
Location: 43 Beechwood Drive Meopham Gravesend Kent

Description: Demolition of existing bungalow, erection of replacement dwelling and erection of a detached double garage.

Relevant Planning History

Reference	Description	Decision	Decision Date
20241045	Demolition of existing bungalow. Erection of detached replacement self-build dwelling with rooms in the roof space, dormer to rear roof slope and two dormers to front rear slope. Erection of a detached double garage.	Refused	13.11.2025

Development Plan

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (September 2014):

- CS01 – Sustainable Development
- CS02 – Scale & Distribution of Development
- CS11 – Transport
- CS12 – Green Infrastructure
- CS13 – Green Space, Sport and Recreation
- CS18 – Climate Change
- CS19 - Development & Design Principles

Gravesham Local Plan: First Review (1994)

- P3 – Vehicle Parking Standards
- T1 – Impact of Development on Highway Network

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

- Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development
- Section 9 – Promoting sustainable transport
- Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places
- Section 13 – Protecting Green Belt
- Section 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard (2015);
- SPG 4 - KCC Parking Standards (2006);
- Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment (2009)

Proposal

The proposed development follows a recent refusal under planning reference 20241045 for '**Demolition of existing bungalow. Erection of detached replacement self build dwelling with rooms in the roof space, dormer to rear roof slope and two dormers to front rear slope. Erection of a detached double garage.**'

This application represents an alternative proposal to that scheme. The change includes but are not limited to:

- Setback of the garage
- Inclusion of hard and soft landscaping details.
- Habitat Assessment

The proposed external materials would be render, grey slate roof tiles and wood grain upvc framed openings to both the main dwellinghouse and the proposed garage. This is confirmed within the application form.

Principle Issues

The main issues for consideration in the determination of this application are as follows:

- Principle of development in the Green Belt;
- Impact on openness and the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- Residential amenity;

It is noted that this application is an amendment to the previously refused scheme under ref 20241045. It will be important therefore to assess whether the scheme overcomes the reasons for refusal on that decision. The reasons for refusal were as follows:

1. This proposal would result in the construction of a new dwelling within the Green Belt. Such development is regarded as inappropriate development unless it meets any of the exceptions set out in paragraph 154 and satisfies all the criteria set out in paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). The development would not meet any of the exceptions set out in paragraph 154 and due to the unsustainable location of the site would not satisfy all the criteria set out in paragraph 155. In addition, the development would harm the openness of the Green Belt. In the absence of any very special circumstances to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, the proposal is considered to constitute inappropriate development, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and Policy CS02 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).
2. The proposed dwelling would not be of a similar scale and mass to the existing dwelling. It would be larger than the existing dwelling and no case has been forwarded to demonstrate that the enlargement is "modest" and required to allow the provision of essential basic amenities such as a bathroom, toilet or kitchen, which currently do not exist or are clearly inadequate to meet the special needs of the occupants. In addition, the site would not be in an appropriate location, well related to essential services. As such the proposal is contrary to Saved Policy C12 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review (November 1994).
3. The application site is located within the Harvel Wooded Downs Landscape Character Area. This proposal would consolidate the sporadic built development within this locality which would erode the spacious, wooded character of the housing in this landscape area. The development would therefore fail to conserve, restore and enhance the overall landscape character and as such would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and Policy CS12 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

4. The application is not accompanied an Ecological Impact Assessment and contains insufficient information to demonstrate the presence or otherwise of protected species and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development. As such the proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and Policy CS12 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

(It is noted that the NPPF has since been updated but the references to the relevant sections within the refusal reasons remain the same in the updated version.)

Principle of Development in the Green Belt

The site is within the Green Belt and the Harvel Wooded Downs Landscape Character Area.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

It is accepted that Green Belts are of great importance and that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by preserving the open and permanent characteristics of Green Belts (para. 137 of the NPPF 2023). Paragraph 147 of the NPPF (2023) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

The relevant exceptions to this policy are as follows:

Paragraph 149(c) identifies 'the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building', as an exception to this policy. Paragraph 149(g) identifies another exception as;

'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or*
- not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority'*

Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy 2014

Core Policy CS02 sets out where development should be distributed in the borough. Preference is given to this urbanised area as sustainable locations. Outside urbanised areas, those rural settlements which are inset from the Green Belt would also be considered acceptable in principle. This site is in a rural area, in the Greenbelt **NOT** forming part of settlement inset from the Greenbelt. In this context the policy states that developments; *'will be supported where it is compatible with national policies for protecting the Green Belt and policies in this plan.'*

Saved Policies in the Gravesham Local Plan First Review 1994

Saved Policy C13 sets out the requirements for extensions to dwellings. Of particular consideration and to assist in assessing whether the addition would be disproportionate, this policy limits the increased floorspace to one third of the gross floor area of the original dwelling. However, this policy does pre-date the NPPF, and greater weight should be given where the approach is consistent with paragraph 149 of the NPPF (2023).

Consent for extensions were given in 1991 and 2002. Based on the plans included in application ref 19910405, the original floorspace can be approximated at 50.8m². The current floorspace is 69.5m² and so the building has already increased by 18.7m², from its original built floorspace.

The following details the calculations for the increased floorspace compared with the previously refused proposal:

Assessment:

Development Stage	Ground Floor	First Floor	Total
Original	59.3 m ²	N/A	59.3 m ²
Current	59.3 m ²	N/A	59.3 m ²
Proposed	75.1m ²	42.9m ²	117 m ²
			Total Increase: 57.7 m ² /(97%)

This would be just over the 1/3 increase prescribed by saved Policy CS13 and above the allowance. The proposed development would therefore not result in a significant increase to the scale of the dwellinghouse from its original footprint, in the Green Belt.

The proposed erection of a garage or another domestic outbuilding does not fall within any of the categories listed in paragraph 149 of the NPPF (2023). As the use of the building would be for parking alone, this use would be ancillary to the main dwelling and if as it does also have a relatively close physical relationship between the proposed garage and the main dwelling (which is likely given the layout and positioning of the dwellinghouse in the plot) the proposed building should be considered to be a normal domestic adjunct.

However, in considering whether the additions would be disproportionate to the existing dwellinghouse, a visual assessment needs to be considered in combination with the floorspace data. In this case, following the previous refusal, and further changes made to the scheme during the progress of this application, there have been improvements to the design and the siting of the replacement dwelling. The cumulative impact of the changes made to both reduce the siting of the dwellinghouse proposed and improved design of the dwellinghouse would reduce the prominence of the proposed dwellinghouse from that previously refused to create the appearance of a chalet style bungalow with some accommodation in the roof, in a manner similar to surrounding properties.

The setback of the proposed dwelling and the garage also reduce the prominence of the replacement dwelling, and would improve its relationship with the dwellinghouse, and lessen the harsh appearance that the previously refused proposal would have had from the street scene.

It should further be noted that the direct neighbouring property was granted a largescale extension to their existing house which produce and increase of over 200% to the original property. It should also be noted that the first reason for refusal for initial application for this site was that it is a new dwelling in the Green Belt.

This is not a new dwelling but a replacement of what is already in situ. More could be achieved by pushing a prior approval to its max but due to the odd positioning of the current building and the surrounding setting, a well-designed replacement building is much more suited. It is also stated in the second reason for refusal that proposed dwelling would not be of a scale matched to that of the existing dwelling. Therefore, the councils own reason for refusal states that there is an existing dwelling. This is not an infill or a new dwelling but a replacement which is only just over the third increase allowed within the Council's own policy.

There have also been huge development increases on neighbouring properties at no.34, 42, 46 all of which include an extra floor being added to form a chalet style property.

On balance, despite the increase in scale, in my opinion, the development would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building visually and would comply with paragraph 149(c) and 149(g) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) and Saved Policy C13 of Gravesham Local Plan First Review (1994). The scheme would therefore overcome refusal reason 1 and 2.

Impact on openness

In appeal reference APP/K2230/D/21/3282859 (Bucklebury, Pear Tree Lane, Shorne), which shall be included as Appendix A the Inspector found that the development accorded with paragraph 149(c) of the NPPF, and for that reason there was no requirement to assess the openness. They stated that: *'As I find the development is not inappropriate under paragraph 149c of the Framework, it is not necessary to consider the development under other sections of that paragraph'*

In this case, as the scheme has been assessed as compliant with paragraph 149(c) it is also not necessary to consider the development under other sections of the paragraph. As above, the scheme is considered compliant with paragraph 149(c) and 149(g) of the NPPF (2023) and so would be considered appropriate development in the Green Belt.

Landscape Character Area

Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy 2014 requires that new development is well designed and respects the character and appearance of surrounding area. This application is located in a semi-rural area but is surrounded by built form, such as this existing dwellinghouse. The dwellinghouses which form part of the immediate area are largely single storey and with some limited footprints. However, the majority of these dwellinghouses have been converted over time to form chalet style properties like the host property which are more appropriate for the rural countryside. This site in particular forms part of the Harvel Wooded Downs Landscape Character Area.

The Landscape Character Assessment described the modern development of the area as follows:

'In the mid 20th Century the land to the north of Harvel was divided into a multitude of small plots that has resulted in sporadic and piecemeal development. These plots are enclosed by a variety of boundaries including fencing, hedgerows and other materials, or defined by clearings in the woodland to create a haphazard mosaic of small-scale housing plots within the woodland. The style of properties is varied in terms of size, scale and style. Many plots accommodate derelict caravans adjacent to small brick bungalows. Security gates and fencing are dominant throughout the area. Many properties appear to have small adjoining paddocks accommodating a small amount of livestock and associated equipment.'

It continues to say:

'The uncharacteristic and sporadic settlement of small plots within coppice woodland is a dominant element within the area creating an incoherent landscape. There are many visual detractors, including derelict buildings and caravans, overgrown gardens, poor fencing, disjointed fencing materials and fly tipping. The visual unity is significantly interrupted, although the wooded nature of the area conceals much of the visual clutter from wider views.'

Given the harm caused to the landscape character from the areas of small plots such as the one referred to in this application, the condition of the landscape area is considered moderate and requiring a Conserve and Create approach, as noted in the Landscape Character Appraisal; 'The strong landscape elements within the Harvel Wooded Downs should be conserved, whilst design standards should be defined to halt the erosion of the area with inappropriate development.' Of particular relevance, the Landscape Character Assessment provides the following guidance to 'halt the erosion of the area with inappropriate development.':

- Conserve and maintain traditional and distinct buildings, materials and elements.
- Resist proposals that introduce inappropriate designs and materials.
- Improve and soften new development using characteristic landscape elements such as woodland blocks and hedgerows.
- Conserve enclosure of settlements within wooded areas.

In this instance, as has already been ascertained, the proposed development would result in a small increase in built form to this plot. However, given its design and the slowly changing character of the area, it should be considered visually appropriate and proportional to the character of the area. It is noted that there are other dwellinghouses in the area with a second storey. Of particular note, is the adjoining neighbour 41 and also 43 Beechwood Drive. The scheme has changed since the previous approval and similar design elements used in this neighbours' alterations are reflected in the new and altered design of this proposal.

The proposed garage would be in a similar position to the previously proposed garage but follows the building line of the neighbouring properties that have had permission granted for large scale development. However, its low form height and the soft landscaping would minimise the visual impact on the area and its landscape character.

Overall and on this basis, the proposal would comply with the requirements of Policy CS02 of the Gravesham Core Strategy 2014, Policy C13 of the Gravesham Local Plan 1994 and Section 13 of the NPPF (2023). Refusal reason 3 would therefore be overcome by this proposed development.

Saved Policy C12 of the Local Plan First Review

Saved Policy C12 of the Local Plan First Review relates to replacement dwellings in the countryside. It states that there will be a strong presumption against allowing the replacement of existing dwellings which will only be set aside if specified criteria are satisfied. These criteria are discussed below:

- i) This criterion requires the existing dwelling to be an "original dwelling" in permanent use as a dwelling. The proposal would meet this test.
- ii) This criterion requires that the existing dwelling must be in an appropriate location, meaning that it must be well related to existing roads and to essential services and must be in or close to an established rural settlement. For the reasons set out previously in this report, the site would not be in a sustainable location and would not be well related to essential services. As such, it would fail to meet criterion ii) of Saved Policy C12. However, neighbouring properties have ALL been granted huge increases in dwellings which are more than what is proposed on this site. The area is built up already by residential dwellings so I would argue that this criterion can be met otherwise why would all of the previously titled 'Holiday Dwellings' be granted permission to become permanent dwellings?
- iii) This criterion requires the replacement dwelling to be of a similar scale and mass to the existing dwelling and must be no larger than the existing dwelling unless it can be demonstrated that modest enlargement is required to allow the provision of essential basic amenities such as a bathroom, toilet or kitchen, which currently do not exist or are clearly inadequate to meet the special needs of the occupants. As set out earlier in this report, the replacement dwelling would be larger than the existing.

A footnote to this criterion states where a modest enlargement can be justified, it should not be greater than one third of the floorspace of the existing dwelling excluding garage(s) and outbuildings and the replacement of bungalows by dwellings of two or more storeys will be resisted.

As previously set out in this statement, the proposal would not be significantly larger than the existing dwelling and the increase in the size of the floorspace would be only slightly over the one third of that of the original dwelling. It would also NOT result in the replacement of a bungalow with a two-storey dwelling. The proposed replacement dwelling would be a chalet style exactly as already stands for ALL neighbouring properties that have been granted increases of over 200% including the directly adjacent neighbouring property. In these respects, the proposal would meet the criterion of Saved Policy C12.

- iv) This criterion states the layout of the replacement dwelling shall not be such as to facilitate its later subdivision. The proposed layout does not lend itself to subdivision and as such the proposal meets this test.
- v) This criterion requires that the replacement dwelling should normally occupy the same site as the existing dwelling. Given the siting of the existing dwelling towards the rear of the site, it is considered that the proposed siting could be justified as it would be more in keeping with the siting of other dwellings within this locality.
- vi) This criterion requires that the existing or proposed means of access, including access for fire fighting appliances, must be satisfactory. It is considered that the proposal would provide satisfactory access.
- vii) This criterion requires that the existing or proposed site drainage and means of soil and waste disposal must be satisfactory. Details of proposed drainage have been submitted with the current application and therefore the proposal meets this criterion.

In light of the above considerations, this proposal meets all criteria of Saved Policy C12 of the Local Plan First Review.

Design and visual impact

Section 12 of the NPPF relates to “achieving well-designed places” and sets out the Government’s requirements in relation to design issues. Paragraph 131 is particularly relevant:

The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

The aims set out in paragraph 131 of the NPPF are reflected in Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy. This requires new development to be “visually attractive, fit for purpose and locally distinctive” and to “conserve and enhance the character of the local built, historic and natural environment”. It also requires new development to “integrate well with the surrounding local area”. In addition, Policy CS19 requires the following:

“.... the design, layout and form of new development will be derived from a robust analysis of local context and character and will make a positive contribution to the street scene, the quality of the public realm and the character of the area. Account will be taken of the scale, height, building lines, layout, materials and other architectural features of adjoining buildings.”

Design for Gravesham (2024) expands on the Core Strategy, and Policy CS19 in particular, to provide additional clarity on what is expected of applicants when submitting design proposals, setting out the minimum requirements to achieve design quality.

Beechwood Drive is characterised by dwellings of differing architectural styles which tend to be located on spacious plots. In this context and previously there was no objection to the design of the proposed dwelling. There are multiple examples in Beechwood Drive of other properties that are of a similar scale and design, and which also have residential space in additional upper floors within the roof space. Details of materials have been provided, and these are of a high quality and complement those used on nearby properties.

It is important to note that therefore that the design of the proposed dwelling is still and was previously considered acceptable.

Impact on landscape

Section 15 of the NPPF highlights the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural environment, one aspect of which is the protection and enhancement of valued landscapes. Policy CS12 of Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy states that the overall landscape character and valued landscapes within the Borough will be conserved, restored and enhanced and that proposals will take account of the Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment.

The site is located within the Harvel Wooded Downs Character Area. The key characteristics are defined in the Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment as follows:

- *Varied topography with steep valley sides and plateaux*
- *Ancient woodland, chestnut coppice and small paddocks and pasture*
- *Traditional historic settlement of Harvel set around village green*
- *Occasional traditional farmsteads*
- *Haphazard mosaic of residential plots and small holdings set within the woodland*

The Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment states that the strong landscape elements within the Harvel Wooded Downs should be conserved, whilst design standards should be defined to halt the erosion of the area with inappropriate development.

This area is characterised by a “haphazard mosaic of residential plots” which are enclosed by woodland. It was previously stated that the initial proposal would further consolidate the sporadic built development within this locality which would erode the spacious, wooded character of the housing in this landscape area.

However, we are proposing a replacement dwelling on an already occupied and built form within the application site. The increase in the footprint is tantamount to a minimal increase compared to that of its direct adjacent neighbours. It should therefore be considered that the proposal would not conflict with the characteristics of the Harvel Wooded Downs Character Area as identified in the Gravesham Landscape Character Assessment and would be contrary to Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy which seeks to conserve, restore and enhance the overall landscape character.

Impacts on residential amenity

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF requires planning decisions to, *inter alia*, provide “a high standard of amenity for existing and future users”. In addition, Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy requires new development to be located, designed and constructed to “safeguard the amenity, including privacy, daylight and sunlight, of its occupants and those of neighbouring properties and land”.

Privacy

The proposed dwelling would not result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers. The main aspect of all the proposed windows is towards the front and rear of the property. As these views would be towards the highway to the front and garden area to the rear, these windows would not result in window-to-window overlooking or the loss of privacy to neighbouring garden areas. No windows are proposed in the side elevations of the building.

Sunlight/daylight/outlook

The proposed dwelling would have similar front and rear building lines to the property to the south, no. 44 Beechwood Drive. Due to the siting and orientation of the new development in relation to this neighbouring property, there would be no significant loss of sunlight, daylight or outlook to the occupiers of this dwelling.

In addition, due to the orientation of the property to the north, no. 42 Beechwood Drive, and its separation distance from the proposed dwelling, it is unlikely there would be a significant loss of sunlight, daylight or outlook to the occupiers of this neighbouring property.

External space standards

Paragraph 9 and table two of the Council's Residential Layout Guidelines set out the Council's requirements for private amenity space for new dwellings. For dwellings with four bedrooms, it requires a minimum garden area of 100m² and a minimum depth from the rear wall of the house of 10.0m. The proposed dwelling would exceed the minimum requirements set out in the Council's Residential Layout Guidelines.

Internal space standards

The "Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard" was published by the Department for Communities and Local Government in March 2015. This document sets out requirements for the gross internal area of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy as well as floor areas and dimensions for key parts of the home.

The proposed dwelling would comprise a two-storey, four-bedroom, five person dwelling. The required minimum gross internal floor area for such units is 97m². The gross internal floor area of the proposed dwelling would measure 106.6 significantly exceed this standard.

These standards also provide minimum requirements for the size of bedrooms, including the following:

in order to provide one bedspace, a single bedroom has a floor area of at least 7.5m² and is at least 2.15m wide

The smaller bedroom on the first floor would measure approximately 1.9m in width and as such would not fully meet these criteria. Given that there is only a marginal shortfall in the width of the bedroom, it is considered that it would be appropriate to take a flexible approach in this particular case. Given that this is the fourth bedroom in the property, it can easily be repurposed as a study, where there are no minimum size requirements.

Highway issues

Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that new development mitigates its impact on the highway and that sufficient parking is provided in accordance with adopted parking standards, reflecting the availability of public transport provision and the accessibility of local services and facilities. Saved Policy P3 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review requires development to make provision for vehicle parking in accordance with the Kent County Council Vehicle Parking Standards.

The Kent County Council Vehicle Parking Standards require a maximum of three on-site parking spaces to serve a four-bedroom dwelling. The proposed block plan indicates that this level of parking could be provided on site. As such it is considered that this proposal would be acceptable in terms of highway safety.

Cycle and refuse storage

The current Kent County Council Vehicle Parking Standards provide minimum cycle parking standards. For residential dwellings there is a requirement of one space per bedroom. Although the submitted drawings do not indicate any cycle storage facility, there is more than enough space for this to be sited next to the bin storage area to the front of the site. This could also be secured with an appropriately worded planning condition.

Paragraph 32 of the Council's Residential Layout Guidelines (2020) relates to refuse storage and contains the following requirement:

Refuse containers shall be provided on a hardstanding and within purpose-built enclosures, which are readily accessible for collection.

A refuse storage area has been highlighted on the proposed block plan.

Biodiversity

Paragraph 180 of the NPPF (2024) relates to biodiversity and states that, *inter alia*, if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy reflects this stance and requires there will be no net loss of biodiversity in the Borough.

The KCC Ecological Advice Service has been consulted on this application and commented that habitats and features (including mixed scrub, log piles and established trees) are present on and around the site, indicating ecological value and these will all be retained. We are also introducing a bog garden to assist with any excess surface water. A report has now been provided which addresses the refusal reason 4.

With respect to Biodiversity Net Gain the proposed dwelling would be self-build. As such it would be exempt from statutory Biodiversity Net Gain.

Very special circumstances

In accordance with paragraph 153 of the NPPF such development "should not be approved except in very special circumstances". It advises that very special circumstances will not exist "unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations".

It should be noted that the applicant is not requesting permission for a completely new build within a plot of land which is not predeveloped land. The proposal is to improve the current property by replacing it with a high-level designed property which is more suited to the area than what is currently present. The applicant has been made homeless due to an unfortunate set of personal circumstances and has had to purchase the land and existing dwelling for him and his family which include young children.

The existing dwelling is not suitable in its current form and would not be financially viable to renovate as the cost would most likely be significantly more than what the proposed application would be. That said, without the scheme being approved, the applicant and his family will be left destitute and would need to be housed by the LPA putting yet more pressure on an already stretched local government department.

This is a self-build project and not one that it is for financial gain. It is needed so that the family and children especially can have a stable base for their future.

Furthermore, the Council have a woeful standard for meeting the five-year housing supply which they are still unable to do. This dwelling, albeit only one dwelling would go towards meeting the housing stock. As such, it is considered that the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness would be substantially outweighed by other considerations.

Conclusion

Given the Council's current inability to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, and as the delivery of housing is substantially below (less than 75%) that required by the Housing Delivery Test, the housing delivery element of Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy must be regarded to be out of date, as required by the Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF.

For the reasons given above and the amendments made to the application, it should be seen that the applicant is actively working with the council to mitigate the reasons for refusal and planning permission should be granted.