CT13 0HL

Ref. No: TC/25/00012 | Received: Wed 22 Jan 2025 | Validated: Thu 23 Jan 2025 | Status: Decided

[Formation of a vehicular access \(existing wall to be demolished\)](#)

244A Folkestone Road Dover CT17 9JP

Ref. No: 25/00012 | Received: Mon 06 Jan 2025 | Validated: Mon 10 Mar 2025 | Status: Decided

In terms of KCC Highways, from our experience they would not generally comment on matters relating to emergency service access.

Kind regards,

**Fire Engineering Team**

Kent Fire & Rescue Service | T: 01622 692121 | Fire Engineering Team



**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 11 March 2026 15:29

**To:** Fire Engineering Team

**Subject:** Fw: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground.

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

**EXTERNAL EMAIL - Do not click links or open attachments if you do not recognise the sender.**

Good afternoon,

Further to my previous email, please see the response from the applicant.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

Please note: I do not work Fridays.



**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 March 2026 14:31  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground  
**[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe]**

Afternoon [REDACTED]

Further to the below, we note that the response cross references the Kent Design Guide which suggests a 50 unit threshold, although this is assessed on a site-by-site basis. The proposals offer a split access route for fire tenders as soon as possible after entry to the site (at the 2<sup>nd</sup> bend, where vehicles will have only passed four dwellings, there is a fire access route controlled by bollards which provides an alternative route around the site for emergency vehicles only). In addition to this, for the short section of road before the road splits, fire and rescue vehicles can mount/drive along the pavement to avoid any obstructions with a total width of 9.5m available in this section (i.e. there is no tree planting that could preclude this, and this can be confirmed through the submission of landscape details which are to be conditioned). In addition, Kent County Council are content with the suggested areas of adoption, including the carriageway and can introduce the necessary parking controls (i.e. double yellow lines) as required. This is a common emergency access solution. The proposals were subject to pre-application discussions with KCC Highways, which have also commented on the application raising no objection in respect of emergency vehicle access. This matter is also comprehensively addressed in the submitted Transport Assessment (TA) accompanying the application, see Section 4.6.

If you need any further information, then please do let me know.

Kind Regards

[REDACTED]

**Director**

Office: [REDACTED]  
Mobile: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dhaplanning.co.uk

[Have a site to discuss? Give us a call or visit our interactive map to get started](#)





Inspiring. Planning. Delivering.

Proudly supporting



Kent  
01622 776226

Gatwick  
01293 221320

London  
020 3005 9725

Leeds  
0113 323 6669

[www.dhaplanning.co.uk](http://www.dhaplanning.co.uk)

DHA Planning Ltd. Registered in England. Registration No. 2683290

This message is confidential to the intended recipient. It does not constitute a legally binding document on the sender or recipient. If you have received this message in error please forward it to: [info@dhaplanning.co.uk](mailto:info@dhaplanning.co.uk). Please note that incoming and outgoing emails are liable to be monitored. WARNING: Although DHA has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses or other malicious software are present, DHA cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this Email or attachments however caused. The recipient should therefore check this Email and any attachments for the presence of viruses or other malicious software.

**CYBERCRIME ALERT: BEWARE OF FRAUDSTERS - REMAIN VIGILANT** - Please note that our bank account details WILL NOT change during the course of a transaction, and we will NOT notify you of a change of our bank details via email. Please be careful to check account details with us in person if in any doubt. We will not accept responsibility if you transfer money into an incorrect account. IF YOU ARE ADVISED THAT OUR BANK DETAILS HAVE CHANGED, PLEASE CONTACT OUR KENT OFFICE IMMEDIATELY.

From: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>

Sent: 11 March 2026 12:09

To: [REDACTED]@dhaplanning.co.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED]@DOVER.GOV.UK>

Subject: DOV/25/00012 - Land north west of Kingsdown Recreation ground

[External email - This message originated from outside DHA – prior to opening any attachments or opening links, please ensure their authenticity with the sender]

Morning [REDACTED]

I am finalising the committee report and have come across comments from Kent Fire and Rescue setting out ' However, where this application is for 70-dwellings, under the Kent Design Guide there is guidance for a secondary emergency access point in the form of a pedestrianised footpath, or cycle lane in developments in excess of 50 dwellings, therefore this should be taken into consideration due to exceeding this figure'.

I appreciate you have provided a secondary pedestrian access but this does not appear wide enough for access for a fire appliance to be able to access.

This is a query raised by a local Cllr and I have had to ask Kent Fire and Rescue for there stance. Have you got any additional information you are able to provide?

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

Please note: I do not work Fridays.



**Principal Planning Officer**  
Dover District Council  
Council Offices, White Cliffs Business Park, Whitfield,  
Dover CT16 3PJ  
Tel: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]@dover.gov.uk  
Web: [dover.gov.uk](http://dover.gov.uk)

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

---

This e-mail has been scanned for malicious content.

For more information about Kent Fire & Rescue Service visit: <https://www.kent.fire-uk.org>

Kent Fire & Rescue Service logs, records and reserves the right to analyse and act upon activity and communication on its Information Systems (including external systems such as external e-mail, emergency telephony etc), to meet our statutory responsibilities, protect systems from abuse, secure the effective operation of systems and any other lawful purpose.

This e-mail, including any attachments, is intended for the above addressee(s) only and may contain marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it on behalf of the addressee), please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and then delete the message without copying it or disclosing it to anyone.

Precautions have been taken to ensure that this is a virus-free message but recipients are responsible for carrying out their own checks. This Council accepts no responsibility for loss or damage to any hardware, software or data resulting from this e-mail.

All GCSx (Government Connects Secure Extranet) traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

Dover District Council is a data controller under GDPR. Our privacy notice at [www.dover.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.dover.gov.uk/privacy) explains how we use and share personal information and protect your privacy and rights.

---

This e-mail has been scanned for malicious content.

For more information about Kent Fire & Rescue Service visit: <https://www.kent.fire-uk.org>

Kent Fire & Rescue Service logs, records and reserves the right to analyse and act upon activity and communication on its Information Systems (including external systems such as external e-mail, emergency telephony etc), to meet our statutory responsibilities, protect systems from abuse, secure the effective operation of systems and any other lawful purpose.

 We've deleted older messages due to your organisation's retention policy.

12/03 11:05

PROW have raised issues, I have addressed this in the report and gone back to them on this point



12/03 11:22

Finalising the other representations and need to do the open space bit, then will go through the report. I have left comments in so you can see them. I'll do the reps, this weren't summarised by me, sorry. I have sent you the email regarding the PROWs...



16 March

16/03 09:54

Hi I have made the necessary changes for Kingsdown.



17 March

17/03 14:56

I messaged regarding the PROw who suggested calling the agent. Have just left a message.



17/03 15:38

17/03 15:40

Is there anything I can start doing? Reading, formatting etc.?