

Places and Policies Local Plan - Submission Draft Summary of Main Issues



Contents

1.	Introduction.....	5
2.	Summary of Main Issues	6
	Breakdown of comments by chapter	6
	Comments on accompanying documents.....	7
	Comments by policy.....	7
	Policies receiving no comments	7
3.	Comments on the Local Plan as a Whole	9
4.	Policy Index.....	10
5.	Foreword	10
6.	Chapter 3: Introduction - Places and Policies Local Plan.....	10
7.	Chapter 4: Introduction - Places	12
8.	Chapter 5: Urban Character Area	13
	Policy UA1: East Station Goods Yard, Folkestone.....	13
	Policy UA2: Rotunda and Marine Parade Car Parks, Lower Sandgate Road, Folkestone	14
	Policy UA3: The Royal Victoria Hospital, Radnor Park Avenue, Folkestone	14
	Policy UA4: 3-5 Shorncliffe Road, Folkestone	14
	Policy UA5: Ingles Manor, Castle Hill Avenue, Folkestone.....	14
	Policy UA6: Shepway Close, Folkestone.....	15
	Policy UA7: Former Gas Works, Ship Street, Folkestone	15
	Policy UA8: Highview School, Moat Farm Road, Folkestone	15
	Policy UA9: Brockman Family Centre, Cheriton	15
	Policy UA10: The Cherry Pickers Public House, Cheriton	15
	Policy UA11: Affinity Water, Shearway Road, Cheriton	15
	Policy UA12: Encombe House, Sandgate.....	16
	Hythe Town	16
	Policy UA13: Smiths Medical Campus, Hythe.....	16
	Policy UA14: Land at Station Road, Hythe	17
	Policy UA15: Land at Saltwood Care Centre, Hythe	17
	Policy UA16: St Saviour’s Hospital, Seabrook Road, Hythe	17
	Policy UA17: Foxwood School, Seabrook Road, Hythe	18
	Policy UA18: Princes Parade, Hythe	18
	Policy UA19: Hythe Swimming Pool, Hythe	20
	Alternative Site Submissions – Urban Character Area	20
9.	Chapter 6: Romney Marsh Character Area.....	21
	General Comments.....	21
	Alternative Site Submissions – Romney Marsh Area.....	21
	Policy RM1: Land off Cherry Gardens, Littlestone	21
	Policy RM2: Land off Victoria Road West, Littlestone.....	22
	Policy RM3: Land rear of the Old School House, Church Lane, New Romney	22
	Policy RM4: Land west of Ashford Road, New Romney	22
	Policy RM5: Land adjoining the Marsh Academy, Station Road, New Romney.....	22

Policy RM6: Kitewell Lane, rear of the Ambulance Station, Lydd	23
Policy RM7: Land South of Kitewell Lane, Lydd	23
Policy RM8: Station Yard, Station Road, Lydd	23
Policy RM9: Former Sands Motel, Land adjoining pumping station, Dymchurch Road, St Mary's Bay	23
Policy RM10: Land rear of Varne Boat Club, Coast Drive, Greatstone	23
Policy RM11: Car Park, Coast Drive, Greatstone	23
Policy RM12: The Old Slaughterhouse, 'Rosemary Corner', Brookland	24
Policy RM13: Lands north and south of Rye Road, Brookland	24
Policy RM14: Land adjacent to Moore Close, Brenzett	24
10. Chapter 7: North Downs Character Area	25
Policy ND1: Former Officers' Mess, Aerodrome Road, Hawkinge	25
Policy ND2: Mill Lane to the rear of Mill Farm, Hawkinge	26
Policy ND3: Land adjacent Kent Battle of Britain Museum, Aerodrome Road, Hawkinge	26
Policy ND4: Land east of Broad Street, Lyminge	26
Policy ND5: General Sellindge Policy	27
Policy ND6: Former Lympne Airfield	28
Stanford and Westenhanger	29
Policy ND7: Camping and Caravan Site, Stelling Minnis	29
Policy ND8: Land adjoining 385 Canterbury Road, Densole	30
Policy ND9: Etchinghill Nursery, Etchinghill	30
Policy ND10: Land adjacent to the Golf Course, Etchinghill	31
Alternative Site Submissions – North Downs Area	31
11. Chapter 8: Introduction – Development Management Policies	32
12. Chapter 9: Housing and the Built Environment	32
Policy HB1: Quality Places Through Design	32
Policy HB2: Cohesive Design	32
Policy HB3: Internal and External Space Standards	33
Policy HB4: Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Development	33
Policy HB5: Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside	33
Policy HB6: Local Housing Needs in Rural Areas	33
Policy HB7: Dwellings to Support a Rural-based Enterprise	33
Policy HB8: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Buildings	34
Policy HB9: Annexe Accommodation	34
Policy HB10: Development of Residential Gardens	34
Policy HB11: Loss of Residential Care Homes and Institutions	34
Policy HB12: Development of New or Extended Residential Institutions (C2 Use)	34
Policy HB13: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)	34
Policy HB14: Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers	34
13. Chapter 10: Economy	35
Policy E1: New Employment Allocations	35
Policy E2: Existing Employment Allocations	35
Policy E3: Tourism	36

Policy E4: Hotels and Guest Houses	36
Policy E5: Touring and Static Caravan, Chalet and Camping Sites	36
Policy E6: Farm Diversification	36
Policy E7: Reuse of Rural Buildings	36
Policy E8: Provision of Fibre to the Premises	37
14. Chapter 11: Retail and Leisure.....	38
Policy RL1: Retail Hierarchy	38
Policy RL2: Folkestone Major Town Centre	38
Policy RL3: Hythe Town Centre	38
Policy RL4: New Romney Town Centre	38
Policy RL5: Cheriton District Centre.....	38
Policy RL6: Sandgate Local Centre	39
Policy RL7: Other District and Local Centres	39
Policy RL8: Development Outside Town, District and Local Centres.....	39
Policy RL9: Design, Location and Illumination of Advertisements.....	39
Policy RL10: Shop Fronts, Blinds and Security Shutters	39
Policy RL11: Former Silver Spring Site, Park Farm.....	39
Policy RL12: Former Harbour Railway Line	40
15. Chapter 12: Community.....	41
Policy C1: Creating A Sense of Place	41
Policy C2: Safeguarding Community Facilities	41
Policy C3: Provision of Open Space.....	41
Policy C4: Children’s Play Space	42
Local Green Spaces	42
16. Chapter 13: Transport.....	43
Policy T1: Street Hierarchy and Site Layout	43
Policy T2: Parking Standards, including Table 13.1 (IGN3: Guidance Table for Residential Parking).....	43
Policy T3: Residential Garages	44
Policy T4: Parking for Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs)	44
Policy T5: Cycle Parking	44
17. Chapter 14: Natural Environment	45
Policy NE1: Enhancing and Managing Access to the Natural Environment	45
Policy NE2: Biodiversity	45
Policy NE3: Protecting the District’s Landscapes and Countryside.....	46
Policy NE4: Equestrian Development	46
Policy NE5: Light Pollution and External Illumination	46
Policy NE6: Land Stability	47
Policy NE7: Contaminated Land.....	47
Policy NE8: Integrated Coastal Zone Management	47
Policy NE9: Development Around The Coast	47
18. Chapter 15: Climate Change	48
Policy CC1: Reducing Carbon Emissions	48
Policy CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction	48

Policy CC3: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).....	49
Policy CC4: Wind Turbine Development	49
Policy CC5: Small Scale Wind Turbines and Existing Development	49
Policy CC6: Solar Farms	49
19. Chapter 16: Health and Wellbeing	50
Policy HW1: Promoting Healthier Food Environments	50
Policy HW2: Improving the Health and Wellbeing of the Local Population and Reducing Health Inequalities.....	50
Policy HW3: Development That Supports Healthy, Fulfilling and Active Lifestyles	50
Policy HW4: Promoting Active Travel.....	51
20. Chapter 17: Historic Environment	52
Policy HE1: Heritage Assets.....	52
Policy HE2: Archaeology	52
Policy HE3: Local List of Heritage Assets	52
Policy HE4: Folkestone’s Historic Gardens	53
21. Chapter 18: Monitoring	54
22. Policies Map.....	54
23. Places and Policies Local Plan Submission Draft – Sustainability Appraisal.....	54
24. Places and Policies Local Plan Submission Draft – Habitats Regulations Assessment.....	54

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Places and Policies Local Plan Submission Draft was published for consultation on 6 February 2018. The consultation was open for comments for a period of six weeks, closing on 19 March 2018.
- 1.2. This report provides a summary of the main issues arising from the consultation process, in compliance with Regulation 22 (c) (v) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 1.3. On 1 April 2018, shortly after the close of the consultation, the local planning authority changed its name from Shepway District Council to Folkestone & Hythe District Council. References to 'Shepway' are kept in this report where they relate to documents produced before 1 April 2018.

2. Summary of Main Issues

- 2.1. The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 require local planning authorities to prepare “a summary of the main issues raised by the representations”. What constitutes a “main issue” is not defined in legislation or guidance but it is generally accepted to mean an issue that goes to the heart of the soundness of the plan.

Breakdown of comments by chapter

- 2.2. A total of **832 representations** were received to the Places and Policies Local Plan from **330 respondents** (different individuals and organisations).
- 2.3. The representations were broken down by chapter as shown in Table 1.

Chapter		Number of comments
Places and Policies Local Plan as a whole		16
1	Policy Index	1
2	Foreword	1
3	Introduction – Places and Policies Local Plan	12
4	Introduction - Places	8
5	Urban Character Area	385
6	Romney Marsh Character Area	70
7	North Downs Character Area	110
8	Introduction – Development Management Policies	0
9	Housing and the Built Environment	43
10	Economy	21
11	Retail and Leisure	19
12	Community	28
13	Transport	19
14	Natural Environment	40
15	Climate Change	14
16	Health and Wellbeing	9
17	Historic Environment	36
18	Monitoring	0
Glossary		0
Appendix 1: Nationally Described Space Standards		0
Appendix 2: Schedule of Policies to be Deleted		0
Total number of comments		832

Comments on accompanying documents

- 2.4. In addition to comments on the local plan, eight comments were received on the accompanying documents shown in Table 2.

Title	Number of comments
Policies Map	6
Places and Policies Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal	2
Places and Policies Local Plan Habitats Regulations Assessment	0
Total number of comments	8

Comments by policy

- 2.5. Policy UA18: Princes Parade, Hythe and the supporting text received the most responses (237 comments). This represents approximately 28 per cent of all the comments received on the plan. The remaining site allocations and the development management policies attracted far fewer comments.
- 2.6. Policies (including pictures and supporting text) receiving more than 10 comments are set out in Table 3.

Title	Number of comments
Policy UA18: Princes Parade, Hythe	237
Policy UA19: Hythe Swimming Pool, Hythe	34
Policy ND6: Former Lymyne Airfield	32
Policy ND4: Land east of Broad Street, Lyminge	19
Policy RM2: Land off Victoria Road West, Littlestone	17
Policy RM11: Car Park, Coast Drive, Greatstone	16
Policy ND5: General Sellindge Policy	15
Policy UA2: Rotunda and Marine Parade Car Parks, Lower Sandgate Road, Folkestone	14
Policy UA11: Affinity Water, Shearway Road, Cheriton	11
Policy ND9: Etchinghill Nursery, Etchinghill	11

Policies receiving no comments

- 2.7. 11 policies received **no comments**. These are set out in Table 4.

Table 4: Local Plan policies receiving no comments
Policy RM8: Station Yard, Station Road, Lydd
Policy RM10: Land rear of Varne Boat Club, Coast Drive, Greatstone
Policy HB13: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)
Policy E4: Hotels and Guest Houses
Policy RL3: Hythe Town Centre
Policy RL4: New Romney Town Centre
Policy RL6: Sandgate Local Centre
Policy RL7: Other District and Local Centres
Policy RL9: Design, Location and Illumination of Advertisements
Policy RL10: Shop Fronts, Blinds and Security Shutters
Policy NE6: Land Stability

- 2.8. The main issues arising from the representations are outlined on a chapter-by-chapter basis in the sections that follow.
- 2.9. ***Where comments have been made against paragraphs of supporting text and pictures they are summarised under the policies they relate to and the numbers of comments are given as a single total. Where comments do not directly relate to a policy but make general points, or relate to a settlement rather than a specific site, they are summarised separately at the relevant part of the chapter.***

3. Comments on the Local Plan as a Whole

3.1. 16 comments were received on the Places and Policies Local Plan as a whole. These raised a number of issues, some general and others relating to specific areas or sites:

- The website is inadequate, crucial documents are missing and there has been insufficient communication with the public;
- Concern at the level of development proposed in the plan - over-development far in excess of local requirements - and the lack of affordable housing;
- Resistance of local people to large scale housing developments;
- Lack of water resources in the district to serve a new town (Monks Horton Parish Meeting);
- Lack of confidence in the planning process and reference made to a recent court case (Little Densole Farm case);
- No justification for further building in Brenzett, given recent developments and the risk of flooding and lack of infrastructure (Brenzett Parish Council);
- There is a need for the plan to address the decommissioning and remediation of the Dungeness 'A' site;
- Housing growth will place additional pressure on social infrastructure, such as education facilities, and education contributions from developers must be sufficient to deliver additional school places (Education & Skills Funding Agency);
- The local plan fails to provide infrastructure in line with Core Strategy Policy SS5¹;
- The local plan has not been prepared in line with the Statement of Community Involvement;
- There is a lack of vision for what the district should be, how economic development can be achieved through heritage tourism;
- Folkestone's road system must be re-examined;
- The impact of development in the Folkestone and Cheriton area has not taken account of existing infrastructure;
- The housing numbers do not reflect the availability of brownfield sites or empty properties;
- The plan does not meet requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and the public sector equality duty;
- There are no strategic issues of cross-boundary importance (Dover District Council); and
- Land adjacent to The Willows, adjoining A20, Lympne should be included as an allocation for residential development. It lies within Newingreen and would not be visually intrusive. The land is available and deliverable and forms part of the area proposed for the new garden town of Otterpool Park.²

¹ See Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan 2013, Policy SS5: District Infrastructure Planning

² See Core Strategy Review – Consultation Draft, Regulation 18 Version (March 2018), Policies SS6-SS9.

4. Policy Index

- 4.1. One comment was received against the policy index. This was to clarify the reference number used for comments submitted by Shepway HEART Forum (Heritage and Arts Tourism).

5. Foreword

- 5.1. One comment was received against the foreword by the Cabinet Member for the District Economy. This stated that the development proposed on Princes Parade³ would result in serious and unjustified harm to the Royal Military Canal scheduled monument.

6. Chapter 3: Introduction - Places and Policies Local Plan

- 6.1. 12 representations were received relating to Chapter 3 and raised the following issues:

General

- The plan does not set out strategic priorities;
- The Core Strategy should be reviewed first as this deals with the larger issues, such as the Garden Town⁴, which could meet all the housing numbers;
- There is a need to address tourism and retail expectations for the next 30 years;
- The council's planning processes has been criticised as it has refused to hold a public consultation meeting about major changes to the proposed Folkestone seafront development; and
- There have been failures in the Duty to Cooperate, especially with Ashford Borough Council (Ashford could take some need and they need to be included in Otterpool).

Housing

- Housing allocations do not conform to the Core Strategy requirement in terms of the numbers for each character area;
- Inability to deliver affordable housing due to 'viability';
- No account has been taken in the housing numbers for the Otterpool Park garden town;
- The target of 8,000 homes should be a minimum – the council should not rely on the Core Strategy Review or garden town as both are still at early stages; and
- Historic England's comments have not been addressed in Policy UA18: Princes Parade.

Garden Town (Otterpool Park)

- Object to the development at Otterpool Park due to lack of potable water, air pollution from vehicles, impact on the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and the loss of quality of life for thousands of residents.

Infrastructure

- The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has not been updated. The existing IDP contains little on education and any review should include capacity, average costs of expanding schools, educational needs associated with planned homes and proportion of children with special educational needs (ESFA);

³ See Places and Policies Local Plan, Policy UA18: Princes Parade, Hythe

⁴ See Core Strategy Review – Consultation Draft, Regulation 18 Version (March 2018), Policies SS6-SS9.

- The plan does not take into account pressures on local infrastructure; GP surgeries, mental health services and other health services. The Royal Victoria Hospital site is being lost as an opportunity for a health facility; and
- There is a need to address the traffic requirements as development increases.

Evidence Base Documents

- Supporting documents have not been published (Heritage Strategy, Destination Management Plan, Economic Strategy, Viability report); and
- There is a need to demonstrate that the plan meets the public sector equality duty and complies with the Equality Act 2010.

Part One – Places

7. Chapter 4: Introduction - Places

7.1. Eight representations were received relating to Chapter 4. The representations raised the following issues:

- The identification of housing sites based on proportionality is illogical and contrary to proper plan-making principles;
- The plan identifies sites well in excess of the Core Strategy target. This is excessive given the environmental, infrastructure and market constraints in the area;
- The target of 8,000 homes should be a minimum as the need has increased – the council should not rely on the Core Strategy Review or garden town as both are still at an early stage;
- The housing numbers don't reflect the potential to bring empty properties back into use;
- Support for the inclusion of Etchinghill as a secondary village;
- Land off Horn Street, Folkestone should be allocated; and
- Table 4.2 does not include Otterpool Park or the identified development sites in Ashford Borough or Dover District.

8. Chapter 5: Urban Character Area

8.1. 385 representations were received relating to Chapter 5.

8.2. Nine representations related to the chapter in general and raised the following issues:

- It is not possible to prepare a local plan until an updated Core Strategy is produced;
- The development of Otterpool Garden Town will affect the entire balance of the district. It is difficult to consider the plan without giving due consideration to the effects of Otterpool;
- The availability of the Otterpool strategic site should have been taken into account when assessing sites that have been included in the plan;
- The Core Strategy set out a requirement that approximately 75 per cent of all new residential development should be in the Urban Area – this is not demonstrated;
- Support the fact that the Cooling Lane allocation has been deleted since the Preferred Options draft consultation document;
- There is no reference to Fisherman's Beach, Hythe. It is registered as a 'Town Green' and is now being seriously damaged by development - object to any further building on the land adjacent to the beach;
- The plan omits potential allocation sites (i.e. Biggins Wood); and
- The definition of the Urban Character Area excludes 'Seabrook'.

Folkestone Town

8.3. Five representations were received relating to Folkestone Town. These raised the following issues:

- Support for Section 106 contributions towards the expansion of Oaklands Health Centre⁵ but question how GPs can be recruited and retained;
- Folkestone's heritage should be emphasised more in the document as something to be protected and promoted;
- Some form of transportation hub would regenerate and serve Folkestone; and
- There is little evidence that the requirements of the Core Strategy have influenced this plan.

8.4. Other representations related to specific policies and are summarised below.

Policy UA1: East Station Goods Yard, Folkestone

8.5. Four representations were received relating to Policy UA1 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- The site should be used as a car park or park-and-ride facility to serve the Folkestone Seafront development⁶, possibly linking with the old train line to the harbour (Policy RL12);
- Access to the platforms at Folkestone East should be created/retained in the event that the station is reintroduced; and
- Criterion 6 should be modified to read: "*A 15 metre gap between the pumping station and any sensitive development (such as housing) should be taken into consideration in the site layout*" (Southern Water).

⁵ See Policies UA13, UA14, UA15 and UA16

⁶ See Planning application reference Y12/0897/SH

Policy UA2: Rotunda and Marine Parade Car Parks, Lower Sandgate Road, Folkestone

8.6. 14 representations were received relating to Policy UA2 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- The effective use of both sites is constrained by the 'estimated capacities'. Of relevance is the recent application⁷ which proposed to amend the maximum height parameters of the consented Seafront development⁸;
- There will be a shortage of places to park once the seafront development is complete. These sites would better serve the area as car parks;
- With the Folkestone Seafront development, these sites would constitute an overdevelopment of the area. The existing infrastructure is insufficient;
- Development should be in keeping with the surrounding conservation areas, listed buildings (especially the Leas Lift) and the seafront development;
- Consideration should be given to walking and cycle access to provide links to adjacent routes (Kent County Council);
- Development must ensure that the England Coastal Path is not adversely affected;
- Marine Parade Car Park was previously a gas works, was contaminated and had a stipulation that it was never to be developed; and
- No account has been taken of Policy FTC8⁹.

Policy UA3: The Royal Victoria Hospital, Radnor Park Avenue, Folkestone

8.7. Eight representations were received relating to Policy UA3 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- There is a severe lack of medical facilities in Folkestone, including GP surgeries, and hospital facilities. The building should remain a medical centre;
- There is one-way traffic flow and limited highway capacity on Radnor Park Avenue. Adequate parking should be provided on-site as any on-street parking restrictions would displace parking to neighbouring residential areas;
- The policy should include details of walking and cycling links to routes to the north, Radnor Park to the west and south; and
- There is a lack of respect for the history of the building.

Policy UA4: 3-5 Shorncliffe Road, Folkestone

8.8. One representation was received relating to Policy UA4. This stated that planning permission has been granted for the site¹⁰.

Policy UA5: Ingles Manor, Castle Hill Avenue, Folkestone

8.9. Six representations were received relating to Policy UA5. These raised the following issues:

- The site would have been ideal for a business growth hub, given its proximity Folkestone Central station;
- If the redevelopment of the 'commercial phase' can consider retail and other commercial services, then criterion 5 needs to be adjusted to reflect the explanatory text;

⁷ Planning application reference Y17/1099/SH

⁸ Planning application reference Y12/0897/SH

⁹ 2006 Shepway Local Plan Review Policy FTC8: The Overcliff (formerly Leas Lift car park).

¹⁰ Planning application reference Y17/0019/PA

- Control should be exercised to ensure that replacement planting is good, and that the remaining green areas are integrated into public space; and
- The following criterion should be added: “A connection is provided to the local sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, in collaboration with the service provider” (Southern Water).

Policy UA6: Shepway Close, Folkestone

8.10. Three representations were received relating to Policy UA6. These raised the following issues:

- Criterion 1 should be amended to make sure open space is accessible from the public footpath and along the western edge of any development. The site is bordered by a public footpath (HBX16). It is important that the path is opened up and runs alongside the open space (Kent County Council); and
- The following criterion should be added: “A 15 metre gap between the pumping station and any sensitive development (such as housing) should be taken into consideration in the site layout” (Southern Water).

Policy UA7: Former Gas Works, Ship Street, Folkestone

8.11. Three representations were received relating to Policy UA7 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- Concern about developing houses on contaminated land, given its former use;
- There is a severe lack of medical facilities in Folkestone. A small parcel of land should be set aside for the building of a new doctor’s surgery, to replace the overcrowded one in Guildhall Street North; and
- Remains of the gasworks buildings should be incorporated into the scheme, and the Triennial Artwork retained as an asset to the town.

Policy UA8: Highview School, Moat Farm Road, Folkestone

8.12. Four representations were received relating to Policy UA8 and supporting text. These stated that the area suffers severe flooding; drainage will either have to be into the Downs Road sewer, which already has insufficient capacity, or sent towards Blackbull Road. Proposals to give relief to Downs Road by opening up access to Blackbull Road sewer system have been refused by Southern Water.

Policy UA9: Brockman Family Centre, Cheriton

8.13. Two representations were received relating to Policy UA9. These stated that the development should include appropriate links to the local footpath network and footpath HF55, which provides access to the wider countryside (Kent County Council).

Policy UA10: The Cherry Pickers Public House, Cheriton

8.14. Two representations were received relating to Policy UA10. These stated that appropriate and proportionate contributions should be made to improve the adjacent Public Rights of Way network (Kent County Council).

Policy UA11: Affinity Water, Shearway Road, Cheriton

8.15. 11 representations were received relating to Policy UA11 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- The allocation should include land north of Shearway Road which is available for commercial development and could provide in excess of 3,500 sq ft B1 space;
- Flatted residential accommodation would be out of keeping with the surrounding character;
- Flooding problems have been underestimated - the Pent Stream causes flooding of gardens and the surface water sewerage system is not able to deal with rainwater. Possibly the stream would benefit from landscaping, as in parts of Broadmead Village, or it could be used as highway surface water storage;
- Proposals for office space will increase the risk of people parking on Cherry Garden Avenue. A suitably-sized car park should be provided;
- Concern about highway capacity at peak times - the junction with Shearway Road would need to be assessed;
- The Morehall Recreation Ground and children's play area is in a very poor condition and requires replacing. Any development should include the requirement to improve the park and play area;
- Proposals might provide an opportunity to extend the Tile Kiln Lane allotments;
- The presence of many mature trees should also be stated as they are exceptional;
- Sport England strongly resist development that would either involve the loss of playing field or prejudice the use of the playing field;
- The following should be added to the policy: "*There is a high quality of design that responds to the site's location within the setting of the Kent Downs AONB, paying particular regard to material, massing, roofscape and landscaping*" (Kent Downs AONB Unit); and
- The following should be added to the policy: "*A connection is provided to the local sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, in collaboration with the service provider*" (Southern Water).

Policy UA12: Encombe House, Sandgate

- 8.16. Three representations were received relating to Policy UA12. These raised the following issues:
- The policy should include appropriate and proportionate contributions to improve the adjacent footpath (HF56 and HF58) (Kent County Council); and
 - The following should be added to the policy: "*A connection is provided to the local sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, in collaboration with the service provider*" (Southern Water).

Hythe Town

- 8.17. One representation was received relating to text regarding Hythe Town. This stated that the Core Strategy requires that significant development must be consistent with maintaining the viability of higher-order tourism. However, proposals to develop Princes Parade contradict this by causing irreparable harm to the two finest tourist attractions in Hythe (the eastern extent of Prince Parade and the Royal Military Canal).

Policy UA13: Smiths Medical Campus, Hythe

- 8.18. Eight representations were received relating to Policy UA13. These raised the following issues:

- The site should be used for the proposed new leisure centre for Hythe. It is better placed to serve the town and the Romney Marsh than the current preferred site at Princes Parade¹¹;
- The access and capacity of the highways has not been adequately considered; and
- The policy should include appropriate and proportionate contributions to improve the adjacent footpath (HB61 - to Hythe Community School) (Kent County Council).

Policy UA14: Land at Station Road, Hythe

8.19. Seven representations (including two duplicates) were received relating to Policy UA14 and Picture 5.16. These raised the following issues:

- This effective 'green lung' should be retained;
- The policy should include appropriate and proportionate contributions to improve the adjacent footpath (HB22), which links to footpaths HE287 and HB23 providing access to the wider countryside (Kent County Council);
- At the density of 30 dwellings per hectare, the capacity should be listed as 40 dwellings; and
- The following should be added to the policy: "*A connection is provided to the local sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, in collaboration with the service provider*" (Southern Water).

Policy UA15: Land at Saltwood Care Centre, Hythe

8.20. Seven representations were received relating to Policy UA15 and Picture 5.17. These raised the following issues:

- The allocation is likely to have an impact on the AONB and its setting; it could be considered as small-scale major development. The policy should highlight the need for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) (Natural England);
- The following should be added to the policy: "*The development is designed to a high standard and would not have a harmful impact on the character and setting of the nearby Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty*" (Kent Downs AONB Unit);
- The following should be added to the policy: "*A connection is provided to the local sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, in collaboration with the service provider*" (Southern Water);
- The policy should include appropriate and proportionate contributions to improve the adjacent footpath (HB23) (Kent County Council); and
- It has been previously demonstrated that no harm arises to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Area; there is therefore no need to continue to view this site as an exception to policy. Remove the restriction to "Class C2 or C3 Extra Care units".

Policy UA16: St Saviour's Hospital, Seabrook Road, Hythe

8.21. Nine representations were received relating to Policy UA16 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- There is a history of land instability and subsidence of the Hythe hillside; question whether this has been adequately considered;
- Concern about the impact of additional traffic on the A259;
- Development will increase surface run-off onto Seabrook Road;
- Requirements for affordable housing are not stated;

¹¹ See Places and Policies Local Plan Submission Draft, Policy UA18: Princes Parade, Hythe

- College Bridge is not a public highway. The policy should be updated accordingly (Kent County Council);
- There is a severe lack of medical facilities, including GP surgeries and hospital facilities. The building should remain a medical centre;
- This site reflects that period of Hythe's history when nuns established nursing orders and hospitals, and should be included in a 'local list'; and
- The following should be added to the policy: *"A connection is provided to the local sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, in collaboration with the service provider"* (Southern Water).

Policy UA17: Foxwood School, Seabrook Road, Hythe

8.22. Seven representations were received relating to Policy UA17. These raised the following issues:

- There is a history of land instability and subsidence of the Hythe hillside; question whether this has been adequately considered;
- Requirements for affordable housing are not stated;
- College Bridge is not a public highway. The policy should be updated accordingly. An emergency access will be required as the development exceeds 50 dwellings (Kent County Council);
- Sport England strongly resist development that would either involve the loss of the playing field or prejudice the use of the playing field;
- The following should be added to the policy: *"Access is maintained to the existing underground sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes"* (Southern Water); and
- The policy should include a requirement for improvements to the GP surgeries in Hythe.

Policy UA18: Princes Parade, Hythe

8.23. 237 representations were received relating to Policy UA18, Picture 5.20 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- Historic England has fundamental concerns regarding the impacts of the proposed development on the Royal Military Canal (RMC);
- NPPF (paragraph 130) states that *"where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of or damage to a heritage asset [setting]; the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision"*;
- The policy does not follow the most appropriate strategy. There are alternative options available to accommodate the delivery of a new leisure centre for Hythe;
- Development would destroy the only break in the coastal urban ribbon development between Hythe and Folkestone;
- The site was deleted from the draft Local Plan (2006) by the Inspector who described Princes Parade as *"one of the finest vistas in the district"* and agreed with the previous Inspector (1996). Nothing has changed since;
- Prior to the 1960s the site was used for leisure and recreation. While the council has restricted public access following its use as landfill and the silt dumping project (2002), this visual open space has a historic and public amenity value;
- Residents are deficient in access to open space and there is a lack of opportunities for informal recreation;
- The open space is not surplus to requirements as set out in NPPF (paragraph 75) nor would the loss resulting from the proposed development be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location;

- Claims that the site has limited recreation value due to past historical uses is the consequence of the deliberate actions by the local authority;
- CPRE does not feel that an alternative level of open space would be provided in the area once the Princes Parade site is developed;
- The site should be designated a Local Green Space according to NPPF (paragraph 77);
- Loss of visual and recreational amenity space. This area is greatly used and valued as an asset by residents and visitors;
- The existing swimming pool in Hythe (South Road) is run down, inefficient and no longer fit-for-purpose - proposals for a new leisure centre are supported;
- Princes Parade should not be diverted alongside the canal. The proposed development will increase traffic on the A259 and air pollution;
- The site is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site (LWS);
- The site is an important stopping off and departing point for migrating birds and is also important for breeding and wintering birds. It also supports an important habitat for invertebrates;
- The canal path will be more intensively used, having a negative impact on the biodiversity;
- Light and noise pollution associated with the development will have an adverse effect on the LWS;
- Kent Wildlife Trust states that there is insufficient emphasis on the need to protect and enhance the LWS adjacent to the development site, consistent with the NPPF (paragraph 118):
 - The policy should be more explicit with regard to the protection and enhancement of the LWS;
 - An adequate buffer strip should be provided;
 - Additional access management measures should also be included within the LWS;
 - Any ecological survey carried out as part of a planning application process should include the use of the site by invertebrates and overwintering and the passage of breeding birds given its proximity to SPA/SAC sites;
- The site is in Zone 3A of the Environment Agency Flood Hazard Map. NPPF (paragraph 101) states that development should be directed away from areas of highest flood risk. The area relies on a coastal flood protection programme that might not be sustainable for the life of the development;
- The site is heavily contaminated owing to its former use as district municipal dump. There is concern about the disturbance of toxic waste. There is potential for toxins associated with the former landfill to leech into the RMC and LWS. Japanese Knotweed is also known to be present on site;
- Concern about the effect the development will have on utilities, particularly sewerage and drainage;
- Existing health, education and social services are already struggling to cope;
- The proposal is inconsistent with the principle of sustainable development;
- Concern about the design of the scheme¹² and the visual impact on the character of the local area;
- The project is not financially viable once the costs of developing the contaminated land have been factored in;
- Due to the high cost of development there is unlikely to be any significant affordable housing delivered;
- The adjacent golf course could, at a later date, be seen as an “infill site” between the Hythe Imperial and Princes Parade;

¹² See planning application reference Y17/1042/SH

- The policy is contrary to policies NE9¹³ and TM8¹⁴;
- There is a conflict of interest between the council as landowner and planning authority; and
- There is a surplus of homes against the Core Strategy target.

Policy UA19: Hythe Swimming Pool, Hythe

8.24. 34 representations were received relating to Policy UA19, Picture 5.22 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- The swimming pool is run down, inefficient and no longer fit-for-purpose - proposals for a new leisure centre on Princes Parade are supported;
- The council has not justified the preferred site for the relocation of the swimming pool nor provided valid reasons why alternatives are not suitable;
- It is not clear whether the existing swimming pool would be knocked down when a 'decision' on where to build it was taken or when planning permission was given and the funds set aside; and
- There is a requirement for a contribution towards improvements to the GP surgeries in Hythe.

Alternative Site Submissions – Urban Character Area

8.25. There was one alternative site promoted for the urban character area. This was recorded against Chapter 4: Introduction – Places (site at Horn Street, Folkestone – see paragraph 7.1 above).

¹³ Places and Policies Local Plan Submission Draft Policy NE9: Development Around the Coast

¹⁴ 2006 Shepway Local Plan Review Policy TM8: Princes Parade, Hythe

9. Chapter 6: Romney Marsh Character Area

9.1. 70 representations were received relating to Chapter 6.

General Comments

9.2. 10 representations related to the chapter in general or promoted alternative sites in the Romney Marsh Character Area.

9.3. General comments raised the following issues:

- The plan fails to recognise the importance of London Ashford Airport to the local economy - it should include a policy supporting future investment at the airport;
- There is concern about the increased recreational impact of allocated sites on nearby protected sites (Kent Wildlife Trust);
- The policies are not consistent with 2013 Core Strategy Policy SS5¹⁵ and the NPPF as they fail to ensure that infrastructure requirements will be met;
- Romney Marsh is being asked to take a far higher percentage than 10 per cent of development, putting pressure on the infrastructure, open landscape and prime agricultural land of the Romney Marsh (CPRE Kent);
- Drainage is inadequate with frequent back-ups of foul sewers in wet weather (CPRE Kent);
- Concerns about highways capacity of the A259 in the event of a major incident;
- There is no evidence to demonstrate that the road network can cope with additional traffic or that measures will secure a shift towards sustainable transport modes (CPRE Kent);
- There are no proposals for any future medical facilities to be located to the north of New Romney (CPRE Kent);
- Local schools are already nearing capacity (CPRE Kent);
- Development will threaten the unique character of the Marsh; and
- Increased pressure on local services has not been effectively justified.

Alternative Site Submissions – Romney Marsh Area

9.4. Alternative site submissions were as follows:

- Land at Brenzett Nurseries, George Street, Brenzett – promoted for 6-8 dwellings;
- Land at Mulberry Cottage, High Street, Lydd – promoted for 8 dwellings;
- New site policy at Dungeness 'A' site – promoted for decommissioning and remediation, together with employment (B1/B2/B8) uses and development associated with energy generation;
- Pepperland Nurseries, Brookland – promoted for 9 dwellings;
- Land at Jenner's Way, St. Mary's Bay – number of dwellings not specified; and
- Land at Brooker Farm, Newchurch – number of dwellings not specified.

9.5. Other representations related to specific policies and are summarised below.

Policy RM1: Land off Cherry Gardens, Littlestone

9.6. Four representations were received relating to Policy RM1 and Picture 6.3. These raised the following issues:

- The site is greenfield with no justification given for development;

¹⁵ Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan 2013, Policy SS5: District Infrastructure Planning

- There are concerns about access and highways capacity of the A259 in the event of a major incident; and
- The policy fails to meet Core Strategy Policy SS5.

Policy RM2: Land off Victoria Road West, Littlestone

9.7. 17 representations were received relating to Policy RM2, Picture 6.4 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- The road is too narrow which creates a poor access and highway capacity is inadequate;
- Doctor's surgeries are at capacity and doctors cannot be attracted to the area;
- Primary and secondary schools are already at capacity;
- The site is greenfield, with no justification given for development;
- The site is within a flood risk area;
- There will be a loss of and disturbance to local wildlife and protected species;
- Employment opportunities on the Romney Marsh will be limited following the decommissioning of Dungeness;
- To bring the plan in line with the NPPF and NPPG, and to ensure sustainable development, criterion 9 should be removed and additional criteria added (Southern Water); and
- Housing is not affordable for local residents.

Policy RM3: Land rear of the Old School House, Church Lane, New Romney

9.8. One representation was received relating to Policy RM3. This raised concerns about highways capacity of the A259 in the event of a major incident.

Policy RM4: Land west of Ashford Road, New Romney

9.9. Four representations were received relating to Policy RM4. These raised the following issues:

- The site is greenfield, with no justification given for development;
- Concerns about site access and highways capacity of the A259;
- There is an over-concentration of homes to the north of New Romney with existing homes built under Core Strategy Policy CSD8¹⁶;
- Employment opportunities on the Romney Marsh will be limited following the decommissioning of Dungeness;
- The development will be detrimental to local character and visual amenity; and
- Existing infrastructure including roads, schools and doctors surgeries cannot cope.

Policy RM5: Land adjoining the Marsh Academy, Station Road, New Romney

9.10. Two representations were received relating to Policy RM5. These raised the following issues:

- The policy fails to meet Core Strategy Policy SS5 as there has been no timely provision of infrastructure;
- There is no evidence to support the need for a medical facility; and
- The site should be safeguarded for educational purposes only to support the expansion of the Marsh Academy.

¹⁶ See Shepway Core Strategy Local Plan 2013, Policy CSD8: New Romney Strategy

Policy RM6: Kitewell Lane, rear of the Ambulance Station, Lydd

- 9.11. Two representations were received relating to Policy RM6. These raised the following issues:
- The policy includes the word “integration” of the wildlife site and this is not appropriate (Kent Wildlife Trust);
 - The wording should be amended given the sensitive location adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site (Kent Wildlife Trust); and
 - Additional land to the west should be incorporated into the allocation to provide a better, alternative access.

Policy RM7: Land South of Kitewell Lane, Lydd

- 9.12. One representation was received relating to Policy RM7. This supported pedestrian permeability throughout and beyond the site, with pedestrian links to Poplar Lane and Kitewell Lane.

Policy RM8: Station Yard, Station Road, Lydd

- 9.13. There were no representations were received relating to Policy RM8.

Policy RM9: Former Sands Motel, Land adjoining pumping station, Dymchurch Road, St Mary’s Bay

- 9.14. Four representations were received relating to Policy RM9. These raised the following issues:
- The policy should include appropriate and proportionate contributions to improve the adjacent footpaths HB142 and HB139 (Kent County Council);
 - Criterion 3 should be reworded to “*improvements to lengthen and widen the bus stop on the east side of the A259*” (Kent County Council); and
 - The toilet block should be maintained in the development and should be open to public use within the coastal park.

Policy RM10: Land rear of Varne Boat Club, Coast Drive, Greatstone

- 9.15. No representations were received relating to Policy RM10.

Policy RM11: Car Park, Coast Drive, Greatstone

- 9.16. 16 representations were received relating to Policy RM11 and Picture 6.13. These raised the following issues:
- Building on the car park would harm tourism and the economy;
 - The site is in a flood risk area;
 - Object to the loss of a community facility;
 - The re-provision of 50 car parking spaces is not enough and does not provide coach parking;
 - No longer object providing the allocation is justified through the sequential test process (Environment Agency);
 - There are other sites in the New Romney area that should be developed instead;
 - 55 per cent of the site is within a national Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitat while 70 per cent of the site falls within a local BAP Priority Habitat; and

- The site is adjacent to protected habitats and conflicts with policy NE2¹⁷.

Policy RM12: The Old Slaughterhouse, 'Rosemary Corner', Brookland

9.17. Two representations were received relating to Policy RM12 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- The allocation fails to use previously developed land;
- The allocation fails to use land of lesser value, rather than the most versatile agricultural land in the open countryside;
- There is an alternative site that consists of previously developed land; and
- The site is greenfield and in the open countryside.

Policy RM13: Lands north and south of Rye Road, Brookland

9.18. Five representations were received relating to Policy RM13. These raised the following issues:

- There is no need to produce a masterplan given the separation of the sites;
- Development on the A259 roundabout does not respond appropriately to the historic form and character of the settlement;
- Drainage is inadequate;
- Access onto Rye Road will be restricted and there are highway safety concerns;
- The site is greenfield and the development of this land is not justified;
- Two additional criteria should be added in relation to an odour assessment and a connection to the local sewerage network (Southern Water); and
- The contribution to housing in Brookland does not conform to the settlement hierarchy and is not justified.

Policy RM14: Land adjacent to Moore Close, Brenzett

9.19. Two representations were received relating to Policy RM14. These raised the following issues:

- Revisions to the policy wording are suggested;
- The contribution to housing in Brenzett does not conform to the settlement hierarchy; and
- The site is greenfield and the development of this land is not justified.

¹⁷ See Places and Policies Local Plan Submission Draft, Policy NE2: Biodiversity

10. Chapter 7: North Downs Character Area

10.1. 110 representations were received relating to Chapter 7.

Introduction

10.2. Four representations were received relating to the introduction and the wider chapter in general and raised the following issues:

- There is insufficient information to understand the housing need context within which new development is proposed within the AONB (CPRE);
- Further explanation is needed in respect of the site selection process and site capacity (CPRE);
- Object to policies ND8 and ND9 (CPRE);
- CPRE may wish to object to policies ND7 and ND10 if development is not needed locally;
- Paragraph 7.4 should explain that the AONB Management Plan does not form part of the development plan;
- Natural England should be consulted in accordance with Impact Risk Zones (IRZs);
- Despite strengthened wording in the Submission Draft, allocations are still likely to have an impact on the AONB and its setting, and can be considered as small-scale major development (including former Lympne Airfield, Etchinghill Nursery and Densole) (Natural England);
- The council will need to ensure that allocations in the AONB satisfy the three tests set out in paragraph 116 of the NPPF. The policies should highlight the need for development proposals to undertake a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA); and
- In relation to development at Westenhanger racecourse/Otterpool Park¹⁸ this will lead to loss of natural amenity and valuable wildlife habitat; despoliation of the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Westenhanger Castle; erosion of the quality of life of existing residents; and pressure on infrastructure.

Hawkinge

10.3. One representation was received (from CPRE) relating to general development in Hawkinge as a whole:

- Ensure sufficient infrastructure is in place, including social infrastructure;
- Greater attention to the roads and highways is required to improve congestion;
- High quality design and landscaping is of particular importance because of the AONB setting; and
- Any historic assets (connected to the Battle of Britain) on the Hawkinge sites should be incorporated into the schemes.

10.4. Other representations related to specific policies and are summarised below.

Policy ND1: Former Officers' Mess, Aerodrome Road, Hawkinge

10.5. One representation was received relating to Policy ND1. This raised the same issues set out above, particularly regarding road and highway infrastructure (exit road onto Spitfire Way is of particular concern).

¹⁸ Core Strategy Review Consultation Draft (Regulation 18 Version), March 2018, Policies SS6-SS9

Policy ND2: Mill Lane to the rear of Mill Farm, Hawkinge

10.6. Two representations were received relating to Policy ND2. These raised the following issues:

- Support for criteria 4 and 5 (public rights of way) (Kent County Council);
- The policy should include appropriate and proportionate contributions to improve footpath HE202 which runs through the development site (Kent County Council); and
- The same issues as set out above under general points, relating to Hawkinge as a whole.

Policy ND3: Land adjacent Kent Battle of Britain Museum, Aerodrome Road, Hawkinge

10.7. Five representations were received relating to Policy ND3. These raised the following issues:

- Support for criterion 4 (pedestrian permeability);
- Kent Battle of Britain Museum - inaccuracies in consultation summary;
- Objection to criterion 11 (heritage assets). Suggested new wording: *“Features and structures associated with the site’s former use as a World War II airfield shall be investigated and recorded wherever possible to provide a link with the site’s past”* (site promoter); and
- The same issues as set out above under general points, relating to Hawkinge as a whole.

Policy ND4: Land east of Broad Street, Lyminge

10.8. 19 representations were received relating to Policy ND4, Picture 7.6 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- Infrastructure concerns, including roads, traffic, sewage (Broad Street and into Station Road and Mayfield Road in particular with cases of overflow), water, school, surgeries;
- A new road junction would be dangerous as cars would be on it before it is visible on a virtually blind bend. Build-outs either side of the exit may help with traffic leaving the village, but would probably make it more hazardous for traffic entering Lyminge;
- Development should have a road frontage onto Broad Street;
- Traffic calming measures will require street lighting, which will need to be carefully designed as the site sits within the AONB (Kent County Council Highways);
- The site is within a Source Protection Zone 2 outer area and any development would contaminate this. A stream crosses the site which is a source for the River Nailbourne;
- Housing design should fit in with the rural setting;
- Ensure criterion 12 (contribution to healthcare) is delivered. Would the area immediately behind the building be used for the extended surgery and car park?;
- The New Lyminge Surgery car park is too small now and the entrance to Greenbanks, the doctor’s and AGE UK gets extremely congested;
- No affordable housing is being proposed. The density suggests large expensive houses;
- The development would fail to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. It would represent a large incursion into the rural hinterland and be an inappropriate extension of the village. The scale of development constitutes ‘major

development', contrary to the NPPF and would be in conflict with the draft revised NPPF. The proposed allocation would also be in conflict with the AONB Management Plan (Kent Downs AONB Unit);

- The policy should highlight the need for development proposals to undertake a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) (CPRE);
- Development here would encourage the coalescence of Lyminge and Etchinghill;
- The site is prominent and clearly visible from the public highway. It is important to retain the rural feel upon entering the village;
- The allocation would involve the loss of a golf course (Sport England);
- This development would reduce the existing amenity of the golf course, which employs a considerable number of people;
- Query regarding what planning permission was granted for the golf course and what conditions were attached;
- The route of the old railway line between Lyminge and Etchinghill does not run for its entire length along land belonging to the Golf Course, so any new public right of way could not follow the old route exactly;
- There are more sustainable areas where the village could be extended;
- Impact of the development on wildlife;
- Criteria 10 and 11, regarding the public right of way and bridleway, are supported (Kent County Council);
- Criterion 1 (design) should be amended by deleting "highest" and substituting "high" - "highest" is prescriptive and leaves no opportunity to consider alternative design solutions (site promoter); and
- Criterion 11 (bridleway) should be amended to recognise that provision should be based on the practicality and viability of delivery, and ensure that the golf course is not adversely affected.

Policy ND5: General Sellindge Policy

10.9. 15 representations were received relating to Policy ND5, Pictures 7.7, 7.8 and 7.9 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- The introduction of small-scale sensitively designed developments is more easily integrated into a village scene;
- The policy is at odds with policies for Otterpool Park;
- Development should support the vitality of the village and its services, while not damaging its characteristics and quality;
- Local infrastructure concerns;
- Clarification is needed on the strategic allocation for approximately 600 homes to the south of Sellindge¹⁹;
- It is prudent to manage patterns of growth in Sellindge over the plan-period;
- The policy should prescribe delivery timescales to avoid conflict;
- The plan does not take account of the latest household projections and objectively assessed needs. It ignores the content of the draft NPPF; and
- The doctor's surgery at Sellindge also serves surrounding villages (Sellindge Parish Council).

The Piggeries

- This is a good use of a brownfield site; houses should be no more than two-storey;
- Measures must be put in place to prevent further development onto the surrounding green fields (Sellindge Parish Council); and

¹⁹ Core Strategy Review – Consultation Draft, Regulation 18 Version (March 2018), Policy CSD9: Sellindge Strategy

- Public footpath HE305 runs through part of the site and footpath HE306 runs adjacent. Kent County Council requests that consideration is given to these routes.

Land West of Jubilee Cottage

- Affordable dwellings should be provided along the boundary with the playing field, with larger dwellings behind the grade II listed Holly Cottage. Perhaps chalet-type dwelling fronting onto Swan Lane (Sellindge Parish Council).

Land at Barrow Hill

- The site is remote from essential services, not a sustainable location (CPRE);
- The proposal is close to an historic asset (bronze age burial mound) without evidence of an understanding of the historic landscape, landscape character and potential archaeology (CPRE);
- The site could have a mix of dwellings with larger dwellings near to the adjoining dwelling 'The Mount' and a mix of more affordable semi-detached and terraced dwellings elsewhere (Sellindge Parish Council);
- There are protected trees on site (TPO 16 – 2016). Criteria on the setting of the AONB are required, as the site is completely open to the AONB;
- The break in the line of buildings along the A20 prevents a completely linear village and allows some natural green space to be retained, preserving the history of the village;
- Access onto the A20 is currently problematic due to the speed and high number of HGVs;
- The public bridleway HE217A runs adjacent to the site boundary. Kent County Council requests that consideration is given to this route;
- This site is within the emerging Otterpool Park Framework Masterplan area. The policy should signpost the development forthcoming at Otterpool Park; and
- There is one goal located in the field at Barrow Hill - the council should consider whether there is some informal sports use (Sport England).

Silverspray

- New wording is needed: *“Access is maintained to the existing underground sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes”* (Southern Water); and
- Development would need to be informed by the implementation of the existing proposals for 250 homes on the adjoining land.

Policy ND6: Former Lympne Airfield

10.10. 32 representations were received relating to Policy ND6 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- No regard is given to Otterpool Park²⁰; decisions do not include the effect that 12,000 homes will have (Lympne Parish Council);
- There is a lack of information and evidence supporting the need to considerably raise the housing number;
- Disagree that Lympne is accessible (Lympne Parish Council);
- There needs to be better public transport and more frequent trains;
- Ensure that section 106 contributions paid for designated improvements are actually used for that purpose (Lympne Parish Council);

²⁰ See Core Strategy Review – Consultation Draft, Regulation 18 Version (March 2018), Policies SS6-SS9.

- Previous public inquiries have been held over plans to develop housing, all of which have been refused by the Secretary of State;
- Despoliation of the setting of the AONB;
- Loss of green buffer that separates the village and the Industrial Estate;
- Loss of natural wildlife habitat and agricultural land;
- Loss of historical character of Lympne Airfield;
- As part of Otterpool Park, upheaval would arise from extensive infrastructure engineering;
- Infrastructure concerns, including health care, water, schools and roads;
- Air pollution arising from road traffic;
- The policy should include reference to a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, street trees and the character and setting of the AONB. Without this the policy would fail to comply with the 2000 Countryside and Rights of Way Act as well as the NPPF and the AONB Management Plan (Kent Downs AONB Unit);
- The site lies in the immediate setting of the AONB, with the boundary of the AONB on the opposite side of Aldington Road. The site is visible from a large section of the Kent Downs scarp and would result in much of the site being visible in views from the AONB. The development would go against the principle that development should avoid ridge tops/skylines (Kent Downs AONB Unit);
- The allocation is likely to have an impact on the AONB and its setting (Natural England);
- Proposals for Otterpool Park and its relationship with the submission document need to be clarified (Kent Wildlife Trust);
- Consultation with the Parish Council, local community and statutory consultees will be critical (CPRE);
- Development is not sensitive to its location, the capacity of local infrastructure and the needs of local people (CPRE);
- Support for criteria 10 and 12 (footpaths). The wording of criterion 10 should be changed to include bridleways as well as footpaths (Kent County Council);
- Concerns regarding the land being purchased by Homes England;
- Places and Policies Local Plan proposals should match those of the Regulation 18 Draft Core Strategy which seeks to move the residential allocation to the west, i.e. from Site 1 to Site 2 (Homes England);
- Lympne airfield is within Otterpool Park Masterplan area, however this policy conflicts with its aspirations and those contained within the emerging Core Strategy Review;
- Housing development of low density is more appropriate at, and adjacent to, the Lympne Industrial estate with a green buffer between the new housing and Lympne village; and
- Planning needs to provide for industrial and commercial businesses to provide employment.

Stanford and Westenhanger

- 10.11. One representation was received relating to text regarding Stanford and Westenhanger (from Stanford Parish Council). This stated that the parish council considers it is being kept in the dark regarding important services and infrastructure and that the parish council wishes to know why the plot announced for Stanford has been withdrawn and why does it not show up in the withdrawals section.

Policy ND7: Camping and Caravan Site, Stelling Minnis

- 10.12. Two representations were received from the site promoter relating to Policy ND7 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- The policy underestimates the site's capacity;
- Criterion 7 (access and pedestrian links) should be amended to: "*A primary vehicle access is provided onto Crown Lane, with pedestrian links to Minnis Lane*"; and
- Criterion 8 (bus shelter) should be deleted as the bus stop relocation is no longer needed.

Policy ND8: Land adjoining 385 Canterbury Road, Densole

10.13. Five representations were received relating to Policy ND8. These raised the following issues:

- Canterbury Road is busy and has experienced many accidents over the years;
- There is insufficient information to understand the housing need within which new development is proposed. There are potentially significant harmful impacts on the AONB. The policy wording should highlight the need for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (CPRE);
- The site helps retain a rural character to the village. The field is enclosed by a virtually continuous native species hedgerow (Kent Downs AONB Unit);
- The development would be a large incursion into the rural hinterland, harming both the landscape and scenic qualities of the AONB (Kent Downs AONB Unit); and
- The scale constitutes 'major development' and would be contrary to the NPPF, the draft revised NPPF and the AONB Management Plan (Kent Downs AONB Unit).

Policy ND9: Etchinghill Nursery, Etchinghill

10.14. 11 representations were received relating to Policy ND9 and supporting text. These raised the following issues:

- Paragraph 7.94 should explain that the facilities in Lyminge are within walking distance of the site (site promoter);
- Paragraph 7.95 should explain that it is possible on reaching the road to walk into Lyminge using the existing walkway alongside the road (site promoter);
- Paragraph 7.97 - the two plots with planning permission on Teddars Leas Road have now been developed (site promoter);
- Object to the estimated capacity - it should be 35 units (site promoter);
- Object to criterion 11 (sewerage connection). It should begin: "*If possible a connection ...*" (site promoter);
- Object to criterion 12 (access to sewerage infrastructure). It should begin: "*Current level of access is maintained ...*" (site promoter);
- The allocation needs to satisfy the three tests in paragraph 116 of the NPPF. There is a need to undertake a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (CPRE);
- There is insufficient information in the plan to understand the housing need context within which new development is proposed within the AONB (CPRE);
- Support for criteria 6 and 10, regarding new footpaths, crossing points and measures to calm traffic, public right of way and bridleway (Kent County Council);
- Local roads are not capable of taking any additional traffic;
- Local infrastructure concerns (including sewage);
- Retention of existing vegetation along both south eastern and south western boundaries is essential. There should be a requirement for tree planting and for road design to be appropriate to the Kent Downs location. Without these additional safeguards the policy is in conflict with the NPPF and the AONB Management Plan (Kent Downs AONB Unit); and
- Canterbury Road will need to be widened to at least 5.5 metres along the site frontage to accommodate two-way traffic flow (Kent County Council).

Policy ND10: Land adjacent to the Golf Course, Etchinghill

10.15. Eight representations were received relating to Policy ND10 and Picture 7.15. These raised the following issues:

- Local roads are not capable of taking any additional traffic;
- Local infrastructure concerns (including sewage);
- Support for criterion 5 (public bridleway) (Kent County Council);
- Amend criterion 5 (public bridleway) to add: “... *subject to no adverse impact on the existing golf course operations*” (site promoter);
- New criterion is needed: “*Access is maintained to the existing underground sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes*” (Southern Water);
- Amended site boundary submitted; size amended to 0.73 hectares (site promoter);
- Concern raised by local resident that the site boundary included land they owned;
- The land owner should not develop further golf course land;
- The developer should maintain high quality development standards;
- Developer contributions towards improved byways and footpaths should be provided upfront; and
- Amend criteria 1 and 2 (design and materials) to read “high quality” rather than “highest quality” (site promoter).

Alternative Site Submissions – North Downs Area

10.16. Four representations were received promoting alternative sites in the North Downs Character Area. These representations were:

- Land rear of Lyndon Hall, Lyminge - promoted for residential development;
- Land at Red House Lane, Canterbury Road, Lyminge - promoted for residential development;
- Land north of Ashford Road, Sellindge (between Meadowbank and Orchard End) - promoted for residential development. Two options have been submitted - a larger site (3.16ha) and a smaller frontage development (0.52ha); and
- Land surrounding Grove House, Sellindge²¹.

10.17. In addition a comment promoting a site (Land adjacent to The Willows, adjoining A20, Lympe) was recorded against the local plan as a whole (see paragraph 3.1 above).

²¹ Allocated within Core Strategy Review – Consultation Draft, Regulation 18 Version (March 2018), Policy CSD9: Sellindge Strategy

Part Two – Development Management Policies

11. Chapter 8: Introduction – Development Management Policies

11.1. No representations were received relating to Chapter 8.

12. Chapter 9: Housing and the Built Environment

12.1. 43 representations were received relating to Chapter 9.

12.2. 11 representations related to the chapter in general and raised the following issues:

- The plan does not adequately support delivery of the local sewerage infrastructure;
- The plan does not include provision for council or genuinely affordable housing;
- A new policy should be inserted to ensure that new developments include a mix of housing, types, tenures and sizes (CPRE Kent);
- The statements in paragraphs 9.19 and 9.20 regarding affordable housing are incorrect and inconsistent with the draft proposed changes to the NPPF. Local authorities are able to set their affordable housing thresholds at a different level where justified by local evidence of need and viability;
- There is a strong need for more affordable housing than the minimum; and
- Paragraph 9.27 should be amended to remove reference to part M4(3) of Building Regulations. This is not a requirement of Policy HB3 and is a higher standard than M4(2) and not the same as M4(3), as currently inferred.

12.3. Other representations related to specific policies and are summarised below.

Policy HB1: Quality Places Through Design

12.4. Three representations were received relating to Policy HB1. The representations raised the following issues:

- Criterion 3 (public open space) should include public rights of way (Kent County Council);
- Reference to Sport England's Active Design guidance should be added (Sport England); and
- The importance of responding to the context of the site and its surroundings should be emphasised (CPRE Kent).

Policy HB2: Cohesive Design

12.5. Four representations were received relating to Policy HB2. The representations raised the following issues:

- Criterion 1 (surroundings) should refer to the promotion of Active Travel (Kent County Council);
- The Heritage Strategy is important and should be delivered urgently;
- Criterion 4 (mix of house types) should be amended to read: *“For housing development, provides a mix of housing types and tenures that meet local requirements and market demands”*; and
- The policy only applies to major development, complex proposals and sensitive sites but should be relevant to all development (CPRE Kent).

Policy HB3: Internal and External Space Standards

- 12.6. Five representations were received relating to Policy HB3 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:
- There is no evidence or justification for adopting the national space standards;
 - The policy should make clear that it is a minimum gross internal floor area and that developments should be designed with a variety of dwelling and garden sizes;
 - Paragraph 9.33 is too prescriptive; and
 - Paragraph 9.34 calculates the size of communal gardens but this is not referred to in Policy HB3 and it is unclear how this is derived or applied.

Policy HB4: Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Development

- 12.7. Four representations were received relating to Policy HB4. The representations raised the following issues:
- Otterpool Park should be exempt from a prescriptive “no less than five per cent” target to reflect the need for certainty of delivery;
 - The policy should clarify whether or not it applies to future reserved matters applications as it could affect the deliverability and viability of developments which already benefit from outline permission;
 - The burden for delivery of self-build plots is placed on house-builders without looking at other delivery mechanisms; and
 - Criteria 1 and 2 are not justified or consistent with national policy.

Policy HB5: Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside

- 12.8. One representation (CPRE Kent) was received relating to Policy HB5. This stated that:
- The policy or supporting text should clarify that the original building should not be of architectural or historic merit; and
 - The policy should specify a “modest” increase in size to avoid the loss of smaller and more affordable homes in rural areas.

Policy HB6: Local Housing Needs in Rural Areas

- 12.9. Three representations were received relating to Policy HB6 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:
- The policy is too restrictive, conflicting with national policy for local planning authorities to be ambitious for securing homes; and
 - The policy should specify that the tenure mix of affordable homes should reflect the identified need (CPRE Kent).

Policy HB7: Dwellings to Support a Rural-based Enterprise

- 12.10. One representation was received (CPRE Kent) relating to Policy HB7. This raised the following issues:
- The reference to “in the last year” should be extended to “three years”; and
 - Criterion 1 should refer to workers who are primarily employed at the enterprise itself.

Policy HB8: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Buildings

- 12.11. One representation was received relating to Policy HB8. This stated that criterion 3 is too prescriptive and should allow appropriate design solutions, even if two-storey and flat-roofed, provided it can be justified.

Policy HB9: Annexe Accommodation

- 12.12. One representation was received relating to Policy HB9. This stated that it is important that an annex is not capable of being converted to a separate dwelling, that it has a clear dependency on the main dwelling and is subordinate (CPRE Kent).

Policy HB10: Development of Residential Gardens

- 12.13. Four representations were received relating to Policy HB10 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- The policy is not sufficiently detailed to control new building in gardens;
- The supporting text should clarify that the policy is not applicable to gardens in the wider countryside (CPRE Kent); and
- The importance of gardens to wildlife and reducing rainwater run-off should be recognised (CPRE Kent).

Policy HB11: Loss of Residential Care Homes and Institutions

- 12.14. Two representations were received relating to Policy HB11 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- Paragraph 9.77 fails to identify extra-care housing;
- The policy is overly restrictive and would harm the NHS's ability to meet local healthcare needs and provide suitable facilities (NHS); and
- NHS request that criterion 1 be amended to read: *"The applicant has provided a viability report, unless the loss of facilities arises from an NHS Service modernisation strategy following a rationalisation programme, demonstrating that..."*

Policy HB12: Development of New or Extended Residential Institutions (C2 Use)

- 12.15. One representation was received relating to Policy HB12. This stated that:

- The policy suggests that it is only care homes and residential homes that fall within Use Class C2 which is not the case; and
- The policy should be amended to include extra-care accommodation.

Policy HB13: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)

- 12.16. No representations were received relating to Policy HB13.

Policy HB14: Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers

- 12.17. Two representations were received relating to Policy HB14. The representations stated that no specific sites for Romany and Travellers are identified and sites should be specifically allocated to meet travellers' needs.

13. Chapter 10: Economy

13.1. 21 representations were received relating to Chapter 10.

13.2. Four representations related to the chapter in general and raised the following issues:

- The council has not carried forward Policy TR15²² regarding London Ashford Airport (LAA) nor developed a new policy that takes account of the planning permission for expansion. This undermines the importance of LAA and its potential to improve the district's economy; and
- Dungeness 'A' should be afforded a site-specific policy and allocation to facilitate decommissioning and remediation, together with employment (B1/B2/B8) uses and energy generation.

13.3. Other representations related to specific policies and are summarised below.

Policy E1: New Employment Allocations

13.4. Three representations were received relating to Policy E1. The representations raised the following issues:

- Link Park is located within the Otterpool Park Framework Masterplan area. The long-term aspiration is to deliver primary low-scale and low-density housing, with an element of medium-density housing at Link Park, with an overall ambition to deliver new employment space elsewhere. The masterplan provides dedicated employment space to the north east of the area, which is a more sustainable location close to junction 11 of the M20 and Westenhanger railway station. Policies should enable flexibility to deliver this;
- The following should be added to the policy: *"For sites located within the AONB or its setting, a high quality of design that responds to the site's sensitive location will be required, paying particular regard to materials, massing and roofscape"* (Kent Downs AONB Unit); and
- There is confusion regarding Policies E1 and RL11: Former Silver Spring Site, Park Farm. Policy E1 states *"a proportion of non-business class uses (up to 25 per cent) will be permitted provided it can be demonstrated that ..."* However, Policy RL11 allows more than 25 per cent non-B classes uses. To make the policy effective the first sentence should be reworded to read: *"The sites identified below are protected for business uses under use classes B1 (business), B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) unless otherwise stated in policy E1 or in other policies within the plan"*.

Policy E2: Existing Employment Allocations

13.5. Two representations were received relating to Policy E2. The representations raised the following issues:

- The six month marketing period is inadequate since it is not unusual for employment sites to remain unlet for a number of years – this reflects the economy and business flexibility, rather than the attractiveness of a site; and
- The long-term protection of all existing employment sites under Policy E2 is not an effective approach. A less prescriptive approach is needed, including B Uses Classes, public and community uses and main town centre uses.

²² 2006 Shepway Local Plan Review Policy TR15: Lydd Airport

Policy E3: Tourism

13.6. Five representations were received relating to Policy E3 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- Criterion 5 (diversification) is unnecessary as there should be no requirement to have to demonstrate the 'need' for a development. Criterion 6 (new tourist accommodation) should not apply to the expansion of facilities - there is little point in looking for alternative sites if the proposal is to expand an existing facility;
- Tourism development in the countryside should also have to meet criteria 1-5 as it would be inconsistent for these to be applied at the urban edge but not in the countryside; and
- The policy should ensure that development would not have a significant impact in terms of traffic, nocturnal character or tranquillity.

Policy E4: Hotels and Guest Houses

13.7. There were no representations relating to Policy E4.

Policy E5: Touring and Static Caravan, Chalet and Camping Sites

13.8. Three representations were received relating to Policy E5. The representations raised the following issues:

- Redevelopment of caravan parks for residential use should be supported where it can be demonstrated that the accommodation is no longer required or an alternative site can be found and the site is within an area with a high housing requirement;
- The list of tourist accommodation should be amended to read: "*chalet, caravan, cabin, hut, pod, lodges or camping sites*";
- Minor expansions to sites should be screened from public rights of way (Kent County Council); and
- A requirement should be added to demonstrate that the business has been marketed at a reasonable rate and for an appropriate period of time (two to three years).

Policy E6: Farm Diversification

13.9. One representation was received relating to Policy E6. This stated that:

- The supporting text needs to be clear how this policy relates to Policies E3 and E7 in terms of tourism accommodation;
- An additional criterion should be added to ensure that new uses do not increase traffic to the detriment of the character of rural lanes; and
- The policy or the supporting text could usefully make reference to historic assets and their setting.

Policy E7: Reuse of Rural Buildings

13.10. One representation was received relating to Policy E7. This stated that:

- This policy also refers to new rural buildings. The relationship to Policies E3 and E6 is not clear;
- The reference to the vitality and functioning of nearby rural towns and businesses is not clear;

- Criterion 3 (access) should require that development does not increase traffic to the detriment of the character of rural lanes;
- Criterion 4 (AONB) should ensure high quality design that conserves and enhances landscapes or improves the quality and character of an area. It would be sufficient to refer to the AONB policy and the management plan; and
- The final paragraph of the policy is somewhat confusing. More detail is necessary to judge whether sufficient effort has been made to find a business reuse before residential can be considered.

Policy E8: Provision of Fibre to the Premises

13.11. Two representations were received relating to Policy E8 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- The written Ministerial Statement (25 March 2015) confirms that *“the optional new national technical standard should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has be considered, in accordance with the NPPG”*. It is not considered that the required assessment has been undertaken; and
- Paragraph 10.52 should be updated, as 95 per cent of homes and businesses in Kent now have access to a superfast broadband service of at least 24mbps.

14. Chapter 11: Retail and Leisure

14.1. 19 representations were received relating to Chapter 11.

Policy RL1: Retail Hierarchy

14.2. Two representations were received relating to Policy RL1. The representations raised the following issues:

- The policy sets out a clear hierarchy as to where retail and town centre development should be focused, as well as setting out that development should be of an appropriate scale in accordance with the centre's position in the hierarchy; and
- Support the 'town centre first' approach; however, Otterpool Park should be identified as a potential future town centre in the retail hierarchy.

Policy RL2: Folkestone Major Town Centre

14.3. Three representations were received relating to Policy RL2 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- Guildhall Street should be de-pedestrianised to revitalise the town centre;
- The policy is incomplete as it fails to identify a primary shopping area, which is required to apply the sequential test;
- The policy should be amended to allow for a continuous frontage of two or more non-A1 (shops) where it can be demonstrated that this would not harm the vitality and viability of the town centre;
- The text within criterion 1, bullet 2 should be amended to only include D1 uses that are not considered to be main town centre uses but which the council would support within the town centre. The reference to C1 hotel use should be removed;
- The text within criterion 2, bullet 2 should be amended to only include B1, D1 and D2 uses that are not considered to be main town centre uses but which the council would support within the town centre. The reference to C1 hotel use should be removed; and
- Consideration should be given to whether the allocation of almost the entire existing town centre for shops and similar uses, plus significant commercial development in Folkestone Harbour and a positive view on shopping development in Park Farm, are all tenable in Folkestone.

Policy RL3: Hythe Town Centre

14.4. There were no representations relating to Policy RL3.

Policy RL4: New Romney Town Centre

14.5. There were no representations relating to Policy RL4.

Policy RL5: Cheriton District Centre

14.6. One representation was received relating to Policy RL5. This objected to the recommendation of the town centre study that additional supermarket space is provided if a suitable site becomes available within the centre (indicatively up to 1,000sqm).

Policy RL6: Sandgate Local Centre

14.7. There were no representations relating to Policy RL6.

Policy RL7: Other District and Local Centres

14.8. There were no representations relating to Policy RL7.

Policy RL8: Development Outside Town, District and Local Centres

14.9. Two representations were received relating to Policy RL8. The representations raised the following issues:

- The current wording of the policy could be misinterpreted to support town centre uses on inappropriate sites. The first sentence should be amended to read: *“planning permission for town centre uses on the edge of and outside the Major Town Centre, Town Centre, District Centres and Local Centres will be permitted provided that...”* and to include an additional criterion to make it clear that these town centres uses will only be acceptable where they do not conflict with any other development plan or national policy;
- Criterion 2 should be amended to read: *“A full assessment is provided of the impact that the proposal would have on the vitality and viability of all centres that are likely to be affected and on existing, committed and planned investment within them, relating to the scale and type of development proposed in accordance with the requirement of the NPPF and PPG”*; and
- The lowering of the retail impact assessment threshold to 500sqm outside of major town centres and 200sqm gross outside of local centres would significantly restrict smaller, specialist entrants to the retail market.

Policy RL9: Design, Location and Illumination of Advertisements

14.10. There were no representations relating to Policy RL9.

Policy RL10: Shop Fronts, Blinds and Security Shutters

14.11. There were no representations relating to Policy RL10.

Policy RL11: Former Silver Spring Site, Park Farm

14.12. Seven representations were received relating to Policy RL11 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- The site mix includes provision of a hotel, contrary to the conclusions of the employment land supply evidence;
- The supporting text (paragraph 11.70) which “suggests” other suitable uses in addition to employment, conflicts with the specific policy wording where the site is allocated for a hotel use;
- The policy which advocates retail and leisure uses, subject to an impact assessment, is self-defeating, particularly if impacts are significant. In such cases, uses may be policy compliant and policy non-compliant at the same time;
- The policy, in seeking to safeguard against town centre impacts of leisure uses fails to consider the impact of the hotel use;
- In allocating the hotel use, Policy E3 would carry less weight and could potentially conflict with Policy RL11;

- The provision of a new hotel may result in impacts on the existing hotels and conflict with paragraph 10.33, which seeks to resist the loss of visitor accommodation;
- There is no justification for the inclusion of retail, restaurants and cafes, hotel or leisure uses on this site, and doing so will undermine the 'town centre first' approach. It is also likely to lead to the loss of a well-located and high quality employment site;
- Object to the hotel use being presented in the singular and the mix including the qualification that uses should be 'non-residential'; and
- A contribution should be provided towards aiding the vitality and viability of Folkestone town centre.

Policy RL12: Former Harbour Railway Line

14.13. Four representations were received relating to Policy RL12 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- Support the positive and flexible approach seeking to connect the exciting proposals at the Seafront and the town centre to the east; and
- A new mode of transport should be provided that services Folkestone East to the Seafront.

15. Chapter 12: Community

- 15.1. 28 representations were received relating to Chapter 12.
- 15.2. Four representations (commenting on Princes Parade, Hythe) related to the chapter in general and stated that: Princes Parade is used by the people of Hythe and Sandgate for recreation; it is full of wildlife and provides access to the beach; it is historic and a tourist attraction; the public are against the development.
- 15.3. Other representations related to specific policies and are summarised below.

Policy C1: Creating A Sense of Place

- 15.4. Three representations were received relating to Policy C1. The representations raised the following issues:
- Older Persons' schemes may be over 10 units in size but are likely to be placed in apartment form on small centrally-located sites where public art provision is neither necessary nor reasonable;
 - The policy is overly restrictive and does not reflect the various ways of creating a sense of place, as detailed in paragraph 58 of the NPPF; and
 - Intentions need to be managed and landowners should not dictate what's provided.

Policy C2: Safeguarding Community Facilities

- 15.5. Four representations were received relating to Policy C2 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:
- The policy is overly restrictive and would harm the NHS's ability to meet local healthcare needs and provide suitable facilities. The requirement for substantial periods of marketing could prevent or delay investment;
 - The policy only refers to particular uses, i.e. cultural facilities such as theatres. Paragraph 12.2 should be revised to better reflect the matters described in paragraph 12.1 and the types of facilities described in NPPF paragraph 70; and
 - Sometimes, community facilities cannot be 'valued' in commercial terms as they have such significance to the local community.

Policy C3: Provision of Open Space

- 15.6. Seven representations were received relating to Policy C3 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:
- Specialised housing for older people is unlikely to place much, if any, additional burden on open space facilities;
 - The Open Spaces Strategy is not available to the public;
 - Land at Princes Parade should be included in the protected open spaces;
 - Princes Parade is a historic and a tourist attraction, it should remain an open area;
 - There is no policy which specifically protects playing fields. The final paragraph would fulfil this function if it makes clear that existing open spaces include playing fields;
 - Allotments should be mentioned as facilities that should be maintained, and in the medium-term considered for expansion; and
 - The policy is contrary to NPPF paragraph 74 which seeks to protect open space and recreational buildings and land. The policy wording indicates open spaces will

be safeguarded but then indicates a presumption in favour of development proposals provided certain criteria are met.

Policy C4: Children's Play Space

- 15.7. One representation was received relating to Policy C4 stating that there is no need for provision within older persons' housing schemes.

Local Green Spaces

- 15.8. Nine representations were received relating to the supporting text on Local Green Spaces (paragraphs 12.45-12.49). These representations raised the following issues:

- Reference could be made to important spaces;
- Why build on any available space? (specific reference is made to Land at Princes Parade, Hythe);
- The land at Princes Parade should be left for local people and visitors to enjoy the canal and to give them access to the beach;
- Land at Station Road and Princes Parade sites should be identified as 'Local Green Spaces';
- The Open Space assessment is too narrowly interpreted and excludes areas which are clearly demonstrably special;
- The area of open space next to Seabrook adjacent to 280 Seabrook Road and opposite 203 and 205 Seabrook Road should be identified as a Local Green Space;
- It is not sound to treat the protection of local green spaces in the Kent Downs AONB in the same way as any other open land; and
- The policy should include a mechanism for people to propose sites in areas not covered by a Neighbourhood Plan.

16. Chapter 13: Transport

16.1. 19 representations were received relating to Chapter 13.

16.2. Five representations related to the chapter in general and raised the following issues:

- Where a development impacts on the strategic road network, the requirement for a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement would need to be agreed with Highways England rather than using indicative thresholds based on the archived DfT guidance. Highways England would also want to agree the scope of the TA or TS at pre-application stage in conjunction with the local highway authority;
- There is no reference to key Highways England documents including 'The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development' and 'Planning for the Future: A guide to working with Highways England on planning matters';
- The plan should include a policy which encourages London Ashford Airport's continued expansion;
- There is no strategic overview showing the cumulative effects that existing and proposed developments will have on the transportation network in Hythe and surrounding areas;
- The Transport Strategy was commissioned in May 2010 - this should be updated before the local plan is approved; and
- There is no overall transport strategy that takes into account the work done by the Roads Review Group.

16.3. Other representations related to specific policies and are summarised below.

Policy T1: Street Hierarchy and Site Layout

16.4. Two representations were received relating to Policy T1. These supported the inclusion of reference to active frontages and active travel routes.

Policy T2: Parking Standards, including Table 13.1 (IGN3: Guidance Table for Residential Parking)

16.5. Seven representations were received relating to Policy T2, Table 13.1 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- The policy is not clear as to how the standards will be applied, referring to these as a "starting point". This does not accord with NPPF (paragraph 154). The policy should state when departures will be acceptable (e.g. in achieving good design);
- Reference to maximum parking standards should be removed from the Guidance Table for Residential Parking, as it is contrary to the NPPF (paragraph 39);
- Footnotes at the bottom of Table 13.1 should be removed, since they conflict with the advice in Policy T2, for example in respect of tandem parking spaces;
- In relation to IGN3: Guidance Table for Residential Parking, houses with more than one bedroom in such areas are highly likely to be occupied by more than one adult and a blanket limit of one parking space per unit, even for homes of 4+ bedrooms, could be problematic;
- IGN3: Guidance Table for Residential Parking does not differentiate parking requirements for older person's developments; and
- The residential parking standards should be mandatory.

Policy T2: Parking Standards

- The council must be clear as to how it defines an area with a *“history of on-street parking problems”*;
- The requirement that parking courts should be small in size, with no more than five properties using each courtyard (criterion 4), should not apply to apartment buildings. For apartment blocks over four dwellings, it would be impossible to comply;
- The size of a “larger car” and the space required for “the movement of wheeled waste bins to a collection point” are undefined (criterion 8);
- The requirement to provide one charging point per dwelling is not evidenced or justified nor has consideration been given to design or viability (criterion 9). No assessment has been undertaken as to the requirement that would be placed on National Grid and what (if any) additional infrastructure needs to be planned for;
- The policy would require significant amounts of car parking to be provided for developments within the town centre, although such locations encourage travel by more sustainable modes and car parking is often available locally. The effect of requiring the same parking provision for central and out-of-centre developments will be to reduce the density of development in more central locations, increasing overall development costs and potentially making sites unviable or undevelopable;
- Tandem on-plot parking for homes which are provided with more than one parking space should not be encouraged unless it can be clearly demonstrated that it is not going to lead to unacceptable unplanned parking (criterion 7); and
- The policy is unsound in relation to non-residential and commercial parking standards as it does not consider the location of development and how that may influence the need for car parking.

Policy T3: Residential Garages

- 16.6. One representation was received relating to Policy T3. This stated that there is no evidence to demonstrate why garages cannot be counted toward parking numbers and why they should be oversized. Evidence that garages are underused (IGN3) is 10 years old and based on insubstantial evidence.

Policy T4: Parking for Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs)

- 16.7. Three representations were received relating to Policy T4. The representations raised the following issues:
- The policy should require new businesses, or those that are extended and result in an increase in HGV movements, to demonstrate that sufficient provision is made for the movement and parking of HGVs in a way that does not lead to the public highway being used inappropriately; and
 - Given the relationship of the Kent Downs AONB boundary with the strategic road network, it is likely that HGV parking proposals may come forward within the AONB and/or its setting. The AONB Unit therefore requests inclusion of an additional criterion: *“If located within the Kent Downs AONB or its setting, the proposal conserves the landscape character and special qualities of the Kent Downs AONB and incorporates appropriate mitigation”*.

Policy T5: Cycle Parking

- 16.8. One representation was received relating to Policy T5. This states that the size requirements for garages incorporating cycle parking (paragraph 13.34) are not detailed and the ability to remove bicycles is likely to be dependent on the size of the car, therefore it is not clear how the policy can be applied.

17. Chapter 14: Natural Environment

- 17.1. 40 representations were received relating to Chapter 14.
- 17.2. Four representations related to the chapter in general. Representations raised the following issues:
- Since the previous consultation on Preferred Options, Defra has published its 25 Year Environmental Plan. This should be referenced in the plan and the key policy to achieve environmental net gain included;
 - A green infrastructure policy should be included. This could be tied into the rural tourism aspect of capitalising on the natural beauty of the district; and
 - The land at Princes Parade should be left for local people and visitors to enjoy outdoor recreation, the canal and to give access to the beach. The area is open space and full of wildlife. At all the public consultations the public said ‘no’ to this development.
- 17.3. Other representations related to specific policies and are summarised below.

Policy NE1: Enhancing and Managing Access to the Natural Environment

- 17.4. Six representations were received relating to Policy NE1. The representations raised the following issues:
- The Green Infrastructure Strategy and Sustainable Access Strategy will be key. The policy should also serve to relieve potential recreational pressure on other designated sites;
 - The Rights of Way Improvement Plan should be referred to;
 - The plan does not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that development in the district (and potentially beyond the district) will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of Natura 2000 sites;
 - Support the development of a robust strategy for mitigating recreational disturbance to European designated sites. Note the continuing work in developing a strategic approach to reduce significant impacts to the Dungeness complex;
 - The development of the land at Princes Parade should not happen: this is an open space for the people of Hythe; and
 - Managing access through land-use planning is unlikely to be achievable.

Policy NE2: Biodiversity

- 17.5. Six representations were received relating to Policy NE2 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:
- Defra’s 25 Year Environment Plan includes a specific commitment for environmental net gain through development. All developments should achieve biodiversity net gain, and that is reflected in Policy NE2 and Housing and Built Development policies. Policy wording or supporting text includes a need for planning applications to be accompanied by a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan;
 - Phrasing of “expect” doesn’t provide the necessary strength to indicate that maintaining the ecological integrity is a lawful requirement;
 - The local planning authority is able to consider if there are “imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI)” when reviewing development proposals. These considerations should be reflected within the policy wording;

- Include Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs) within the Local Sites criteria to demonstrate that the council is conserving its LWS network;
- The policy does not specifically refer to appropriate ecological surveys, only “appropriate safeguarding measures”. Mitigation can only be constructed when it is based on appropriate ecological surveys;
- Include reference to the Hythe Bay Marine Conservation Zone;
- The policy does not provide sufficient guidance to ensure that development minimises impacts on biodiversity and achieves net gains;
- Detailed policy wording should establish the importance of ensuring development contributes to the creation and maintenance of habitat networks;
- Supporting text should explain the importance of conservation outside protected sites. ‘Living landscapes’ and landscape-scale biodiversity networks (including Biodiversity Opportunity Areas), and the role of resilient habitat networks to allow species to respond to the changing climate, should be explained;
- Include policy wording which refers to irreplaceable habitats, such as ancient woodland, marshland, certain hedgerows, veteran trees and traditional orchards;
- Include supporting text which ensures the relationship between the planning process and Biodiversity Action Plans and the national strategy ‘Biodiversity 2020’ is clear. Habitats and species of principal importance are not mentioned;
- The policy should be amended to ensure it is clear that mitigation provided on-site or in the immediate locality is preferred to off-site compensation. It needs to be clear that mitigation must be in the control of the developer; and
- There are too many “get out” clauses. In relation to European sites, the bar is “adverse impacts” not “significant adverse impacts”.

Policy NE3: Protecting the District’s Landscapes and Countryside

17.6. Six representations were received relating to Policy NE3 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- The policy should refer to NPPF paragraphs 115 and 116;
- The policy should refer to preserving and enhancing the role and distinctiveness of landscapes and utilise landscape character assessment;
- The final section, ‘Landscape Character Areas’, should be amended; development should respond to the landscape character of the locality. The policy should ensure that the value, character, amenity and tranquillity of the district’s landscapes are protected and enhanced where appropriate;
- Too many “get out” clauses; and
- Support; however there is an error in criterion 2 of the policy – “setting” should read “siting”.

Policy NE4: Equestrian Development

17.7. Two representations were received relating to Policy NE4. The representations raised the following issues:

- Protection of existing bridleway provision should be included; and
- The control of lighting and the impact on night-time views should be given more emphasis.

Policy NE5: Light Pollution and External Illumination

17.8. Four representations were received relating to Policy NE5 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- The policy is too restrictive and could unnecessarily prohibit development. The requirement for all major development applications to be accompanied by a lighting assessment must be removed;
- Concerned about the impact of lighting on rivers and other watercourses: this needs to be assessed when the council considers planning applications near water;
- Light pollution is not related to ‘tranquillity’ as defined within the glossary and the reference should be removed; and
- The policy or text should acknowledge the need for appropriate lighting at London Ashford Airport.

Policy NE6: Land Stability

17.9. No representations were received relating to Policy NE6.

Policy NE7: Contaminated Land

17.10. Five representations were received relating to Policy NE7 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- The council does not have a Contaminated Land Public Register, as this is a statutory requirement the Local Plan cannot be compliant; and
- The development of the land at Princes Parade should not happen: this is an open space for the people of Hythe.

Policy NE8: Integrated Coastal Zone Management

17.11. Four representations were received relating to Policy NE8 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- A co-ordinated approach to marine planning is essential since development can cause erosion or other effects elsewhere along the coast. This could adversely affect seabed ecology and biodiversity, marine ecology and heritage assets, such as the Goodwin sands;
- Pleased to see the inclusion of infrastructure for cycleways and public rights of way; and
- Object to Princes Parade, Hythe.

Policy NE9: Development Around The Coast

17.12. Three representations were received relating to Policy NE9. The representations raised the following issues:

- Object to Princes Parade; and
- Support the inclusion of reference to the “England Coast Path National Trail” and amended text in criterion 5.

18. Chapter 15: Climate Change

18.1. 14 representations were received relating to Chapter 15.

Policy CC1: Reducing Carbon Emissions

18.2. Four representations were received relating to Policy CC1 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- Paragraph 15.16 clarifies that policy CC1 will be applied to reserved matter applications. This policy could therefore be applied to developments that already benefit from outline consent;
- The policy is contrary to national guidance which identifies that energy requirements for new housing are a matter to be addressed through Building Regulations rather than the planning system;
- No evidence has been prepared to show that it would not negatively impact on viability;
- The supporting text should refer to the energy hierarchy as the primary means by which minimise energy use and CO₂ emissions;
- The use of decentralised energy should be considered before renewable energy; and
- The threshold for reducing carbon emissions could be lower - a 10 per cent reduction in carbon emissions is quite conservative.

Policy CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction

18.3. Five representations were received relating to Policy CC2 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- South East Kent is an area of water shortage and insufficient use is being made of “grey water”;
- Criterion 1 (water efficiency) - the council has not published an up-to-date viability assessment and has stated in paragraph 15.20 that the district is already under severe water stress but have not provided any evidence to support this;
- Criterion 2 (non-residential development) should not be applied to developments that already benefit from outline planning consent, especially where there have already been issues of viability;
- Criteria 3 and 4 (passive design and future adaption) are vague and not clearly defined;
- Flexibility was previously included within Policy CC2 to allow negotiation;
- Support the new optional standard of water efficiency in new dwellings mentioned in paragraph 15.5 and specified in Policy CC2 criterion 1 and also support the expectation of non-residential developments reaching at least the BREEAM standard of “Very Good”, mentioned in paragraph 15.21, and specified in policy CC2 criterion 2;
- The policy might be divided into two sections, so that essential site layout, orientation and infrastructure requirements are discernible from measures associated with building construction, materials and technology;
- The first paragraph should “require” development to be resilient to climate change and encourage all developments to meet the highest standards that are financially viable;
- The policy should make clear whether the information sought should be included in the design and access statement, or as a separate statement;
- Some measures should be framed more positively; and

- Water efficiency measures should be included.

Policy CC3: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

18.4. Two representations were received relating to Policy CC3. The representations raised the following issues:

- Paragraph 15.35 outlines that for brownfield sites discharge rates should be reduced to the equivalent of greenfield run-off rates. On many brownfield sites it may be impossible to achieve this; and
- Supporting text should be reordered so that the SuDS measures clearly encourage a hierarchical approach. Potential value to ecological networks should be mentioned.

Policy CC4: Wind Turbine Development

18.5. One representation was received relating to Policy CC4. This raised the following issues:

- The plan should recognise the importance of consultation beyond the neighbourhood plan boundary;
- The plan should be clear how a proposal will be considered if an application is submitted without the benefit of a neighbourhood plan allocation; and
- There should be a presumption against large-scale wind turbine development in the AONB and on best and most versatile agricultural land.

Policy CC5: Small Scale Wind Turbines and Existing Development

18.6. One representation was received relating to Policy CC5. This stated that the policy is unclear in relation to: the scale of turbine that is acceptable; the means by which cumulative impacts will be considered; and the expected relationship to the dwelling.

Policy CC6: Solar Farms

18.7. One representation was received relating to Policy CC6. The representation raised the following issues:

- Criterion 1 (AONB) should refer to the setting of heritage assets and ‘valued’ landscapes. Impact on landscape character should be mentioned. There should be a presumption against large-scale wind turbine and solar farm developments in the AONB;
- It is unclear what value the word “direct” has (criterion 2);
- Criterion 3 (ancillary works) should refer to the sensitive siting of ancillary buildings;
- Ecological enhancements, such as pollinator habitat, should also be sought;
- The reference to best and most versatile agricultural land is supported; and
- The policy should prioritise previously developed land and buildings.

19. Chapter 16: Health and Wellbeing

19.1. Nine representations were received relating to Chapter 16.

Policy HW1: Promoting Healthier Food Environments

19.2. Three representations were received relating to Policy HW1. The representations raised the following issues:

- No assessment has been made of: the numbers or densities of hot food takeaways that are needed or harmful; the distance from schools at which harm might occur; the numbers that might be refused; the resulting job losses; or the resulting journey length increases;
- The policy is not supported by evidence and will do nothing to assist in reducing child obesity;
- Primary school pupils are not normally permitted to leave school at lunchtime and would be accompanied to and from school;
- Food high in fat, salt or sugar is sold at a wide variety of facilities in many Use Classes, including many supermarkets, and focussing on one type of land use is not an effective solution;
- The approach assumes all hot food takeaways serve the same type and standard of food; and
- National Planning Practice Guidance does not recommend banning hot food takeaways based on proximity to schools.

Policy HW2: Improving the Health and Wellbeing of the Local Population and Reducing Health Inequalities

19.3. Two representations were received relating to Policy HW2. The representations raised the following issues:

- The requirement to undertake a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) unnecessarily replicates the requirement of policy which already takes health considerations into account;
- The piecemeal preparation of HIAs when sites come forward risks the deliverability and viability of sites;
- The policy should make clear that it does not apply to developments which already benefit from outline consent. This would stop HIAs being requested at both the outline and reserved matter stages; and
- The requirement to explain how development facilitates health and well-being is unnecessary and an additional burden on applicants.

Policy HW3: Development That Supports Healthy, Fulfilling and Active Lifestyles

19.4. Two representations were received relating to Policy HW3. The representations raised the following issues:

- The policy would be strengthened through a reference to Sport England's Active Design guidance;
- The policy would cover all applications including reserved matter applications which follow on from outline applications that already have consent (granted before this policy comes into effect). Such developments would not have been able to account for the additional burden, potentially affecting the deliverability of sites; and

- The policy is inflexibly worded in requiring all new major developments to incorporate productive landscapes in the design and layout of buildings and landscaping - this may not always be practical.

Policy HW4: Promoting Active Travel

19.5. Two representations were received relating to Policy HW4. The representations raised the following issues:

- The Active Travel Strategy and the Rights of Way Improvement Plan should be referenced and supported in this policy; and
- A 'Green Walk' or 'Martello Trail' has been proposed that would add to the list of walks available in Folkestone; this should be added to the policy.

20. Chapter 17: Historic Environment

20.1. 36 representations were received relating to Chapter 17.

20.2. 14 representations related to the chapter in general and raised the following issues:

- Concern that the Heritage Strategy has not yet been completed, consulted on or adopted;
- The Heritage Strategy should preserve the heritage of the district and not 'build, build, build';
- The plan should include policies or text to assist on issues such as 'setting', for each conservation area and include an action plan for the next two years;
- The allocation of land at Princes Parade has been raised; and
- Revisions strengthen the historic environment purpose of the plan (Historic England).

20.3. Other representations related to specific policies and are summarised below.

Policy HE1: Heritage Assets

20.4. Six representation were received relating to Policy HE1 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- Strategic assets are based on a document not in the public domain;
- Supporting paragraphs are vague - the plan needs clear aims so that heritage assets are protected; and
- More explanation should be given regarding the criteria for applications being approved, or what would be denied. There should be a formal requirement for any assets demolished or altered to be recorded to set standards.

Policy HE2: Archaeology

20.5. Five representations were received relating to Policy HE2 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- There is no mention of a need for specialist advice or what happens when archaeology is discovered;
- Archaeological field evaluation and/or historic building assessment should be an essential planning condition; and
- The reference to the Areas of Archaeological Potential (AAP) should be removed.

Policy HE3: Local List of Heritage Assets

20.6. Seven representations were received relating to Policy HE3 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- The supporting text needs to clarify what level of protection will be given;
- How do local people identify and put forward suggestions - there is no timeline. Could the old Grade III listings be used?;
- Local lists should be recognised throughout the planning stages; and
- The policy does not accord with the NPPF as it does not balance the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of a heritage asset with the desirability of new development; it is too far reaching; and the criteria are too broad.

Policy HE4: Folkestone's Historic Gardens

20.7. Four representations were received relating to Policy HE4 and supporting text. The representations raised the following issues:

- The section is relevant to parks and gardens throughout the district and should be renamed "Shepway's Historic Parks and Gardens";
- If parks and gardens are covered by Policy HE1, why are they not mentioned in it?; and
- The policy could create a barrier to statutory utility providers in delivering essential infrastructure.

21. Chapter 18: Monitoring

21.1. No representations were received relating to Chapter 18.

22. Policies Map

22.1. Six representations were received relating to the Policies Map. Representations raised the following issues:

- Introduction - a revision is requested to the settlement confines at Kitewell Lane, Lydd;
- Picture 2.8 - Princes Parade - sufficient care has not been taken to protect this historic site and the allocation is contrary to the NPPF;
- Paragraph 3.12 - Coast Drive Car Park, Greatstone - Object to the allocation on the basis of: the principle of development; flood risk; impact on surroundings; and environmental impact. The site is the only coach park so its removal would harm tourism. It should remain a community asset; and
- Picture 8.16 - the Civic Society supports the designation of land between the Imperial Green residential development and the Royal Military Canal as “open space”.

23. Places and Policies Local Plan Submission Draft – Sustainability Appraisal

23.1. Two representations were received relating to the Sustainability Appraisal (both from the Environment Agency). Representations raised the following issues:

- Support for the objectives and key strategies relating to remediation of contaminated sites, to maintain or improve groundwater, surface water, river or coastal water; the status of the Water Framework Directive and development where there is adequate foul drainage, sewerage treatment facilities and surface water drainage; and
- Section 1.40 - where there is potential for direct impacts from development on water quality and discharges of treated wastewater, the need for robust drainage assessments should be included.

24. Places and Policies Local Plan Submission Draft – Habitats Regulations Assessment

24.1. No representations were received relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment.