
Local Plan Report to Canterbury City Council

by C J Hoile MA (Oxon) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

The Planning Inspectorate
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☐ GTN 1371 8000

**PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY INTO OBJECTIONS TO THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT
LOCAL PLAN REVIEW**

JUNE 2005

1. CHAPTER ONE

1. OBJECTIONS TO THE INTRODUCTION AND OTHER OBJECTIONS OF A GENERAL NATURE

UNLOCKING THE POTENTIAL

Objections and Key Issues

RN010 Mrs A Wilks (344, 346, 349, 350, 352, 354, 355)

RN120 English Nature (462)

RN255 GOSE (2663)

- Reflect value of nature conservation sites in the introductory text
- Para 4: Reject competition to see who can build the most; would not mean decline, as this would be a desirable place to live and work. The present working spaces would prosper
- Aim should be to improve the quality of life and the environment. This does not mean build, build, build, but making the most of what we have
- Should be moratorium on all development, except conversions of existing properties, with all Council resources going into improving the environment and quality of living
- Re: Economic Growth: Need to stop spiral of development. More employment places = more houses, roads and schools. Reject as key objective
- Nearly all open urban spaces gone; an impossible aim for all new development to be on brownfield land: shutting the stable door once the horse has bolted
- Transport: Development ideas will generate more traffic. Need moratorium to sort out traffic problems: reject this as a key objective
- Reject all key objectives except culture and heritage and regeneration which need not be confined to zones, but be more widely spread

Re: Ai/001

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20546)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20586)

- Say City Council will work in partnership with the County Council & other service providers to ensure that these core aims are delivered
- Add text: which contributes to the economic, cultural and social well-being of the district & secures the redevelopment and re-use of derelict disused & brownfield land wherever it occurs before resorting to any other land

Re: Ai/003

RD134 English Heritage (20504)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20587)

- Add: including areas of derelict land within the E Kent Coalfield after historical assets
- Para could be strengthened by drawing out the regeneration value of utilising the area's heritage rather than appearing as more limited renaissance of culture for culture's sake, would complement para. 4.20

RE: Ai/004

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (20445)

RD133 Reeves & Neylan (20491)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20588)

- Proposal unduly restrictive. Need balance between natural environment & economy. Current restrictive Policy led to average wage levels in district £40 per week below Kent Average
- Add "and to seek out derelict, damaged, despoiled &/or brownfield land wherever it occurs before resorting to use of greenfield land for development"
- Amend to add developed & undeveloped coast, foreshore and beaches

Re: Ai/006

RD004 Blean Parish Council (20210)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RD020 Mrs A Wilks (20040)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20589)

- Delete entire amendment. Reducing journeys times will reduce services at small stations, discouraging train use and encouraging car use. Likely to increase fares
- Add to end "in so far as the same is consistent with the Council's objective or reopening of Chislet Halt as a station for Hersden in order to serve the new & expanded community & employment clusters at Hersden & surrounding area."
- Add that Council will endeavour to ensure that the Parkway Station is built to achieve the full benefits of the high speed rail link

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 1.1 The Council has put forward PCi/001 to amend Ai/003 further by deleting the word "cultural" from the last line of the paragraph. A further Proposed Change – PCi/002 expands the new paragraph created by Ai/004 to bring the categories of developed coast, foreshore and beaches into the list of features mentioned in the last sentence.
- 1.2 The Introduction is and should remain short, without extraneous verbal clutter, and no more than generally informative. The text expresses the outlook of the Council; objections that take a different view about the pace or direction of change envisaged by the Council have failed to change that body's mind, and I see no need to disagree with the Council to the extent of amending its basic planning philosophy. Some textual change has arisen between the Deposit and Revised Deposit Drafts because of objections, but I am generally satisfied by the tenor of the Council's responses to representations (CDs 1.3 and 1.22).
- 1.3 The text of the fourth paragraph in the section named "Unlocking the Potential" will need amendment, in view of the inadequacies I have found elsewhere over the allocated sites to meet the strategic housing requirement. Likewise, the section on the Chapters of the Plan could amend the description of Chapter 2 – Providing Decent Housing, to say something like: "...aim to locate the maximum amount possible on previously developed land...".
- 1.4 The section on the Role and Purpose of the Canterbury District Local Plan would be improved, in terms of public enlightenment, by adding some short account of how the Council sees itself bringing its first Local Development Framework into being, and the implications of the new process in terms of the probable life of this emerging Local Plan.

Recommendation

- 1.5 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes Nos. Ai/001 and Ai/002 as set out in Appendices F1 and F2, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraphs 1.3-1.4 above, but that no other modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

THE ROLE AND PURPOSE OF THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN/CHAPTERS OF THE PLAN

Objections and Key Issues

RN120 English Nature (463)

- Mention the Sustainability Appraisal in the text on page

RE: Ai/007

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20590)

- Council should be clear in its Policy allocations & objectives relating to Regeneration Zones, & dereliction left by minerals working activities in East Kent coalfield rather than deferring positive decisions through monitoring

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 1.6 The Council has met English Nature's objection in the Revised Deposit Draft. The comment by the MHP Partnership is just one of a large number made at both Plan stages to advance the objectors' proposals for Hersden, a matter that I consider later in this report.

Recommendation

- 1.7 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

CHAPTER TWO

2. OBJECTIONS TO THE CHAPTER ON THE KEY VISION AND STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

OUR DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

Objections and Key Issues

RN322 English Heritage (1773)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1569)

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne (2320)

RN120 English Nature (464)

RN208 Thanet District Council (760)

- The addition of the Strategic Development Objectives to the decision-making process is of questionable merit and may confuse the plan
- Concern because Plan indicates that its strategic development objectives will carry more weight than other Local Plan policies
- Delete Paragraph 1.4; not clear that the objectives are actual policies, as they are not named as such
- Strategic development objectives should not take precedence over other policy objectives.
- English Nature objects to a number of the strategic objectives taking precedence over other policies in their current form.

Re: A1/002

RD020 Mrs A Wilks (20039)

RD090 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne (20209)

- Delete "Strategic development.... to Local Plan"; nothing must take precedence over environmental or open space Policy
- Not agreed that strategic development objectives should take precedence over other objectives of Plan

Reasoning and Conclusions

2.1 In paragraphs 2.1 to 2.5 the principle of Strategic Development Objectives is set out. I believe that this is a useful device in an age of detailed development plans; development control decisions often cite a number of plan policies that can be quoted and compared by disappointed developers to show how they contain elements of mutual contradiction. A demonstration of the Council's over-arching concept and its priorities is a vital counter-weight in these circumstances, and there is no proscription I am aware of against the use of such a device.

2.2 Nevertheless, the wording used needs to be considered very carefully, not least because it will be frequently quoted back at the Council in the control of development by applicants, appellants and their advocates. I consider that the removal of the words "take precedence over" from paragraph 1.4 would be worthwhile, as it could not then be plausibly argued that there is some hidden agenda favouring development over non-development. This could be achieved if the second sentence of paragraph 1.4 were re-drafted to read: "The Strategic Development Objectives briefly set out fundamental development principles for the implementation of the vision and key objectives. Consequently, the particular objectives of all other policies in the Local Plan are to be interpreted as having been formulated not to contradict or undermine the Strategic Development Objectives." That redrafting should remove any plausible argument that the existence of the Objectives fetters the discretion of the Council to give appropriate weight to any policy in its consideration of a particular planning proposal.

2.3 The text of paragraph 1.7 will need amendment, in view of the inadequacies I have found in the allocated sites to meet the strategic housing requirement. Likewise the Strategic Development Initiative (a) might start: “..To maximise the delivery of sustainable housing development ...”, because this would retain the purpose of the objective, if anything strengthening it, but also implicitly acknowledge that other sites must be brought into play.

Recommendation

2.4 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraphs 2.2-2.3 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

HOUSING

Objections and Key Issues

- RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (253, 254)
- In 1.6 insert "and the Regeneration Zones/Study Areas" after "urban areas"
 - In 1.7 insert " and Regeneration Zones/Study Areas" after "urban areas"; and at the end of the sentence, refer to safeguarding employment/community/environmental benefits and uses

Reasoning and Conclusions

2.5 These objections are made with the aim of furthering major development at Hersden, but the Plan text, on which I have already commented on above, is not related to the objector's concerns and does not need to be.

Recommendation

2.6 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Objections and Key Issues

- RN320 JTS Partnership (1996)
- RN104 Relf (916)
- RN115 Gardner & Croft (906)
- RN124 Lee Evans de Moubray (902)
- RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2181)
- RN207 Reeves and Neylan (745)
- RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (256, 257)
- Unclear definition in paras. 1.9 to 1.11
 - In 1.9 Amend text to be more precise and clear re reducing economic disparities in the District and East Kent
 - Low average wage levels and high house prices could be targeted but are ignored. The statement 'the plan proposes to address this' is meaningless. Recognition is required that quality and quantity of housing is essential

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- After "colleges" insert reference to housing demand from the growing City student population of the City, also requiring additional housing over and above any new proposals for new campuses
- Add, "and make provision for the accommodation of the growing student population
- Should address need for science and business park with an allocation

ReAI/003

RD137

MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20591)

- Para 1.8 after New Thanet Way add "and the A28 corridor"

Reasoning and Conclusions

2.7 The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC1/001, to add mention of the A28 corridor to the last sentence of amended paragraph 1.8. The other objections are generally seeking expansion of the text to address or expand on particular matters covered elsewhere in specific Plan chapters. That is neither necessary nor desirable in a short crisp chapter like this.

Recommendation

2.8 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC1/001, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

RURAL AREAS

Objections and Key Issues

RN311 Bridge Parish Council (2288)

RN270 The Church Commissioners for England represented by Cluttons (1965)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (258)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2183)

- Village and rural area sustainability has suffered due to policies stopping organic growth. The key objective is meaningless as almost all policies prevent vitality, viability and sustainability.
- Unclear what paragraph means. Further information should be included.
- If objectives for rural areas are to be fulfilled, the strategy needs to provide greater flexibility for residential development in villages. Needed for enhancing vitality and viability

Reasoning and Conclusions

2.9 Having read this paragraph through several times I am still not really sure whether it says anything of real significance. A short definition of "Rural Areas" would help me, at least. If it means everywhere outside the three Urban Area Boundaries, perhaps that could be said. A mention of the need and aim to protect the open countryside for its own sake would be appropriate, lest "thriving" is interpreted as some sort of excuse for avoidable incursions on to undeveloped land.

Recommendation

2.10 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 2.9 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Objections and Key Issues

RN229 Property Review & Development (2608)

- In 1.13, a failure to address adequately the provision of Community and Cultural Services. Development contributions should be sought for these in the town centres

Reasoning and Conclusions

2.11 The Council points out that the matter objected to is addressed in Local Plan Chapter 4. I find there is no need to go into detail here.

Recommendation

2.12 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

REGENERATION ZONES

Objections and Key Issues

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (259)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2496)

RN328 Westbere Parish Council (2410)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1567)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (260, 261)

- Add support for new development which adds to the vitality and viability of the Regeneration Zones/ Study Areas
- Any development at Lakeview should only be granted to give employment opportunities to the Hersden community. The development should be high quality
- The regeneration zone notation should apply to the former colliery land at Hersden
- This statement is acceptable if Hersden is planned so that people live and work there and do not need to travel, as the A28 is already congested
- There is a failure to recognise Hersden's isolation in terms of public transport links and access to services. It should also pass the PPG3 sequential test for future development.
- Add to the text by identifying the Former Colliery Land at Hersden as a location for mixed use development
- Add, "In addition the Council will actively support proposals for the reopening of the former railway station at Hersden."

Re A1/004

RD077 Hillreed Developments Limited (20155)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20592)

- Object to the deletion of paras. on Hersden. Extensive formal & informal public consultation has identified need for additional housing, social & environmental improvements at Hersden. Reinstate and include additional text

Reasoning and Conclusions

2.13 Between the Deposit and the Revised Deposit Draft versions of the Local Plan, the Council thought better of its earlier decision to create a "Regeneration Zone Area of Study" on a large area of land around Hersden Village, enclosed by a boundary line on the Proposals Map. In the Revised Deposit Draft, the Proposals Map shows no demarcated Zone around Hersden Village, and the Plan text is altered radically about future action at Hersden, envisaging a "Community Plan", and deleting previous reference to a Development Brief. The Community Plan process would produce a non-statutory document that would not usurp the functions of a future Local Development Framework about planning decisions. It is seen more as a vehicle for identifying new regeneration needs, to be produced by or before mid-2007.

2.14 I have considered the whole matter of Hersden in my Chapter Three, at paragraphs 3.3.104-3.3.137. I explain there my reasons for agreeing with the Council's change of heart. Consequently, there is no need for a special mention of Hersden in the present Plan Chapter.

Recommendation

2.15 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

PARAGRAPH 1.24 – THE STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

Objections and Key Issues

- | | |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| RN156 | BSF Planning Consultants (1882, 1889, 1890, 1891) |
| RN198 | MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (262, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269) |
| RN322 | English Heritage (1774) |
| RN139 | Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1566) |
| RN260 | Peter Jackson Architects (2186, 2187, 2188, 2189) |
| RN229 | Property Review & Development (2601) |
| RN284 | RSPB (981) |
| RN086 | Thomas (443) |
| RN120 | English Nature (465, 466, 467) |
| RN209 | PACE (774,775) |
| RN061 | PACE (30) |
| RN212 | Canterbury Christ Church University College (804) |
- Re 1.23, the Council's Strategic Development Objectives will carry more weight than other policies in the Plan - allows Council to always argue economic development comes first
 - Paragraphs seem unlikely to provide outcomes which release new land or produce significant growth opportunity for the core business of Canterbury Christ Church University College
 - Insert into objective (a) "and Regeneration Zones/Study Areas" after "urban areas"
 - Re (a) - This is a short term and entirely unsustainable objective with no proper analysis and scant justification
 - Re (a) - English Nature objects because brown field land can have a higher nature conservation value than many green field sites
 - Re (b) -There is no mention of sustainability in this objective

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Re (b) - conflict of policy. The effect of employment land on the environment is more negative than the effect of well designed housing. Quality housing is needed to go with employment land
- Re (c) - add "particularly on brown-field land within the Regeneration Zones/Study Areas."
- Re (d) - add "particularly on brown-field land within the Regeneration Zones/Study Areas."
- Re (e) - Sustainable rural economies need some organic growth, which the plan wholly prevents
- Re (g)- insert "including new housing on brownfield land" after "encourage investment"
- Re (h) - English Nature objects to the wording of this objective as it would seem to override the Habitats Regulations
- Add new (j) to give priority to development projects in areas of deprivation within the East Kent Coalfield area including the Former Colliery Land at Hersden
- Add new paragraph, to select new housing from derelict sites, including the former colliery site at Hersden and not those in existing employment use
- Add new paragraph. In selecting new sites for housing avoid land currently or recently in employment use, avoid land at risk of flooding and in recreational use
- Policies and proposals of plan fail to meet strategic development objectives, with particular reference to: insufficient opportunities for business growth or land for business innovation
- There should be a sustainable rural policy and explanation of how sustainable development will be achieved. It should also clarify how community infrastructure will be met through housing development
- Protection and maintenance of heritage and distinctiveness are worthy of investment support
- Policies and proposals of plan fail to meet strategic development objectives, with particular reference to: insufficient employment land, important employment sites allocated to inappropriate uses
- Policies and proposals of plan fail to examine the needs of rural communities for housing and employment
- Object to statement that the listed strategic development objectives will carry more weight than other policies - as this would endanger Canterbury's environment
- Objectives in paragraph 1.24 won't bring about aims in paragraph 1.23: too biased to promoting business – (b) doesn't say will safeguard environment, (c) sets out no geographical limit, (d) only looks at business, (e,f,g,h) all promote business development
- The Strategic Development Objectives are so broad based that they are capable of overriding every policy in the Local Plan. It is not clear that the objectives are actual policies
- Objectives should be more holistic, with a focus on conserving the natural environment
- The well being of people, environment and local economy should be paramount strategic objectives. The policies as presently drafted would be counter productive in all these areas
- Achieving a better spatial balance of retail provision between Canterbury, Whitstable and Herne Bay would be beneficial and should be a strategic objective
- Additional objective required: A strong policy on the quality of materials and design is essential, particularly if village repair by controlled growth is considered

Re AI/005

RD077	Hillreed Developments Limited (20164)
RD097	English Nature (20257)
RD135	KCC Education and Libraries (20547)
RD020	Mrs A Wilks (20041)

- Object to deletion of Hersden Regeneration Zone in para 1.24 criterion g) – reinstate
- Objects to part a) and part h). Suggests additional text for each criterion
- Maintain objection as amendments does not address KCC's concerns. How will sustainable development pattern be achieved within urban areas & accommodate new community facilities
- Delete "and the wider East Kent Area"

Reasoning and Conclusions

2.16 The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC1/002 to refine and strengthen part (a), to reinstate part (b), and to add to part (h) mention of protecting wildlife in adjacent internationally important sites.

2.17 I have given careful consideration to all these representations, but other than the specific textual amendments made by the Council in the Revised Deposit Draft and the Proposed Change, nothing suggests to me an obvious need for further text or changes. Often the points made are covered more appropriately and in greater detail in a particular subject chapter or, if not, are simply not what the Council itself wants to stress. I consider that

some very brief mention of the need and aim to protect the open countryside for its own sake, while pursuing this aim, would be appropriate within the text of Objective (e). Otherwise I find that the Objectives achieve pithy expression without losing meaning or effect.

Recommendation

2.18 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC1/002, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 2.17 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

CHAPTER THREE

3. OBJECTIONS TO THE CHAPTER ON PROVIDING DECENT HOUSING

Introduction

The provision of new housing is a quite complex matter in the emerging Local Plan, because the Council's thinking has changed tack materially since the Plan was conceived. I have divided this chapter of my report into five parts.

Section 3.1 covers the list of the Council's Housing Objectives, Plan text about the Strategic Housing Requirements, and the general objections made about Allocated sites, Reserve Sites and Phasing.

Section 3.2 deals with objections made to the specific Allocated and Reserve Sites in the Revised Deposit Draft. In it, I take account not only of duly made written objections, but also of the developed objections set down following the Housing Round Table Housing Session held on 6 May 2004, where a number of housing objectors appeared under the lead of the House Builders' Federation. I conclude the section with three Tables that summarise the respective figures arrived at by the Council, HBF-led objectors and myself for the supply total that can be relied on from the Council's Allocated Sites. I do find a shortfall.

Section 3.3 deals with the merits of omission sites for (or including) housing put forward by objectors, and of the Council's two Reserve Sites at Herne Bay.

Section 3.4 contains my conclusions on the necessary additional housing allocations to meet the Structure Plan Housing Requirement, from my short list of the best omission sites and the two Reserve Sites.

Finally, Section 3.5 deals with objections made to policies H2 to H6.

3.1 OBJECTIONS TO THE STRATEGIC HOUSING ALLOCATION AND ALLOCATED HOUSING SITES IN THE PLAN

THE COUNCIL'S HOUSING OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIC HOUSING REQUIREMENTS, PARAGRAPHS 2.1-2.24; POLICIES H1, H1a AND H1B – THE COUNCIL'S ALLOCATED SITES, RESERVE SITES AND PHASING: AND PARAGRAPHS 2.1-2.24

(My conclusions on the totality of these matters start on page 21)

Objections and Key Issues

Housing Objectives

RN147	SE Estates Ltd represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2023)
RN246	SE Estates Ltd represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2089)
RN247	Mr Mavaddat represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2098)
RN248	Messrs Adams, Mount, Ridout & Hume represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2108)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN249 Mr & Mrs Wilson & Messrs Coleman & Partners represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2119)

RN250 Messrs Barnes, McNeil, Halsey & Adamson represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2137)

- Chapter 2 Objectives generally supported, but additional land should be provided in recompense for the loss of general market housing to the student population

Paragraph 2.1 – Strategic Housing Requirement

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (275)

RN267 Persimmon Homes (South East) Ltd (1962)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2192)

- Not clear if Structure Plan housing distribution between Canterbury and Herne Bay is met
- Objection to the 452 density increase and the Housing Supply Study figure of 6,878. The Former colliery Land at Hersden could accommodate the additional 500 units
- Housing figures have not been met in the past. It must be ensured that the low targets are genuinely achievable

Re: A2/001 Paragraph 2.1 – Strategic Housing Requirement

RD078 JTS Partnership (20171)

- Add to last bullet point "and take account of identified shortfalls in provision as may exist throughout the Plan period."

Paragraph 2.2 - Strategic Housing Requirement

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1565)

- Technical documents of the UHCS are in conflict and the availability of some sites is not demonstrated. A serious shortfall of housing will occur

Re: A2/002 Paragraph 2.2 - Strategic Housing Requirement

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20691)

- First amendment to the Urban Housing Capacity Study not available during the consultation period.

Paragraph 2.3 - Strategic Housing Requirement

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1592)

RN228 Kent County Council (1627)

RN230 Rydon Homes (1717)

RN142 Hillreed Developments Limited (503)

- Many sites in the UHCS reliant on significant land assembly or the relocation of existing firms. HLS calculations rely on over-inflated average completion of 255 units from these sources
- Will be shortfall in houses coming forward; UHCS overestimates the numbers and sites coming forward
- There should be a clear explicit link from the summary table to the list of sites in Appendix 3
- The mixed period for housing calculations is very confusing. The second deposit draft should therefore be reassessed on the basis of the HLS calculations with a base date of 31st March 2001
- New sites coming forward in the Land Supply are insufficient to meet targets. A 10% discount should be factored for undeliverable sites

Re: A2/003 - Paragraph 2.3 - Strategic Housing Requirement

RD077 Hillreed Homes Ltd (20163)

RD118 Kitewood Estates (20456)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20356)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20593)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20690)

- Contribution to HLS from sources identified in Urban capacity study is considerably inflated
- Need to reassess the large site, small site and UHC contribution to reflect likely yield; will need greenfield urban extension
- Strategic Land Requirement analysis of potential provision far too optimistic
- Object to calculation of availability - large sites, small sites, capacity, UHCS; full information to support the calculation not available during the consultation period

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Re: Aa5/005 – Strategic Housing Sites

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20696)

- There may be good reasons why larger strategic windfall sites should come forward before 2011
- Paragraph 2.4 - Strategic Housing Requirement*

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1591)

- Over estimation of the UHCS will result in a shortfall of houses in the Plan period

Re: A2/005 – Paragraph 2.4a

RD004 Blean Parish Council (20211)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20357)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20594)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20686)

- Object to the comments concerning post 2011 Housing Requirement; land supply in this plan must meet requirements for the 2001 - 2011 period, plus any residential requirement carried forward from the pre 2001 period.
- Delete the word “major” in line 11 from major greenfield sites
- Amended text ignores stated & acknowledged need for an additional 450 affordable dwellings p.a. through plan period. Also ignores additional student housing needed to match ambitious expansion plans of UKC & other colleges of higher education
- Delete para 2.4a - The basis of this statement with respect to the number of houses likely to come forward is flawed. Greenfield site release is required now
- There can be no possibility that the District should again be allowed not to fulfil its Structure Plan requirement, as has happened previously. Post 2011 requirement should be subject to early review and not dealt with here. Delete after '...housing sites' in 2.4b

Re: A2/006 – Paragraph 2.4b

RD118 Kitewood Estates (20457)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20358)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20595)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20687)

- Support annual monitoring, but HBF should be involved; any deficit year on year of HLS should trigger the release of reserved sites
- Do not refer to post 2011 period, plan is up to 2011. Add new text for 2nd and 4th sentences to ensure remainder of the former colliery land at Hersden is brought forward as an absolute priority. Arguably sufficient land on this site at Hersden to meet strategic requirements entirely on brownfield; 48 acres of land at Hersden could accommodate between 300 and 500 new houses

Paragraph 2.5 - Strategic Housing Requirement

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1590)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2497)

- The UHCS makes assessments concerning density which are too high
- The most efficient use of land, its location, quality and intensity should be considered

Paragraph 2.6 – Housing Development within Urban Areas

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2194)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1888)

RN144 Persimmon Homes represented by Tetlow King Planning (483)

RN186 Strutt and Parker (173)

- Brownfield sites outside the Urban Area should be treated on their merits. May be as good as extensions to the urban area
- To 'maximise' residential development on brownfield land should mean a realistic target of 60%
- General approach of UHCS flawed: many sites are in important existing uses which should be retained
- Misgivings about the council's intentions due to planning constraints. UHCS does not fully anticipate the timescales required to overcome the limitations of developing in the historic city

Paragraph 2.7 - Housing Development within Urban Areas

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (276, 277)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1589)

- A failure to recognise that densities within the urban areas of the District are such that there is a danger of 'town cramming'
- Line 3 should add, after "towns", "Regeneration Zones/Study Areas."
- After "urban areas" add "and Regeneration Zones/Study Areas."

Paragraph 2.8 – Housing Development within Urban Areas

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (278)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2195)

- After "built up areas" insert "Regeneration Zones/Study Areas."
- A brownfield target of 60% may be achievable, but only if overriding policy support is given. It is not, however, sustainable in the long term

Paragraph 2.9 – Urban Housing Capacity Study

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (280)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1588)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2196)

RN080 Dover District Council (1556)

- The UHCS makes assessments about density which are too high and includes sites unlikely to come forward
- Consider villages in the HCS for their own well being, sustainability and provision of sufficient stock
- The text should add the potential for additional housing development on the former colliery land at Hersden
- No mention is made of the contribution that Aylesham within Dover is making towards meeting housing need for the wider area

Re: A2/008 Paragraph 2.9 - Urban Housing Capacity Study

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20596)

- Insert "and the regeneration zone at Hersden" after the words "identified for minor"

Paragraph 2.10 - Urban Housing Capacity Study

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (281)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1587)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2197)

RN305 Norris (2275)

- Commitment to concentrate development in urban areas fails to address the need for villages and the rural areas to be sustainable
- The UHCS makes assessments concerning density which are too high and includes sites which are unlikely to come forward
- The statement in the paragraph regarding the UHCS is demonstrably incorrect
- Add to last sentence; "and on the remainder of the former colliery land in the Hersden Regeneration Zone/Study Area."

Re: A2/009 Paragraph 2.10 - Urban Housing Capacity Study

RD078 JTS Partnership (20170)

RD118 Kitewood Estates (20458)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20597)

- Add to first sentence "should the potential and capacity within the Urban Areas be realised"
- After undeveloped (greenfield) insert "or part greenfield"
- Amended UHCS is still too optimistic

Paragraph 2.11 – Urban Housing Capacity Study

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (282)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1586)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2200)

- Add sentence to give priority to derelict and underused brownfield sites in the urban areas and on the former colliery land within Hersden Regeneration Zone/Study Area"

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- The Plan should seek to preserve the employment sites in sustainable locations within the urban areas. This paragraph conflicts with para. 1.8, which seeks to protect employment sites
- Clustering of employment sites has limited potential and is not necessarily desirable, increasing traffic densities and highway improvements

Re: A2/010 Paragraph 2.11 – Urban Housing Capacity Study

RD118 Kitewood Estates (20459)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20359)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20598)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20689)

- Object to the release of any employment sites for housing whilst derelict & despoiled brownfield sites are available e.g. Hersden
- Relocation of employment uses analysis does not take into account that often existing use value of these sites is higher than their redevelopment value
- Deleted amendment. Concerned about where these businesses will be located to. Need for balance between land available for housing and employment uses; only so much previously developed land. This does not provide a framework for this balance to exist
- Text still fails to recognise that the relocation of existing businesses to allow the redevelopment of their site for housing development will require land for relocation, insufficient sites are provided for in the Plan

Paragraph 2.12 – Urban Housing Capacity Study

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (279)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2201, 2202)

- The term 'exceptional circumstances' does not exist in practice. Perhaps cite environmental enhancement and clarify that small growth is essential for sustainable rural areas
- The remainder of the former colliery land at Hersden an obvious candidate for development, and is regarded as lying within a village
- There seems to be fear of village nimbyism in this policy regarding brownfield land in villages. Many villages have been defaced by poor development and policy should correct the situation

Re: A2/011 Paragraph 2.12 – Urban Housing Capacity Study

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20599)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20702)

- The sites referred to in 2.12 should not be released for housing so long as sites such as former colliery land are available.
- The proposed sites have not been subject to full scrutiny in the Urban Housing Capacity Study

Paragraph 2.13 – Urban Housing Capacity Study

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1585)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2199)

- The UHCS makes assessments concerning density which are too high and includes sites which are unlikely to come forward
- The statement in the paragraph regarding the UHCS is demonstrably incorrect

Policy H1 – Residential development

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (380, 383, 410, 412)

RN025 Cutler (649)

RN038 Girlings Solicitors (1848)

RN046 Lambert (685)

RN048 Stebbing (431, 429)

RN061 PACE (167)

RN087 Eves (422)

RN112 Canterbury City Partnership (517)

RN125 Snook (108)

RN130 Herne Bay & District Residents Association (1615)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN132	Hennell (142)
RN139	Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1577)
RN141	Hart (425)
RN142	Hillreed Developments Limited (502, 512)
RN143	MOD Estates (1926)
RN144	Persimmon Homes represented by Tetlow King Planning (482, 487)
RN146	Somerlee Homes represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2014)
RN147	SE Estates Ltd represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2024)
RN156	BSF Planning Consultants (1874, 1875, 1876)
RN186	Strutt & Parker (170)
RN196	The House Builders Federation (1551)
RN197	Cluttons (236)
RN203	E.M.S Watson (1550)
RN210	Furley Page Solicitors (797)
RN230	Rydon Homes (1714)
RN240	Angela Hirst Surveyors and Valuers (2065, 2066, 2067)
RN241	Angela Hirst Surveyors and Valuers (2068, 2069, 2070)
RN243	Angela Hirst Surveyors and Valuers (2072, 2073, 2074)
RN244	Angela Hirst Surveyors and Valuers (2076, 2077, 2078)
RN246	SE Estates Ltd represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2090)
RN247	Mr Mavaddat represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2099)
RN248	Messrs Adams, Mount, Ridout & Hume represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2109)
RN249	Mr & Mrs Wilson & Messrs Coleman & Partners represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2120)
RN255	GOSE (1726)
RN257	Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2167, 2161, 2158)
RN258	Sands (2170, 2171, 2174, 2169)
RN260	Peter Jackson Architects (2179, 2190, 2191)
RN267	Persimmon Homes (South East) Ltd (1960, 1963)
RN297	Dock (2256)
RN312	Canterbury College (2291)
RN313	Rutherford (2294)
RN321	Cox (2314)
RN344	Fishpool (2449, 2451, 2452)
RN345	Oaten Hill & District Society (2439)
RN354	Matherne (1305)

- The housing allocations on greenfield sites are not strictly necessary
- Many sites allocated for housing are unlikely to come forward for development
- Objects to loss of City Council car parks to housing
- A great deal of parking marked up for housing; not of benefit to anyone. The parking should be rafted over and have housing above, as in Castle Street
- Sufficient brown field land cannot be brought forward within the plan period. Greenfield sites will be required
- Object to proposed housing allocations on sites with existing employment uses. This will damage the economy and community of Herne Bay
- Herne Bay needs to retain facilities for sports and recreation
- The Herne Bay Chamber of Commerce objects to the allocation of sites for housing within the area shown as at risk for flooding

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Not enough consideration given to the provision of low cost housing adjacent to or decked over the existing park and ride sites in Wincheap/Sturry Road
- The objective of restricting development to zones and limited areas is misguided, leading to increased commuting traffic between zones and distorting proper balance
- High density, well designed low cost housing must be allowed to occur naturally by extant market forces
Constricted land supply will have the opposite effect
- Unrealistic to expect high quality housing on brownfield sites. High quality range housing needs low density sites in rural or semi-rural areas. Shortage of these houses is creating excessive prices
- To achieve 60% target of brownfield housing requires special provisions to over-ride normal development control criteria, and assist higher densities and less drawn out yield times
- 95% housing development in towns is clearly a distortion, particularly when the remaining 5% is concentrated in only one village
- Rural revival: Distributed village housing is required to support village shops and businesses and a reduction in commuting traffic would also be a benefit
- Commitment to concentrate development in urban areas fails to address the need for villages and the rural areas to be sustainable
- UHCS and Plan allocations of dubious accuracy; quite possibly a shortfall
- No need for local plan to allocate only previously developed land for housing; quite proper to develop 40% greenfield and still meet government's objective
- Completion rates over-inflated. Make policy more flexible so that sites can be easily released to ensure continuity of supply
- The word "strategic" difficult to quantify meaningfully; should be specific reference to regeneration zones and village locations
- No need for so many houses
- Too optimistic. CCC has never met KSP requirements
- The local plan should identify future potential housing sites, even if not formal allocations at this stage
- Already extensive development along the Thanet Way. Why not restrict new housing to there
- The development of brownfield sites within urban areas should be actively encouraged by the plan
- Wish to prevent development of greenfield sites around Beltinge and Hillborough. The sites in this area include protected herpetofauna, lizards, slowworms, birds, trees and hedging
- Housing should be restricted to sites already developed, for essential housing required by local people
- Limitation to brownfield sites will result in very dense development in urban areas. Include rural areas at the edge of the urban boundary in the policy
- See what brownfield accommodation can be found within the city for knowledge based business parks. The Council has already allocated all such land to housing development
- Object to those housing sites that currently involve community uses, open space or sports facilities
- In the light of the shortfall in land for housing, the Council should consider designating reserve housing sites
- Resist urban sprawl north of University of Kent to villages of Blean and Tyler Hill and beyond to protect green belt around Blean village
- Whilst new housing in countryside is unacceptable in principle, one exception may be experimental, self sufficient, eco houses or temporary dwellings at suitable sites as necessary experiments
- Brownfield sites unlikely to satisfy demand for business if also being allocated for residential use and vice-versa
- The housing sites allocated in the City centre without adequate parking spaces would lead to further City centre decline
- New housing should make full provision for schools, hospitals and other social facilities
- Not clear if brownfield sites definition contains green sites previously designated, but never developed

Re: A2/012 Policy H1 - Residential Development

RD064 Mr T McKellar (20134)

RD077 Hillreed Homes Ltd (20153)

RD124 Stansfield (20341)

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20548)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20600)

- Amend last sentence of Policy H1: all development will be subject to Policy BE1, IMP2 & Policy (on developer contributions) of the local plan, and those sites...
- After "within the urban areas" add "and at Hersden". After well-being of town insert "village". Policy H1 ignores requirement for 450 affordable dwelling p.a. & need for student accommodation

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Object to new sites allocated under this Policy. Need review of mixed use provisions which will result in a loss of employment opportunities and result in unsustainable commuting. Reallocate for employment uses
- Revise Policy H1 to allow for residential or mixed use schemes on site identified on PM or upon land identified from the community development brief for Hersden
- This amendment is inconsistent with fast rail link proposals (A7/074). Could lead to excessive housing development, conflicting with needs to use Canterbury West Station for services via the new Channel Tunnel Rail Link

Appendix 3 – Schedule of Housing Allocations

RN118 Dept of Health represented by Inventures (2632)

RN145 Goddard Planning Consultancy (454)

- explain how site phasing was assessed and tested
- housing provision figures are far too optimistic

Paragraph 2.14 – The Phased Release of Housing Sites

RN147 BSF Planning Consultants (2028)

RN246 SE Estates Ltd represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2094)

RN247 Mr Mavaddat, represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2103)

RN248 BSF Planning Consultants (2113)

RN250 Messrs Barnes, McNeil, Halsey & Adamson represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2135)

RN270 The Church Commissioners for England represented by Cluttons (1966, 1968, 1969)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1584)

RN267 Persimmon Homes (South East) Ltd (1961, 1964)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2203, 2204, 2205, 2206)

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2335)

RN142 Hillreed Developments Limited (510)

RN230 Rydon Homes (1718)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1878)

- The sites should be phased realistically; put some of the more difficult brownfield sites to the end of the plan period to allow their proper development
- Inappropriate to leave consideration of alternative sites until a review of the Local Plan in 2006. They should be considered at this stage with the aim of producing a reserve list of sites
- Leave this paragraph out of the plan; in conflict with the statement on all housing development being on brownfield land
- The plan should contain a policy committing the Council to meeting its structure plan housing provision
- The approach to releasing housing sites should include those outside the urban areas and should be based upon anticipated supply, a shorter monitoring period and more detailed matrix criteria
- Compulsory purchase may be a good threat to have, but it is not realistic as a guarantee of even medium term site availability
- Designate reserve housing sites. The strategy set out in para. 2.14 is inadequate
- The review process reactive, not proactive and cannot possibly bring sites on stream within a reasonable period
- Paragraph 2.14 should be more explicit about the need and importance of the HLS
- Identification of new greenfield sites may be caught up in the local plan review process in 2006 and which may take a considerable time to complete
- Provision must be made now for ensuring adequate supply by identifying a 1st phase of non- brownfield land - commencing now
- The review provisions are inadequate for effective meeting of targets
- Allocations in the Plan in no way addresses this fundamental issue of consistent under-provision
- Considerable weight placed on sequential site selection; amend wording to ensure that the regenerative benefits arising from development at Hersden are not prejudiced
- Many of the allocated housing sites have been available for many years, but have not been developed. These sites have not come forward because of constraints which the HLS has not properly addressed

Re: A2/013 Paragraph 2.14 – The Phased Release of Housing Sites

RD095 House Builders Federation (20227)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RD118 Kitewood Estates (20460)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20601)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20703)

- Support HLS monitoring subject to HBF involvement
- Whilst the recognition that greenfield land may be necessary, if there is a shortfall in housing land coming forward, the plan should then assess which greenfield sites should come forward. A worked through list of reserve sites should be included
- Insufficient contingency housing; provision over-optimistic on UHCS sites assuming great increase in completion rates; new allocations can not be brought forward through SPG contrary to PPG12; should be consultation on monitoring
- Provision should be made now & not at some indeterminate future date for identified housing needs; 25% contingency, 450 affordable dwellings pa & student accommodation. Current calculations are misleading & inaccurate

Paragraph 2.15 – The Phased Release of Housing Sites

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1582)

- Only if sites are identified at the front end of the plan period can delivery be properly managed and planned

Re: A2/014 Paragraph 2.15 – The Phased Release of Housing Sites

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20361)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20602)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20685)

- Paragraph not consistent with H1, which requires that only allocated land will come forward during the plan period. It appears this paragraph anticipates that there is likely to be a shortfall and there will need to be further allocations. Need to recognise likely shortfall and allocate further sites
- Still a failure of the draft plan to rigorously assess which of the greenfield sites should come forward. The failure to identify appropriate sites will give rise to an ad hoc approach to the identification of greenfield sites
- Do not rely on SPG. To be fair/consistent/transparent the approach should be set out in LP & tested at inquiry

Paragraph 2.16 - The Phased Release of Housing Sites

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (283)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2207)

RN206 JTS Partnership (740)

- There is a lack of acknowledgement of land that can contribute to the overall housing supply from the villages that are in accessible locations
- After "urban areas" add "and on derelict sites within the Regeneration Zones/Study Areas."
- The sequential list provided might be seen to meet intentions but makes no provision to meet the stated objective of including high quality housing

Re: A2/015 Paragraph 2.16 - The Phased Release of Housing Sites

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20603)

- Object to deletion on basis that Hersden is not allocated nor identified as part of Regeneration Zone. Reinstate paragraph and add "and at Hersden" after identified brownfield land in the urban areas

Re: A2/016 Paragraph 2.17 – Sequential Approach

RD020 Mrs A Wilks (20042)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20604)

- Para 2.17 delete "starting with extensions to the urban area"; must not ruin urban edge which is needed for environmental and recreational reasons
- Objects to application of certain criteria in Appendix 5; insert text para 2.17 "and at & on damaged land within E Kent Coalfield such as at the remainder of former colliery land at Hersden

Paragraph 2.18 - The Phased Release of Housing Sites

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (284)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1580)

- The UHCS is not as critical as it should be. The necessary greenfield allocations should be made in the plan following the sequential test. Sites should also be phased realistically
- After "urban areas" add "and Regeneration Zone/Study Areas."

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Re: A2/019 Paragraph 2.18 - The Phased Release of Housing Sites

- RD095 House Builders Federation (20230)
RD118 Kitewood Estates (20462)
RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20365)
RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20705)

- Proposal that fresh allocation should be part of 2006 review too late, given the lead-in time to completed development, which is 10 years. Reserve sites should be allocated now
- Proposed sites should be identified now in order to facilitate land assembly etc. in order to allow an orderly and planned delivery. Phasing should be the mechanism by which the sites are delivered sequentially. Alternative new sites and set out a phasing sequence.
- Reserve sites are needed as a contingency to maintain average annual completion rates. Need more than 300 dwellings; should be double. Decision to release reserves dependent on need to maintain average annual completion rates
- Welcome recognition that further greenfield sites may be necessary; assessment should be done as part of this plan rather than lengthy wait for local plan review

Re: A2/020 New paragraph 2.18a

- RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20608)

- Object provisionally on basis of need to accelerate rather than retard development of derelict despoiled land as an absolute priority e.g. Hersden

Re: A2/021 New paragraph 2.18b

- RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20609)

- Para 2.18b to be qualified having regard to unsuitability of identified Regeneration Zones for housing, due to flood plain and other constraints

Re: A2/022 Paragraph 2.19

- RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20697)

- Object to deletion of requirement for annual monitoring of land supply

Re: A2/023 New Policy H1b

- RD020 Mrs A Wilks (20043)

- RD050 Fuller Peiser (20097)

- RD095 House Builders Federation (20231)

- RD102 Highways Agency (20261)

- RD118 Kitewood Estates (20463)

- RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20610)

- RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20698)

- Add to Policy H1b (2) "or involves the redevelopment of derelict and despoiled land"
- Poorly worded. Not the role of this plan to phase the development of sites post 2011. Clause should not limit the number of windfall sites coming forward within the plan period. There should not be a requirement for qualitative and quantitative assessment
- Policy does not recognise which sites would be suitable for development. Policy should include a point to recognise such sites
- Policy H1b (ii): delete last phrase "...or is required.. need" – provides excuse to avoid all other housing policy
- Criterion (i); unclear as to whether sites phased for post 2011 refers to reserve sites or something else
- Add "or transport strategy" in (ii) to ensure proposals for 5+ dwellings take into account Council strategy

Paragraph 2.20 – Housing Development on Previously Developed Land

- RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (285)

- RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1579)

- RN186 Strutt & Parker (175)

- RN144 Persimmon Homes represented by Tetlow King Planning (485)

- RN010 Mrs A Wilks (345)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- The emphasis on brownfield development serves to squeeze housing supply. The 60% target should be measured against need rather than completions
- The percentage of brownfield development has been overestimated. Need to express brownfield development as an aspiration once the UHCS has been reassessed
- Aims for brownfield development impossible: not enough of it. Developers at the inquiry will say sites are not available to them
- After "derelict or underused land" - (with preference being given to derelict brownfield land such as the remainder of the former colliery land at Hersden)."
- Government guidance still anticipates that a further 40% of development will be required on greenfield land

Paragraph 2.22 – Setting the Development Agenda

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1879)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (286)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1581)

- Reference to Compulsory Purchase Orders should be deleted unless explicit commitments can be made following detailed assessment of the scale of funds and staff time have been made
- CPO powers for housing allocations are unnecessary and will harm the local economy and the business sector

Paragraph 2.23 - Setting the Development Agenda

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (287)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1578)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2210)

- In most of the area there are parking problems. The potential densities if a sensible amount of parking is to be retained will be quite low
- Add; "However, derelict brownfield sites within the urban areas and regeneration zones/study areas will be regarded as a first priority for development"
- Canterbury City already gridlocked. The removal of further car parks will only exacerbate the problem. Canterbury also cannot accommodate the necessary high-rise development

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.1.1 The Council's list of six bullet-point Objectives at the start of the chapter is not controversial, including the amended sixth Objective. The Council's thinking on the distribution of housing in the District is that Structure Plan guidelines on distribution between two areas, Canterbury City and Herne Bay/Whitstable, are now less relevant. I agree that newer factors: the current national emphasis on using previously developed land wherever possible, the search sequence for identifying housing in PPG3, and the logic of pursuing the possibilities stemming from an Urban Housing Capacity Study all lead to a common-sense preference for dealing with the District as a whole.
- 3.1.2 There is no doubt in my mind that this emerging Local Plan has to find realistic, available sites so that it can satisfy the entire residual housing requirement of the adopted Structure Plan 1996. The underlying assumption must be that housing providers will be able to find a public wanting and able to purchase its products, and to build that number of dwellings in the period. The adopted Structure Plan does not give any specific guidance on special or additional considerations that should be given to the housing needs of the District's significant and growing student population, but this is another factor justifying adequate provision up to Structure Plan levels.
- 3.1.3 The emerging Kent and Medway Structure Plan of September 2003 had yet to receive its Examination in Public when I held my Inquiry. Kent County Council's thinking therein – that future housing requirements for Canterbury District up to 2011 might be lower than in the adopted Structure Plan – was subject to objection from GOSE. By the time this Local Plan is adopted, perhaps in early 2006, Canterbury City Council may be in possession of more definite facts. However, the Local Plan should still follow the adopted Structure

Plan; the Council's first Local Development Framework, which it aspires to bring into being well before 2011, will be able to benefit from an up to date Structure Plan context.

- 3.1.4 It is a fact that the Council has struggled to achieve housing completions in phase with the adopted Structure Plan's targets so far in the period 1991-2011. There was a shortfall in the period 1991-2001 of 607 dwellings. The exceptional development opportunity presented by the release of St Augustine's Hospital in the somewhat peripheral location of Chartham has helped prevent a more significant shortfall subsequently.
- 3.1.5 Many objections in this section of the housing Chapter express major doubts about the conclusions of the Urban Housing Capacity Study (presented at the Inquiry in the form of the Revision of February 2004 – CD2.5).
- 3.1.6 Undertaking an urban capacity study led to the allocation of a large number of urban housing sites in the Revised Deposit Draft, at the expense of certain greenfield sites initially allocated in the First Deposit Draft. Many sites in the UHCS are reliant on significant land assembly, or the relocation of existing firms still occupying land and premises there. What I have to do is make a properly sceptical and realistic assessment of whether development is actually likely to come forward on any allocated site, and how many completed new dwellings on a site could be achieved before the end of the Local Plan period in 2011. Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 stresses how essential it is that "...the operation of the development process is not prejudiced by unreal expectations of the developability of particular sites nor by planning authorities seeking to prioritise development sites in an arbitrary manner" (para. 34).
- 3.1.7 Nevertheless, I am well aware that simply extrapolating current market conditions, even over the relatively short time scale of this emerging Plan, is inappropriate. The very existence of strong local and national planning policies can change some previous market expectations. Therefore, when I assess the draft housing allocations, I always bear in mind: viability; the likely willingness of an owner, or owners to release a site in whole or in part; possible competing alternative uses; infrastructure matters including access; and physical constraints extending to such issues as flood risk and site contamination.
- 3.1.8 The UHCS drew on separate market viability studies and design feasibility studies, both prepared by highly reputable private sector professionals. Few of the resulting allocations are on previously developed land that is easy, or undeniably straightforward to develop. Half or more of the new dwellings on such land are seen as arising from the redevelopment of what I saw to be apparently viable employment land or buildings. Cluttons, authors of the market viability studies, state that they assumed a willing seller on a particular site, and that a landowner's unwillingness to sell for housing redevelopment would represent a major constraint.
- 3.1.9 There is a marked absence of owner-led advocacy on the Urban Capacity Study sites. Also, this type of development target is not directly included in the sources of capacity set out in Figure 1 of the former DETR's 2000 study "Tapping the Potential". Some of the allocations made do display over-optimism about the probability of relocating existing land uses, and about the realistic availability of alternative sites for displaced land uses.

- 3.1.10 In looking at particular allocations, I have also pondered the inherent desirability of displacing a particular non-residential use from an established urban location in favour of housing. This is even more pertinent where the owners themselves are not advocating relocation or extinguishment of a particular activity. Often, diversity of activity and a mixture of activities within a quite small area can add to a desirable urban complexity, without marked planning drawbacks. A certain degree of scruffiness is often an inevitable concomitant of urban vitality, even in a great historic City like Canterbury. I hope that my site assessments are properly sceptical about allocations that might displace continuing activities of this kind with "neater" uses that would reduce this beneficial complexity.
- 3.1.11 I find no reason to question the Council's concentration on the District's three Urban Areas as a source of allocations in this Plan, and its intention to avoid villages as first-choice sources of major housing development. This reflects national guidance in PPG3, and generous allocations in the 1998 Local Plan at Chartham and Hersden. Nevertheless, some rephrasing will be in order, in Paragraph 2.9 and elsewhere, if the Council accepts my later recommendation in this report chapter that a reserve housing provision be made to expand the settlement of Broad Oak, very close to Canterbury City, for exceptional reasons (which I explain in considering an omission site objection in paragraphs 3.3.145-3.3.156 below). Doubtless, the Council will look very carefully at village housing possibilities in its first Local Development Framework, taking account of emerging Structure Plan thinking on the appropriate sequential approach in Kent to supplement existing national policy guidance (draft Policy HP4).
- 3.1.12 As to the particular textual objections made to this part of the Housing Chapter, I consider the following modifications would be appropriate. In amended Paragraphs 2.3 and 2.5, the figures will need to be updated to reflect the latest Housing Land Study information, and my conclusions on the Council's allocations. In new Paragraph 2.4a, the figures in the first four sentences will also need like adjustment; the penultimate sentence would be most honestly worded if it concluded "...should be met with the minimum possible release of greenfield land". In new Paragraph 2.4b and amended Paragraph 2.14, since this Local Plan is unlikely to be adopted before the start of 2006, the Council may think it sensible to cease to refer to "phasing" in two periods (2001-2005 and 2006-2011, and to alter the text of the paragraphs accordingly. This factor is also relevant to the wording of Policy H1b, which talks of phasing. Also in H1b, I see no need for specific reference to "sites phased for delivery post 2011". I see no reference in the Plan's Appendix 3 to any site so classified save CA305, and my report finds that this site merits allocation in the Local Plan period, as do the two Reserve Sites.
- 3.1.13 Paragraph 2.10 will need amendment to reflect the proposed allocations on green field land that I find necessary to meet the Structure Plan requirement. In the light of my amended allocations, which do affect land not previously developed, I consider that the text in paragraph 2.14 onwards, which covers the phased release of housing sites, should take up a matter that arose during my Inquiry. There is some confusion in the definitions relating to the sequential approach between PPG3, "Tapping the Potential", and the emerging Structure and Local Plans. PPG3's paragraph 30 makes no mention of urban greenfield sites in describing the sequential search hierarchy. There are a number of such sites within the Urban Area Boundaries of the District's three main settlements, and the Council officers' view at my Inquiry was that urban greenfield sites should rank lower than urban brownfield sites, but above urban extensions. "Vacant

land not previously developed in urban areas” seems to me the best term to use, and it could be qualified to show whether the land was used for a particular purpose, or had specific status in terms of quality or significance.

- 3.1.14 The wording of Paragraph 2.23 appears to me far too tentative, and should be made more positive. A number of car parks in the urban areas are allocations made by the Council, which I fully endorse. I see it as essential that the Council makes early progress to get these developed in the Local Plan period. With the completion of Canterbury's Whitefriars Shopping Centre in sight, and the restitution of public car parking there, I assume that the Council will have no real practical impediment to early implementation of these Canterbury car park allocations, which seem to entail relatively modest car space losses. The allocations in the Urban Housing Capacity Study that I have endorsed in this report are seldom free from all problems, and a number will prove quite complex to implement, even when they are clearly profitable. Private sector developers, dealing with occupied or semi-occupied privately owned urban sites, will hardly be spurred to early action if they see the Council hanging back on relatively straightforward car park sites in its ownership.

Recommendation

- 3.1.15 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered drafting as suggested in my paragraphs 3.1.12-3.1.14 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

3.2 SITE BY SITE OBJECTIONS TO THE COUNCIL'S ALLOCATED SITES AND INSPECTOR'S CONCLUSIONS

The Allocated sites below are set out in the order i which they appear in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan of March 2003.

HOUSING ALLOCATIONS CARRIED FORWARD FROM THE 1998 ADOPTED LOCAL PLAN

ALLOCATION CA031 – BETWEEN 254 AND 260 RECVLVER ROAD, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Owners holding as long term investment. Post 2011. The 1999 Study agreed that this was a 2006-2011 site, but no activity as of April 2004. This was first surveyed in 1993.

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.1 The Council re-calculated the expected yield from this site as 7 dwellings, rather than the 5 assumed in the adopted Local Plan. The Council does not dispute the objectors' assessment of the owner's present intentions. However, I see no reason to de-allocate an urban area site, seemingly free of constraints, given that the Plan period runs to 2011, and that expectations can change.

Recommendation

3.2.2 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION CA279/CA039 – THE TANNERY, MILDREDS LANE, AND THE TANNERY, STOUR STREET, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/001 – CA279Tannery

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20693)

- Full comments cannot be made on this change without the publication of the amendment to the UHCS.

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.3 The HBF argued at the round table session that these two sites north and south of the river should be treated as one, for the purposes of the housing land study. The local plan shows CA279 as a mixed use allocation including hotel, residential, community and leisure; CA039 south of the river is a purely housing allocation. The HBF/Objectors' position is that the total capacity of the combined sites is 336, 18 units up to 2006 and 316 for the period 2006-2011.

3.2.4 The Council's position is that the site the site is likely to produce nearer 400 units: 370 on the site to the north of the river (CA279) and 30 to the south (CA039). My

information from the Council when the Inquiry closed was that a planning application currently under consideration was thought likely to generate 400 units on CA279, and 50 units on CA039.

- 3.2.5 In these circumstances, I have no good reason to believe that 400 dwellings could not be achieved on site before the end of the Plan period.

Recommendation

- 3.2.6 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA043b – ROSEMARY LANE CAR PARK, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Not yet declared surplus. CCC car park. Disagree, capacity should be 10 and phased later. Site is contaminated and subject to great archaeological interest - see letter dated 14th May 2004 from Da Vinci New Homes.

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.2.7 This Council-owned site has been the subject of a design feasibility study (CD 2.3). This study envisages a frontage development of flats on Stour Street and Rosemary Lane, which would allow retention of a majority of the present 89-space car parking provision. The Council says that a 1999 contamination survey did not conclude that development would be seriously constrained. A necessary and detailed archaeological survey could be made prior to development, starting on land that O.S. data shows was last developed with frontage housing.
- 3.2.8 The market credibility of putting housing on previously developed land in the heart of Old Canterbury will be significantly influenced by the progress that the local planning authority makes on land it owns. The Council thus has every incentive to forge ahead with a well-designed scheme within the Plan period.

Recommendation

- 3.2.9 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of the objection.

ALLOCATION CA278 – NORTHGATE CAR PARK, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Not yet declared surplus. CCC car park. Disagree capacity; change to 10 and phased later. Part of the site has been developed as a doctors' surgery - see letter dated 14th May 2004 from Da Vinci New Homes.

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.10 This car park is on open flat land. The Council says that implementation would be through decking over the car park. The 0.2 ha site appears quite capable of accommodating the 21 dwellings envisaged. The remarks I made above about the Council's incentive to get results in the Plan period on sites that it owns apply equally here.

Recommendation

3.2.11 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA281 – HAWKS LANE, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Private car park – no action. Disagree, owners only prepared to develop if entire business is located to a Greenfield site with extra car parking, not foreseeable

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.12 The Council's evidence is that the owners, Furley Page, have reiterated to officers their wish to relocate. My report endorses the Council's intention to allocate a 20 ha business allocation at Barton Farm in the Local Plan, which might suit the owners' requirement in the near future; they have submitted evidence of the inadequacies of their present spread of floorspace in central Canterbury, and of the need for the Council to allocate sites that might make them avoid a major relocation outside the District. These factors suggest to me that the allocation for 9 dwellings remains reasonably capable of implementation before the end of the Plan period.

Recommendation

3.2.13 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA284 – CHURCH STREET, ST PAUL'S

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Not yet declared surplus. Have made archaeological excavations in the past and advised that development is precluded

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.14 The Council now accepts that a forthcoming change of ownership suggests the site is unlikely to come forward within the Plan period, though it sees possibilities thereafter. I have no reason to disagree.

Recommendation

3.2.15 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete this allocation.

ALLOCATION CA292 – CORNER OF CANTERBURY ROAD/VICTORIA PARK, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/002 – CA292 Corner of Canterbury Road/Victoria Park Herne Bay

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20378)

- Objection on the basis that the sites could be contaminated and that, taking a precautionary approach, the site should be allocated for non-residential use

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.16 The site is actively used as a BT car park, with an area of grass closer to the mature planted frontage to Canterbury Road. The overall character of the surroundings is solidly residential, and new housing would appear to offer the highest development value in this area of Herne Bay. No clear evidence has been shown to me that the site would have abnormally high or prohibitive decontamination costs. The 5 dwelling allocation seems soundly based for implementation at some time within the Plan period.

Recommendation

3.2.17 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA295 – YORK ROAD/SEA STREET, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Discussions with landowner; unlikely to come forward given existing rental returns. Existing use value higher than redevelopment value

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.18 I saw that the uses on site include auto sales on a former petrol filling station/garage, other open areas filled with cars for sale, general parking of vehicles, and a body shop next to houses on the York Street frontage. The Council does not specifically dissent from the matters advanced by the objectors, but relies more on the opportunity to replace an unpleasing variety of uses on a run down site, which would obviously be ripe for re-development, if a satisfactory profit could be made.

3.2.19 A Plan-led system provides guidance as well as incentive. This is a site that is visually squalid, where the continuance of present uses will tend to lower the amenity and value of surrounding residential and commercial property. Since the arguments before me against the profitability of redevelopment fall short of being conclusive, I find that an 11 dwelling allocation is reasonable for this Plan period.

Recommendation

3.2.20 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA303 – DIAMOND ROAD, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Disagree, HBF now aware of flood defence requirements of Plan. Outweighs value of development

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.21 Construction of housing on the western part of this allocation was well under way at the close of the Inquiry. The flood risk implications of the remaining area cannot be different in kind or degree. This new construction, within a predominantly residential area, makes the utilitarian business premises on the remainder of the allocation look ever more anomalous. I cannot easily believe that the achievement of 26 dwellings on the whole allocation by the end of the Plan period is ruled out by market factors.

Recommendation

3.2.22 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA305 – ADJOINING 15 HAMILTON ROAD. WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Disagree, thriving retail outlet value more than redevelopment value. Jewsons Yard in 1999 no intention to relocate at that date. (Jewsons wish to move to a freehold premises - nowhere available)

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.23 The site is occupied by quite recently built premises of Jewsons, which appear to operate efficiently. There is a minimum of visual untidiness in the yard areas, which is a socially necessary quality in this solidly residential area. The traffic draw of such premises is obviously not ideal here. Neither Council nor objectors dispute that the occupier is looking for other premises. A successor use would need to demonstrate less adverse traffic characteristics, and it is difficult to see anything but a redevelopment of the site predominantly by housing fitting the bill. I find that the 12 dwelling allocation remains a reasonable and potentially achievable aspiration in the Plan period.

Recommendation

3.2.24 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA323 – REGENT STREET, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- In use - disagree, existing businesses would find it uneconomic to move and residential values here are low. There are three different businesses on the site.

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.25 The Council's Summer 2004 response to this objection is that the relevant officers understand that relocation is a matter of months away. For that reason alone I am content to make no adverse recommendation about a site that appears to contain flourishing and viable businesses. The 12 dwelling allocation should remain.

Recommendation

3.2.26 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA346 – HAVELOCK STREET, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- No resolution to relocate school - this site is the playground for the school.

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.27 This is a well-maintained playground, in use by the school that stands immediately north of Old Ruttington Lane. The only response from the Council that I have on the matter is that it awaited a response from the school governors. If the school has no scheme to relocate activities within the Plan period, the allocation should be deleted. For the purposes of this report, I assume no contribution from the allocation in the Plan period.

Recommendation

3.2.28 I recommend that the allocation be deleted from the Adopted Local Plan, in the absence of a positive indication from the responsible authorities that the site will be released and ready for the achievement of development before the end of the Plan period.

ALLOCATION CA347 – IVY LANE NORTH, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Disagree - not yet declared as surplus. Capacity should be 5 and later phased

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.29 This allocation occupies only a minor area of a Council car park. The remarks I made above about the Council's incentive to get results in the Plan period on sites that it owns apply equally here. In fact, the unpleasing appearance of the Longport Car Park as a whole in this historic area suggests that a more extensive scheme might prove practical and have aesthetic benefits, while not involving too great a loss of parking spaces. I find that a 10 dwelling allocation is reasonable for this Plan period.

Recommendation

3.2.30 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA420 – CHAUCER ROAD BARRACKS CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

- RN010 Mrs A Wilks (321)
- RN077 Christodoulou (96)
- RN079 Chapman (95)
- RN089 Rumley (52, 53)
- RN100 Smith (921)
- RN170 PACE (935)
- RN171 Rumley (217)
- RN309 Martin (1940)
- RN321 Cox (2311)

- Object to loss of Chaucer Road, Canterbury as a housing allocation on open land, and its location giving views over the City. Flooding, pollution, congestion, loss of wildlife. The meadow in Chaucer Road should be protected open space

Re: Aa3/013 – CA420 Chaucer Road Barracks Canterbury

RD114 Defence Estates (20435)

RD142 Diocesan Board of Education represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20671)

- Object to the deletion of Chaucer Road housing allocation. Site was allocated by last local plan inspector and should remain allocated as per adopted and first deposit local plan
- The site could be re-allocated as a primary school

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.31 This is a 1.34 ha site where planning permission for housing was refused in 2002, and I have no record of any subsequent appeal against the decision. The Council's intention is that the urban boundary should return to the natural limits of development, subject to general countryside restraint policies (CD 1.16, page 38-39). The site was a housing allocation in both the Adopted Local Plan and the First Deposit Draft, and was only removed because of the Council's opinion that the Urban Housing Capacity Study (CD2.5) identified better alternative sites on previously developed land. I have read the previous Local Plan Inspector's assessment of the site, and while I do not dissent from the particulars of her findings (CD 1.8, pages 295-7), development on this site would

create a substantial nib of developed land, intruding eastwards beyond the densely built urban edge into an open area; in other words, it would not be a "natural" rounding-out of the local built-up area.

- 3.2.32 Since my report finds a deficiency of housing land provision, this site must be considered against other alternatives, when I make a decision on the most appropriate locations to achieve the Structure Plan target. I do this in my Section 3.4 below, and therefore make no recommendation at this stage.

ALLOCATION CA428 – LAWSON CLOSE, CHARTHAM

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/014 – CA428 Lawson Close, Chartham

RD005 Arjo Wiggins Fine Papers Ltd represented by Caxtons Chartered Surveyors (20012)

- Object to the deletion of Lawson Close Chartham as a housing allocation. Allocated in adopted local plan and application was for 15 affordable houses which was withdrawn. Should reconsider the site

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.2.33 This 1.1 ha site was allocated for residential development in the 1998 adopted Local Plan, but the allocation, rolled forward into the First Review Draft Local Plan of 2002, was deleted in the Revised Deposit Draft of 2003. This is an irregularly shaped 1.1 ha greenfield site, with a 50 m frontage to Bakers Lane, and a depth of c.180 m. There is no dispute that the site can accommodate some 15 dwellings. A former planning permission of 1989 for two dwellings on the site has lapsed.
- 3.2.34 Chartham is a village comprising three sub-settlements, and neither the Adopted nor emerging Local Plans have defined a village boundary. The Council does not dispute that the transport connections from and to the village are good, that there are significant employment premises, and that there are reasonable facilities for primary education, village scale retailing and services. Nor does it argue that this site is any more than minor in size, in the overall village context. No point is made about the particular visual or other planning merits of the site.
- 3.2.35 I find, like my colleague in her 1997 report, that this site has housing to the north, west and south, and would not significantly intrude into open countryside. There is good screening from trees and hedges on most of the boundaries with adjoining properties, and it would be possible to landscape the eastern boundary as part of any development scheme to provide an effective visual stop to further expansion. That said, there remains the clear deficiency that this development would not accord with the ideal of the Council's present strategy: to confine new housing in this Plan period to the urban, built up areas of Canterbury, Whitstable, and Herne Bay, treating other than minor new housing in village areas as something not specifically encouraged by PPG3.
- 3.2.36 The site was only removed because of the Council's opinion that the Urban Housing Capacity Study identified better alternative sites on previously developed land. Since my report finds a deficiency of realistic housing land provision, this site, with its potential 15 dwelling yield, must be considered against other alternatives, when I make a decision on the most appropriate locations to achieve the Structure Plan target. I do this at my section 3.4 below, and therefore make no recommendation at this stage.

ALLOCATION CA310 – BERESFORD ROAD NORTH AND SOUTH, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Disagree - multiple leases - will probably not come forward, if so, only small area in which case it would only be a small site.

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.37 There are now two planning permissions for a total of 9 dwellings in existence, according to Council evidence, and some new housing is occupied on the north side of the street. I have seen the variety of employment uses that occupy the land now, and though they differ in quality and size, my impression is that there is no obvious longer-term impediment to the achievement of new housing on both sides of the street; moreover, the full development of the north and south sides would seem likely to exceed 20 dwellings comfortably. Though these Housing Round Table reservations have not been withdrawn, the final comparative table of assessments of allocation numbers before me, of September 2004 which, the Council assures me, represents the agreed position between it and the objectors, shows no disagreement that 20 dwellings may come forward by 2011.

Recommendation

3.2.38 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATIONS ARISING FROM THE URBAN HOUSING CAPACITY STUDY - CANTERBURY

ALLOCATION CA506/C04 – LAND AT ROPER ROAD/ST DUNSTAN'S, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RD124 Stansfield (20347)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20739)

RD149 Network Rail (20725)

- Object to allocation of land at Station Road West and Roper Road for housing. Regeneration zone should remain flexible and respond to needs of the new rail link. Additional housing may increase traffic congestion
- Object to amendment to Policy H1 resulting in the de-allocation of housing sites at Roper Road, including Traction Control Room, which would make comprehensive redevelopment
- Roper Road should remain in employment use

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Loss of constrained employment site. Existing uses commercial/industrial. Relocate to where? Split ownership – was Railtrack operational land/part BRPB. Commercial leases, e.g. Grahams tile and bathroom site. Possibly` retail corner to St. Dunstan's – smaller site? Electric traction control room and adjoining depot leased to mainline freight ltd for 125 years from 1-4-1994. (A2/012) Modern Ceramic tiles showroom at end of the site. Now site A2/012. No evidence that site will be available in the foreseeable future. Former tyre sale building on the corner of St Dustan's street being considered for retail and residential uses (Aa3/041). Possible residential development on car sale area measures 988 m2 plus flats over shop 1485 m2. At a high density for

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

flats of 50 dwellings per ha this represents 13 dwellings. (Mike Goddard has had dealings with the owners of the site, and has stated that it is operational land and will not come forward)

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.2.39 This allocation consists of several sites, with an assessed yield of 60 dwellings. Cluttons' market viability study (CD2.4) says that in marketing terms the site would be desirable for residential use and would interest developers, but that "the key is really the various occupiers' aspirations". Cluttons' market viability rating is only "possible".
- 3.2.40 The Council's response to the objections above says that agents for Railtrack/SRA have met Council officers and "informal schemes have come forward incorporating residential and retail". An electric traction room within the allocation would not be developed because of cost. A long lease to the Freight Rail Company "does not preclude development", but would require that company to have "other arrangements along the track for a depot for displaced activities". Development is seen as being after 2006.
- 3.2.41 With this scant information about intentions, I have used sceptical common sense and the evidence of my own eyes. Problems with such matters as the electric traction room strongly suggest that any achieved development in this period would be on particular areas of the allocation. The tile/kitchen/bathroom operation at the north-east end seems to operate very efficiently in a good secondary location in the City. The car sales area to the south-west – open land with few structures on it – appears a good and realistic candidate for development on its own within the Plan period. The 13 dwelling figure of the objectors seems to me neither unduly optimistic nor pessimistic for the Plan period. One would hope it could be exceeded, but hard evidence for such hope is lacking.

Recommendation

- 3.2.42 I recommend that the allocation should be retained in the Adopted Local Plan, but that the yield from the site should be reduced to 13 dwellings.

ALLOCATION CA507/C05 – CASTLE STREET CAR PARK, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Loss of public car parking. Disagree capacity - reduce to 27 units (JO) - see letter dated 14th May 2004 from Da Vinci New Homes

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.2.43 This Council-owned site has been the subject of a design feasibility study (CD 2.3). This envisages a frontage development of flats on Castle Street and Castle Row, with only three of the present 68 car parking spaces lost. The development would need to be three storeys high to achieve 54 dwellings, but the Council appears to be satisfied that this is acceptable in terms of the effect on the surrounding area, and from what I saw this would not seem intrinsically problematic.
- 3.2.44 As I have said about other car park schemes, the market credibility of putting housing on privately-owned, previously developed land in the heart of Old Canterbury will be

significantly influenced by the progress that the local planning authority makes on land it owns. The Council thus has every incentive to forge ahead with a well-designed scheme within the Plan period.

Recommendation

3.2.45 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA508/C07 – SCRAP METAL YARDS, PARHAM ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN317 Canterbury, Whitstable and Herne Bay Dist. Scouts (1937)

- C07 - Scrap metal works, Parham Road, Canterbury. District Scouts not opposed to new development provided a replacement hall is built within the new development

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Planning permission(s) granted for parts of site 50 units to date. Existing uses and constraints identified by Cluttons make this site extremely unlikely to come forward within the Plan Period. Part floodplain – non conforming uses – difficult to relocate. Multiple ownerships. Comprehensive approach for much of site. Part of Parham road under construction as Christ Church student accommodation. Scrap yard in active use and plant hire yard. 50 houses built so far – but student lets; next phase 50 or so. Will be student lets, too

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.46 Cluttons call this “one of the largest, most difficult sites viewed...an old industrial estate with a range of existing occupiers on different occupation terms, together with vacant buildings and a number of pollutant occupiers, particularly the scrap yard which has occupied this site for many years”. Extensive contamination, fragmented ownership, and the problem of finding equally cheap alternative accommodation are highlighted as problems. Compulsory Purchase Order procedures by the Council or SEEDA are seen by Cluttons as a possible way forward, as part of a mixed use/employment scheme.

3.2.47 The only comment on feasibility I have from the Council, in response to the above objections, is that “operators (are) actively trying to relocate and (the Council) believes (it) has found suitable site...”. I consider that this falls very far short of assurance that 170 dwellings could be achieved in the relatively short time remaining of this Plan period. There is not even a firm indication in the Urban Housing Capacity Study (CD2.5) that CPO powers will be used, and I think that the complexities of assembly, to create an attractive site free of constraints, will require at least partial compulsory acquisition if anything is to happen by 2011. I also bear in mind that the Council’s laudable ambition to get development started on a number of its own City sites, notably its car parks, will fully stretch its officer resources in this period. While the Council’s intentions here should be actively pursued, my lack of conviction that anything comprehensive will emerge soon means that the allocation must be removed.

Recommendation

3.2.48 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site C07 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION CA478/C13 – JEWSON YARD, MARKET WAY, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Loss of existing retail site - do not believe alternative premises are available. Cluttons comments re: cost of emergency access may rule out redevelopment. No intention to relocate. Important site for Jewsons

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.49 The Council response on the matter suggests that the inappropriate location of this use, in an area where there has been increasing house building, is a prime motive for the allocation. The comment is made: “with at least two Jewsons in Canterbury City there is the opportunity to consolidate into one location”. However, this would be a commercial decision, and there is nothing the Council can do to make the operator relocate, if the business case is not sufficiently strong. The site may come up in coming years, and housing would seem the most attractive replacement activity; the Council appears satisfied that emergency access would not prove a serious problem. However, the case for an allocation for 43 dwellings in the period to 2011 is flimsy, as there can be no reasonable assurance of actual completions.

Recommendation

3.2.50 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site C13 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION C17 – LAND ADJACENT TO REGISTRY OFFICE, ST STEPHEN'S ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN324 Stagecoach (2404)

- Against the allocation, as the company need to carry on its operations

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.51 The Council says that this objection has been withdrawn in principle, and there is no information before me to contradict its statement. The formal objection therefore remains, but has no real substance; there has never been any expansion of the original brief expression of opposition to the allocation..

Recommendation

3.2.52 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION C20 – CANTERBURY WEST STATION, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN164 Railtrack PLC (595)

RN159 St. Dunstan's Management Company (1893)

- Any housing on the site adjacent to the Engine Shed, Station Road West (C20) should be in keeping with the remainder of the Berkeley Homes Development
- Support the allocation of land at Canterbury West St (C04) for housing. The site, however, is protected in the long term and a replacement rail freight facility would need to be created if the area

Re: Aa3/018 – C20 Canterbury West Station

RD036 Frost (20075)

RD053 Kennett (20100)

RD059 Baker (20126)

RD068 Wilkins (20142)

RD083 Bounds (20268)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20657)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20694)

- 40 units is over-intensive use of site
- Full comments cannot be made on this change without the publication of the amendment to the UHCS
- Residents bought houses in this area on assumption land would be car park as shown in adopted plan. They have no visitor parking. Part of site should be set aside for residents' paying parking. If developed, trees should be planted on road frontage
- Some land should be reserved for car parking specifically for rail station. Inadequate parking will discourage train use
- Land should remain in employment use
- Objects to housing allocation as land was originally allocated for car parking. Need more parking, open spaces and recreational areas
- Would affect prospects for fast rail link to London; land may be needed for public transport connections, new platforms new station building

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- The allocation is not agreed

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.53 The size of the allocation was changed in the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan from 0.24 ha to 0.58 ha, incorporating more of the unoccupied and overgrown railway sidings land, and increasing the anticipated housing yield to 40 dwellings. Significantly, the allocation has the support of the site owner, the former Railtrack, but there remains an element of doubt about the ease of formally releasing the site from its historic status as a rail freight facility. A very successful template for the design of housing already exists immediately to the south, but matters of design and relationships to nearby historic buildings can all be dealt with through development control procedures, or the drafting of a development brief beforehand.

3.2.54 There is no clear evidence before me to suggest that changed services running through Canterbury West Station following completion of the CTRL would affect the availability of this land for housing. On the other hand, Canterbury West Station does appear likely to become the prime station in the District once the CTRL becomes operative towards the end of this Plan period, and this will probably mean some increased demand for parking very close to the Station. However, local residents' concerns about inadequate parking in the area do not in themselves justify the removal, or major diminution in size, of this particular allocation, within a Regeneration Zone focussed on the Station and its surroundings, for which a Development Framework will

be prepared. The contextual difficulties in developing this allocation will need to be resolved in much more than superficial detail in that exercise. Nevertheless, none of the objections before me suggests that the principle or size of the allocation is flawed. I find that a 40 dwelling allocation could be achieved by 2011, if the Council actively pursues the project with the landowners.

Recommendation

3.2.55 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION CA483/C22 – LAND AT DANE JOHN WORKS, AND CANTERBURY EAST STATION, GORDON ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN043 Griffith Investments (93)

- Objects to housing allocation at Gordon Road, Canterbury as the company would not wish to unsettle tenants at this stage

Re: Aa3/019 – C22 Land at Dane John Works Canterbury

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20658)

- Land should remain in employment /office use
(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)
- Site in active commercial use. Railtrack surplus land of 0.269ha ransomed. Restricted site with shared access to commercial area. Likely terraced housing to match existing. Only 15 dwelling yield can be counted on

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.56 The Council says the allocation was reduced in size to a 25 dwelling capacity at the Revised Deposit Draft stage, to show only the parts where companies confirmed they would move, given an option. The reduced allocation is in a predominantly residential area south of the rail line, and there would remain a substantial area of employment immediately to the east, for relocations if wanted, for this Plan period at least. I do not see that the loss of employment land from this site is significant, given the undoubted ability of occupants of the land to relocate.

Recommendation

3.2.57 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION C25 – CAR PARK AT CANTERBURY WEST STATION, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN164 Railtrack PLC (594)

- Object to allocation of car park adjacent to Canterbury West Station for housing (C25). Adequate levels of parking is required to service the station

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Re: Aa3/020 – C25 Car Park at Canterbury West Canterbury

RD068

Wilkins (20143)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20715)

- Allocation for offices would be an asset, but should be on outskirts with ample parking. If developed, allowance for ample parking for staff visitors and public. Should retain horse-chestnut trees.
- Should not be allocated for anything other than car parking until the potential for West Station high speed link to London is clarified.

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.58 The Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan has changed the desired use of this land from housing, with an indicated 24 dwellings, to office employment. This altered status removes the need for certainty of early delivery that attends a housing allocation. Its position within a Regeneration Zone, focussed on the Station and its surroundings, should ensure that the concept of office development would take account of a possible high speed link to London, as well as the retention of public car parking. The conservation area location should ensure that the need to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of this historic locality is a priority.

Recommendation

3.2.59 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION CA486/C32 – UNIGATE DEPOT, MILITARY ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Loss of employment site - no intention to relocate. This is a key site for the Dairy in its distribution for the City. No development since first included in 1993 HLS

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.60 The Council's response is that the "owners have expressed a long term interest in the residential potential of the site, subject to relocation". In considering whether sufficient reliance can be put on a relocation to justify the allocation, I come back to certain basic concerns: the unglamorous function of delivering milk and ancillary goods to City buildings requires a substantial base close to customers, and this unattractive depot seems to fulfil the function well, for so long as a sufficient customer base remains to keep the operation profitable. If the owners pursue residential redevelopment, they must know they are assured of a positive response from the Council, given the nature of the local area north of Military Road. Consequently, an allocation that cannot be relied on would serve no good planning purpose.

Recommendation

3.2.61 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site C32 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION CA552/C38 – LENLEYS, ROPER ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN262 Lenleys (2225, 2226)

- Object to the non-allocation of 25 - 34 Roper Road for residential development, subject to economic condition and appropriate alternative location

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Site in active use. Amounts to 0.47 ha@ 50/ha town houses - equal to 24 dwellings

Re: Aa3/024 – C38 Lenleys Roper Road Canterbury

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20648)

- Objects to Lenleys (C38) as housing allocation; lack of intention

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.62 The owners express a clear desire for this allocation. However, the details of their 2002 representations do not show that they have identified an alternative location which would satisfy them in the short term, whether in Wincheap, Sturry Road or some other hypothetical edge of town comparison shopping location. I consider the allocation should stand, but only if, on receipt of my report, the Council satisfies itself that relocation still appears practical. It appears to me that, in the absence of a materially better site, there would be every practical reason for Lenleys to stay in their present well-equipped premises in the short term.

3.2.63 The size of the site leads me to conclude that the Housing Round Table generated objection about site capacity has much force, even at PPG3-approved housing densities. Anything achieved above 24 or so dwellings would be a bonus, rather than a realistic expectation.

Recommendation

3.2.64 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to alter the notional dwelling capacity of Site C32, from 50 to 24, in the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION C39 – ROPER YARD / ROPER CLOSE, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN330 Yu (2416)

- Objects to housing allocation at Roper Close, Canterbury on the grounds of impact upon traffic and amenity, devaluation of property prices. An alternative access arrangements may be more acceptable

Re: Aa3/025 – C39 Roper Yard / Roper Close Canterbury

RD042 Wenn (20090)

RD043 Waring & Partners (20091)

- Object to the deletion of housing allocation from Roper Yard, Roper Road

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.65 The Council took an informed view that the site was unlikely to come forward during the Plan period. Its stance remains in favour of such development, and it acknowledges that a windfall proposal may yet emerge by 2011. I see no real detriment to any party arising from this stance.

Recommendation

3.2.66 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

TWO LINKED AREAS: ALLOCATION CA490/C42 – BUILDERS CENTRE, STURRY ROAD, CANTERBURY & CA553/C43 – ATS, STURRY ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objections formulated post Housing Round Table)

- (C42) Access owned by ATS. No alternative site and ransomed
- C43) Poor site for residential development. Redevelopment for 6 dwellings in this low value area highly unlikely to exceed the existing use value

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.67 The enterprises that occupy these two sites are viable, useful to the functioning of urban life and physically unattractive. Cluttons rated the market viability of housing redevelopment as “unlikely”. It appears that the objectors see the development of site C19 to the west as less problematic, and it seems reasonable to assume that, if the less constrained site was redeveloped successfully, these two sites might benefit from changed market perceptions. The prospect of any stand-alone residential scheme on the ATS site is remote, given the small size and noisy location. For this Plan period, I cannot foresee a probability of voluntary action by the owners. Consequently, the allocations should be removed, although there might be an outside chance of some windfall development in this period, perhaps linked to extension of the C19 allocation.

Recommendation

3.2.68 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Sites C42 and C43 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION CA492/C44 – INVICTA MOTORS, STURRY ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Forms part of wider Kingsmead area. Active dealership and part in flood plain. No indication of active development; could be developed independently from other land, but post 2011

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.69 The car dealership occupies what appears a commercially attractive site for housing, with a substantial river aspect and a local context of existing dwellings. The existing enterprise may well operate successfully, but it does lack first class visibility of its products to the passer-by, and the existing buildings are basic rather than modern and attractive. Cluttons were aware of continuing market interest in the site.

3.2.70 If the existing owners could find alternative premises, or be helped significantly by the Council in this respect, I consider that the allocation would fall into the "probable", rather "possible" category. On balance, I find this site merits its allocation, with a reasonable chance of achieving some 45 dwelling in the period to 2011, provided that the Council maintains an encouraging and pro-active stance.

Recommendation

3.2.71 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION C45 – KCC OFFICES, BEER CART LANE, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN051 D'Ath (428)

- The development would adversely dominate the whole area, loss of privacy and concerns regarding the commercial uses. Human rights violations

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.72 The Council reconsidered the allocation in the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan, and omitted it. The decision appears uncontroversial.

Recommendation

3.2.73 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA495/C47 – OFFICE BLOCK AND CAR PARK, IVY LANE, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Highly unlikely that the existing use value will ever be exceeded for the plot value

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.74 Cluttons found the economics of redevelopment for housing unconvincing. The Council says only that "the owners are actively looking at redevelopment proposals". The evidence is that a development of this site would be very likely to be linked to, and made viable by, association with other adjoining land. All these factors rule out any

reasonable assumption that the site could be relied on to provide some 17 dwellings by 2011. The Council indicated during the Inquiry that it had come round to this view.

Recommendation

3.2.75 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site C47 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION CA497/C49 – SCOUT HUT AND LAND, HEATON ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Disagree - 4 built but the rest remains in occupation. Good standard of garages contributes to reduction in off street car parking. Scout Hut is a community use which should remain in the community it serves. Small site supply

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.76 The proposed allocation is in the heart of an established and well maintained area of housing. Even with the four new houses built recently on site, the scout hut and the remaining 11 garages remain a normal and not really unpleasing part of such an area. All the existing elements appear to serve a useful purpose. Nothing on the allocation is ill-maintained or an eyesore. Presumably the local scout activities would wish to remain local, so displacement from here would not seem terribly advantageous. Also, any development here would not be so large that it could realistically incorporate the scout activities on-site in new premises.

3.2.77 Market interest will exist, with or without an allocation, because of the 4 dwelling development. Thus, as the Council would presumably give planning permission for well designed development, I see no real advantage in an allocation, as there is no assurance that 10 dwellings can be delivered by 2011.

Recommendation

3.2.78 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site C49 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION CA498/C50 – LAND AT WESTGATE GROVE/ST PETER'S PLACE, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Disagree. Houses are in occupation and there are 12 of them. Could develop remainder (garden dump) for 4 units. Small site. Refurbishment would be better financially than redevelopment

Reasoning and Conclusions

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

3.2.79 The key to this allocation is the ownership by the Council. A development sensitive to the shabby but not unattractive character of the older terrace houses that comprise the bulk of this street could result in a net gain of 5 or so dwellings. If the Council is convinced it has the will to deal with the requirements of the existing tenants and proceed expeditiously, I see no real problems in an allocation.

Recommendation

3.2.80 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION - CA501/C53 – PUCKLE SUPPLIES LAND AT OLD DOVER ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN110 Canterbury Sea Scouts (911)

- Objection to housing allocation at Puckle Lane Canterbury - would not object if suitable alternative site could be found for the Sea Cadets in central Canterbury preferably by the River

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.81 Before the close of the Inquiry, the Council accepted the HBF view that the 7 units allocated would not come forward in the Plan period. I have no reason to disagree.

Recommendation

3.2.82 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site C53 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION CA505/C54 – AIR CADET CENTRE, COSSINGTON ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN056 Johnson (88)

RN272 Dayani (1728)

- Housing allocations at the Air Cadet Centre and 2-14 Cossington Road, Canterbury would add to the lack of parking in the area
- There is an existing lack of parking spaces in Cossington Road, Canterbury. Additional housing would exacerbate this problem

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Where relocation of Air Cadet Centre? It is unlikely that the Kingsmead Regeneration community facility will come forward during the Plan period

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.83 Neither of the neighbour objectors is against redevelopment in principle. The bar to something happening – a 7 dwelling gain through sympathetic terrace housing – is a voluntary relinquishing of the site and the provision of acceptable new premises for the

Air Cadets. The Council response merely says that "community provision at Kingsmead or Vauxhall Avenue would offer relocation potential for Air Cadet Centre". I have no real information whether this is just a bright idea, or something achievable in the near future. In the absence of the necessary detail, it would be unwise for me to treat this allocation as likely to happen by 2011.

Recommendation

3.2.84 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site C49 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION C57 – BT CAR PARK, UPPER CHANTRY LANE, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN336 Derham (2423)

- No objection, but any scheme must be in keeping, 2 storey, the density reflecting Ersham Road, and access from Ersham Road pedestrian only

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.85 This is only technically an objection. Matters such as this should be treated within a development brief for a site of this importance.

Recommendation

3.2.86 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION C59 – 7-16 STOUR STREET, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN304 County Hotel, represented by Street Design Partnership (2271, 2272)

- Object to the allocation of their land at 7 - 16 Stour Street for residential development

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.87 The site was deleted as a housing allocation in the Revised Deposit Draft, after this objection making clear that the site was required for hotel expansion.

Recommendation

3.2.88 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATIONS ARISING FROM THE URBAN HOUSING CAPACITY STUDY - HERNE BAY

ALLOCATION H05 – LAND AT HERNE BAY STATION

Objections and Key Issues

RN130 Herne Bay & District Residents Association (1612)

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2167, 2168)

- The housing allocation at site the Herne Bay Station car park will cause more parking in surrounding residential streets
- Object to the allocation of land at Herne Bay Station for housing. Car park should be protected in the longer term for future initiatives in rail travel

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.89 The land was suggested by the landowner as an allocation. The site is unused and a well-designed redevelopment could improve the appearance of the locality. The visual and written evidence shows that the existing area assigned for parking north of the station is seldom very full. The Council confirms that many station users prefer to park on the unregulated roadspace in residential streets nearby, and says that no parking scheme is envisaged locally. I consider it important that a development brief, or development control requirements made of an applicant, should include an assessment of present and envisaged station parking requirements – including those vehicles that now park locally, rather than in assigned parking areas. It may then be found necessary for a part of the allocation to contain provision for station parking.

Recommendation

3.2.90 I recommend that action be taken to effect what I suggest in my paragraph 3.2.89 above, but that no other modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION CA509/H08 – FORMER WHITE HORSE PH, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

RN205 Hampshire (1513)

- The housing allocation at White Horse Yard, Avenue Road would result in the loss of small business units which add to the diversity of the town centre
(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)
- Existing use value higher than redevelopment value. Letter received from owner confirming that there is no intention to redevelop the site

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.91 The Council's reasons for wanting an allocation are the centre on the present visual detriment in this part of a conservation area. It "considers conversion to flats to be appropriate". This is a pleasing building in the high street, with a side alley leading to a rear area containing various semi-derelict sheds; I saw some vehicle parking/storage and open storage of materials on the land. There appears to be some residential occupation within the former pub.

3.2.92 The difficulty here would seem to be the somewhat depressed character and economy of the immediate local area. It is not clear to me that the rear yard area would be an easily marketable proposition for some new housing, if the former pub remained and was converted to flats (the Council sees a 10 dwelling capacity here). Though I see that some kind of incentive to action might be provided by an allocation, I do not find that the site can be considered likely to deliver 10 or so dwellings by 2011. The site is best considered as a potential windfall.

Recommendation

3.2.93 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site H08 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION H12 – HERNE BAY FOOTBALL GROUND, STANLEY GARDENS, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

- | | |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------|
| RN041 | Brown (91) |
| RN050 | Herne Bay Football Club (416) |
| RN078 | Lofts (67) |
| RN094 | Steinberg (65) |
| RN130 | Herne Bay & District Residents Association (1613) |
| RN229 | Property Review & Development (2603) |
| RN257 | Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2165) |
| RN335 | Blyth (2420) |
| RN344 | Fishpool (2449, 2450, 2451, 2452) |
- Object to the allocation of Herne Bay Football ground for housing totally / until after the current users have been consulted and suitable alternative sites made available
 - Retain Winch's Field, Herne Bay, a gift to the people of Herne Bay and an important site for sport
 - It is difficult to judge housing growth in the urban areas. All development should refer to the need to comply with a development contribution policy. Site H12 should be considered as a school site

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.94 The Council removed the allocation in the Revised Deposit Draft, in the face of a large number of local objections, many now withdrawn. I have no evidence that anything other than football activities are envisaged on the site in future.

Recommendation

3.2.95 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION H18 – ADJACENT TO 181 SEA STREET, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

RN130 Herne Bay & District Residents Association (1615)

- The housing allocation at land adj. 181 Sea Street, Herne Bay should be deleted and the land retained for employment

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.96 The Council says that this is a former coal yard, now with a haulage business on site. While I agree with the objector's point that business and housing may not automatically be incompatible neighbours, what I saw here leads me to think that development for housing would significantly enhance the amenities of existing local residents, and is feasible within the Local Plan period.

Recommendation

3.2.97 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA516/H20 – WESTBROOK INDUSTRIAL PARK, SEA STREET, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

RN138 Premus Homemaker Superstores (99)

RN130 Herne Bay & District Residents Association (1617)

- The housing allocation at Westbrook Industrial Park should be deleted and employment retained on the site
- Objects to loss of Herne Bay West Trading Estate to housing allocation (Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)
- Ownership issues. Contamination. Existing use value higher than redevelopment value

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.98 The Council's response on this matter is that the owner has confirmed in writing that the site will come forward for redevelopment. The allocation is in an area where employment activities are petering out, and the predominant land use is housing. Consequently, I do not consider that the proposed allocation would have any real adverse effects on the local economy.

Recommendation

3.2.99 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION H23 – HOCKEY CLUB, BEACON ROAD, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

RN078 Lofts (66)

RN176 Taylor (210)

RN108 Parsons (913)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN257	Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2166)
RN293	Hart (2246)
RN316	Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2378)
RN326	Booth (2408)
RN231	Tabony (1706)
RN335	Blyth (2421)
RN169	Stone (934)
RN214	Collier (809)
RN215	Kadwell (810)
RN218	Brinkley (817)
RN173	Board (211)
RN176	Taylor (209)
RN177	Rogers (207)
RN130	Herne Bay & District Residents Association (1614)
RN109	Russell (912)
RN276	Rands (1760)
RN277	Ogilvie (1761)
RN338	Hirst (2426)
RN343	James (2437)

- Object to the allocation of Beacon Road Tennis and Hockey Pitches in the Local Plan
- Support, in principle; should be subject to the creation of a social space, a children's zone safe area and 40% affordable housing
- Consult the current users; make alternative sites available
- Hockey Club land one of the few unbuilt in the area. New housing will also have an impact on drainage, access, parking and local infrastructure

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.100 These are remnant objections, not withdrawn after the Council removed the allocation in the Revised Deposit Draft, in the face of a large number of local objections, most now gone. I have no evidence that anything other than sport is envisaged on the site in future.

Recommendation

3.2.101 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATIONS ARISING FROM THE URBAN HOUSING CAPACITY STUDY - WHITSTABLE

ALLOCATION W03 – LAND AT SHAFTESBURY ROAD ETC, WHITSTABLE

ALLOCATION W09 – TANKERTON ROAD CAR PARK AND GARAGE, WHITSTABLE

ALLOCATION CA529/W16 – CAR PARK, MIDDLE WALL, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN067 Whitstable Society (697)

- Support for brownfield development, but concerned about loss of part of the car parking in Whitstable at Shaftesbury Road, Middle Wall, Station Road, Tankerton Road

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.102 I am satisfied with the Council's response to this objection about sites in Whitstable: that the approach is to retain car parking to meet the Council's parking strategy, and that surplus sites can be disposed of, if appropriate. The objector has not raised any further point to the response.

Recommendation

3.2.103 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION W04 – LAND AT WHITSTABLE STATION

Objections and Key Issues

RN063 Brooker (445)

RN067 Whitstable Society (697, 989)

RN087 Eves (421)

RN264 Lerigo (2230)

RN327 Comins (2409)

RN347 Sergeant (2454)

- Object to housing allocation near Whitstable Station unless alternative parking for train users can be found. Alternative brownfield sites should be identified
- Object: impact upon the conservation area, loss of parking spaces and pressure for on-street parking, loss of mature trees and height
- Object: a severe parking problem in this area

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.104 The evidence is that the allocation is on land which is not the formal station car park, that parking use is informal, and that the right to park could be withdrawn by the owner at any time. Network Rail considers the land surplus to requirements, says the Council. My survey on more than one weekday confirms Cluttons' assessment (CD2.4) that the site is under-used, as well their sentiment that an allocation for 24 or so dwellings might still accommodate an element of car parking, if there is found to be a need to augment the official car park. The Council says that it would ask for a study of formal rail parking prior to any development. That seems to me imperative. It has also helpfully indicated that the scope for obtaining some public parking to the rear of the residential site could be addressed at application stage. In terms of the visual effects on the station buildings and conservation area, it appears to me that well set-out and landscaped conventional town housing, but not high or bulky flats, could be designed for this site without detriment.

Recommendation

3.2.105 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION W06 – APPLES GARAGE./TYRE CENTRE, HEADWAY, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN090 McBratney (718)

RN044 Kwik Fit Properties Ltd represented by DGG Planning Ltd (94)

- The site is unlikely to come forward in the foreseeable future

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.106 Though the objections have not formally been withdrawn, the allocation does not feature in the Revised Deposit Draft.

Recommendation

3.2.107 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION W08 – LAND ADJACENT TO SHIPWRIGHTS LEA (THE VINES), WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN066 Nyman (687)

- Area allocated was the garden of the listed Old Vines House; not built on and so not a brownfield site

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.108 The Council evidence is that this six dwelling allocation has a planning permission.

Recommendation

3.2.109 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION W10 – LAND AT GOLDEN HILL, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN114 Williams (908)

RN133 Field (141)

RN233 Little (1622)

RN334 Gunn (2419)

RN342 Englefield (2436)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Objection on grounds of impact: access/traffic, congestion and the rural area; also visual, physical and social impact matters; and matters of access, congestion, school places, play areas, value of property

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.110 The 85-dwelling allocation is on land that lies within the Urban Area Boundary in the Adopted Local Plan, on part of which there was an employment allocation. The land is all previously developed, albeit at low density. I can see no particular planning drawback in respect of any of the categories of objection brought up by the objectors.

Recommendation

3.2.111 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION W12 – 4 HILLVIEW ROAD, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN028 Medway Cutters (26)

- Objection to UHCS site W12. No plans to relocate and have concerns regarding demolition of adjoining building

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.112 In response to this objection the Council removed the site from the first phasing period of the Plan, and this action has not prompted further action by the objector. I consider that the 9-dwelling allocation in a residential area is not essentially problematic.

Recommendation

3.2.113 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA529/W16 – CAR PARK, MIDDLE WALL, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Could result in the loss of 42 spaces which are critical here to sustain tourist economy. Not possible to deck due to sensitive nature of area

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.114 This is a site that was studied for its design feasibility (CD2.3), and appears to be feasible, given the loss of a minority of its spaces. If the Council considers that the loss is acceptable, given public parking needs for this part of Whitstable, I do not see a strong reason to disagree. A well executed scheme could actually improve the urban quality of life locally, and it is to be hoped that the Council's ownership of the site will drive the project for some 21 dwellings forward expeditiously.

Recommendation

3.2.115 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATIONS ARISING FROM THE URBAN HOUSING CAPACITY STUDY - RURAL

ALLOCATION CA557/R01 – LAND OPPOSITE CHARTHAM PAPER MILL, CHARTHAM

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/038 – R01 Land Opposite Chartham Paper Mill Chartham

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20377)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20660)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20695)

- Objection to the inclusion of the land opposite Chartham Paper Mill due to potential for flooding
- Full comments cannot be made on this change without the publication of the amendment to the UHCS (Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)
- Site unavailable. Letter has been received to say that it is not coming forward, and CCC has a copy

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.116 The Council now accepts that the site is effectively withdrawn.

Recommendation

3.2.117 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site R01 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION CA558/R02 – FORMER PETROL STATION, BLEAN COMMON

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/039 – R02 Former Petrol Station Blean Common

RD070 McCabe (20145)

RD096 Blean Hackington & Tyler Hill Society (20241)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20649)

- Objects to the element of greenfield land to rear of petrol filling station. Supports development of the petrol filling station on its own
- Object to extent of allocation. Land to rear of petrol station is within curtilage of 81 Blean Common; should be excluded. Amend boundary to reflect recent planning application for 2 bungalows.

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Disagree number - site split in two - pp for 3 units already. Two different sites in different ownerships

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.118 After the Housing Round Table, the Council and HBF-led objectors have agreed that the site can accommodate 6 dwellings.

Recommendation

3.2.119 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to alter the notional dwelling capacity of Site R02 from 10 to 6 in the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION R03 – ROUGH COMMON ROAD, ROUGH COMMON

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/040 – R03 Rough Common Road Rough Common

RD003 Ravenscourt Road Residents' Association (20003)

RD032 Norrington (20066)

RD045 May (20093)

RD046 Pearce (20050)

RD052 Hart (20099)

RD060 Beattie (20127)

RD062 Docherty (20140)

RD064 McKellar (20134)

RD072 Cooke (20147)

RD074 Murdoch (20149)

RD081 Viney (20744)

RD094 Wilson (20226)

RD098 Antill (20258)

RD104 Garland (20287)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20650)

- Rough Common housing allocation objectionable on traffic grounds, highway safety and congestion, inadequate infrastructure re schools & hospitals
- Previous planning application refused on traffic grounds. Proposals not in keeping with other properties. Site is not brownfield. Additional hardstanding has been laid recently
- Ravenscourt Road has inadequate road facilities; will lead to further development south-east of site
- Increase in traffic flow, speed, congestion, extra hazards, create problems for existing residents gaining access to driveways, will lead to further phases of development eroding green land between Rough Common and Canterbury
- Blean Primary is oversubscribed & has traffic problems, only part of site is brownfield, existing properties are not selling
- Adverse impact on nature reserve of Blean Woods
- Rough Common has had enough development
- Land had a former agricultural use. Planning permission was not needed for construction of shed north-east of site. Hard standing has been created in April 2003
- Should not build on every open space; this would create a town outside the city without facilities. Impact on medical facilities, losing its hospital, need a pumping station for waste; water problems in past

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.2.120 This site has a total area of 0.53 ha. The previously developed land status of most of the site (0.387 ha) appears to me to be unarguable. A nursery/fruit packing and transport activity has operated for many years. Storage and workshop uses have been observed by Council officers. The length of time these activities have been carried on means that no enforcement action could be carried out if they were actively resumed in future.
- 3.2.121 The remaining portion of 0.143 ha is agreed by the Council to be greenfield land, but because of its ancillary and subordinate nature, is held to be not unacceptable in terms of national policy guidance.
- 3.2.122 The site is allocated for 16 dwellings. I do understand the degree of local opposition to what is seen as over-development of a gap site. However, the Council has to find sites for housing allocations in and around a City that is subject to many constraints because of its great historical and architectural sensitivity. This outlying area of Canterbury is a location where the impact on the historic City would be minimal. The taking of a modest amount of green land allows a valuable addition to the housing stock to be made. Careful design, and good landscaping of the site to create a defensible and natural looking rear boundary area, would mean that there need be no real adverse effect on the privacy and essential domestic amenities of owners of surrounding houses. I find that the size and shape of the allocation would not be an effective signal to a potential developer that the site could be easily enlarged in future.
- 3.2.123 I have no doubt that the definition of the site would allow essentially safe access to Rough Common Road. I understand the fears of local residents that an already well trafficked road would become more busy and dangerous. However, in itself this scale of development in this particular suburban road would not make an appreciable difference. Rough Common Road is well used by non-local drivers; I know this is not popular with residents, but it is not technically over-loaded or intrinsically hazardous – this activity is a fact of life which will not diminish in the foreseeable future. Moreover, during my Inquiry, a roundabout was built at the junction with the A290. I have used it, and observed its use at peak periods; it does ease delays to local movements appreciably. The Council's evidence is that improvements to the A2050 junction to the south may come about soon; however, that is not a major factor in my conclusion that the allocation is sound.

Recommendation

- 3.2.124 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

MIXED USE ALLOCATIONS INCORPORATING AN ELEMENT OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ARISING FROM THE URBAN HOUSING CAPACITY STUDY - CANTERBURY

ALLOCATION CA532/C02 – CLARKSON HOUSE AND CANTERBURY MOTORS, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- loss of constrained employment site. Includes petrol filling station; Canterbury Motor Co. Car Sales; car parking; offices. All to be relocated. Some elements have high existing use value, office building and petrol filling station. Includes Police Station – not to relocate. This is a prime location for Peugeot and the filling station. Not likely to be redeveloped for housing. JO received information from Lee Evans that the site is to be full residential. The site includes Clarkson House and the relocation of these offices is unknown.

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.125 A site visit reveals that the Canterbury Motors site has much under-used open ground to the rear of the car lot. Otherwise the operation is large and appears to trade well. I have no real assurance that the operators positively wish to relocate, or have in mind other suitable premises with similar visibility to car buying customers. This makes me very cautious of endorsing an allocation that could produce some 186 dwellings by 2011. The Clarkson House portion of the site is even less believable as a housing site. At the end of my Inquiry, in October 2004, a notice outside the building announced that it had been acquired for conversion to teaching accommodation by Canterbury Christ Church University College. At the least, such a use would take Clarkson House out of contention for the next few years. The site might produce some housing in the Plan period, but it would be best to regard that prospect as no more than a possible windfall.

Recommendation

3.2.126 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site C02 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION CA563/C04a – TYRE GARAGE, ROPER ROAD/ST DUNSTAN'S, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

Mixed-Use Allocations

Re: Aa3/041 – C04a Tyre Garage Roper Road / St Dunstan's Canterbury

RD075 Pollicott (20151)

RD124 Stansfield (20339)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20651)

- Object to mixed use at tyre garage, Roper Road (C04a)
- Reduce number of houses proposed, possibly to zero. Incompatible with local road conditions for vehicles and pedestrians and with consequent needs to provide parking and delivery facilities on-site.

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Waiting to hear from CCC re possible planning permission for site. Possible redevelopment as a supermarket with 10 flats over post 2006

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.127 The HBF-led objectors see a realistic 10 dwellings emerging in the Plan period on this c.25 dwelling allocation. The site is empty of occupants, and there seem no obvious problems in developing it straight away. The Council mentions interest from developers in putting retail at ground level, with market or social housing above. The issue is only what dwelling numbers can be relied on in the Plan period. Based on what

I have seen locally, I see 10 dwellings as a dependable minimum. The Council's figure of 25 seems to me high for a development that, if good street manners are to be observed, is unlikely to rise above three storeys. However, it is an aspiration worth pursuing.

Recommendation

3.2.128 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to alter the notional dwelling capacity of Site C04a from 25 to 10 in the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION C28 – WINCHEAP REGENERATION ZONE INCLUDING TELEPHONE HOUSE, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/021 – C28 Wincheap Regeneration Zone inc Telephone House Canterbury

RD127 Telereal Development Ltd Represented by RPS (20382)

Re: Aa3/043 – C28 Wincheap Regeneration Zone inc Telephone House Canterbury

RD127 Telereal Development Ltd Represented by RPS (20383)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20652)

- Dwelling provision figure for Wincheap Redevelopment Zone, including Telephone House, should not be reduced to 130. Reinstate 230 units figure and acknowledge more may be achieved depending on detailed design.
- Object to mixed use allocation Telephone House Rheims Way/Wincheap regeneration Zone C28; floodplain location suggests exclusion of housing

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.129 The Council and the HBF-led objectors both favour an allocation capable of producing 130 dwellings in the Plan period, replacing the First Deposit Draft figure of 230. I accept the Council's reasoning on the figure of 130, in response to the prospective developer's more optimistic approach: 130 is only a guide figure on a mixed use allocation, and detailed greater work on capacities will be done when producing the Regeneration Zone Framework for this and other nearby sites. I understand that the Environment Agency has no objection in principle to this kind of mixed use.

Recommendation

3.2.130 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION CA537/C33 – NORTHGATE/NEW RUTTINGTON LANE, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Many covenants and different uses. Relocation of existing businesses to where? JT to confirm

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.131 The most prominent part of this site is the post-war Job Centre offices, which do not appear obviously redundant (though I note the Clutton comment that the office did not appear fully utilised, and that the building will date significantly in the near future). Other uses, the car rental operation and the car parts business look much more ephemeral; their operators are short term occupants of unattractive, but presumably cheap, sites. The Council comment is that it owns part of the site, without saying what part, and that “another owner is keen for the site to come forward”. However, unless there is a positive wish from the owner of the office building to develop in the very near future, I could not rely on the allocation realising 20 or so dwellings by 2011. This is not a very attractive location for market housing, and it is near a busy road, as Cluttons noted. Moreover, the site does accommodate viable economic uses not incompatible with a location on the edge of the City centre. My findings should not, of course, deter the Council actively pursuing eventual redevelopment by attractive modern mixed uses.

Recommendation

3.2.132 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site C33 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION CA487/C36 – LAND AT JEWRY LANE, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- This is part of the County Hotel redevelopment site and Salvation Army and yard. Where would Salvation Army go? Do not believe that ten units are achievable on that site

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.133 This allocation appears to me to seek its justification from a theoretically laudable desire to replace unglamorous land uses by something more urbane and respectable in this core area of the historic city. However, I find it unrealistic, because the present uses serve real commercial needs. The County Hotel needs a car park to attract the irreducible minimum of guests who have cars and choose hotels that can accommodate their vehicles. The hotel might well want to retain the land for possible future expansion, given the existing site constraints.

3.2.134 Similarly, a staff car park for Nasons store must be a desirable perquisite in the business of attracting and retaining staff in a competitive labour market. I have no information that the Salvation Army intends to relocate from a very central position in a great Christian City, nor that this would be a good thing, in planning, social or religious terms. In the short term, that seems to leave as available only modest premises formerly occupied by a corner shop selling sandwiches. I really cannot rely on this allocation producing 10 dwellings in the Plan period.

Recommendation

3.2.135 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site C36 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION CA488/C37 – LAND EAST OF WHITE HORSE LANE

Objections and Key Issues

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Yard. Restaurant recently established. Do not believe restaurant will wish to relocate.

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.136 As Cluttons said, this is a large, irregular shaped site, comprising a mixture of open land, derelict buildings and car park. It declares itself to the observer as a site in need of redevelopment to a much greater degree than Allocation C36 above. The restaurant recently created in a relatively small old building would not seem to me to rule out a well conceived and actively pursued redevelopment scheme for the whole site. Given the size of the allocation overall and the possibility, noted by Cluttons, that yet more under-used contiguous land might be added to the presently defined area, I see the opportunity for a redevelopment scheme to provide Nasons store with continued delivery parking. I see no environmental or commercial reason why housing should not be the prime element in a development package.

3.2.137 To me, the key question is whether the Council can rely on the site producing dwellings by 2011. I consider that the assembly of land and negotiations with owners may be protracted, but that task could be made less difficult with the benefit of a Plan allocation, by lessening any market uncertainties. The allocation for 10 dwellings is thus, on balance, justifiable and desirable. However, the Council must be pro-active, if action is to happen by 2011.

Recommendation

3.2.138 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA496/C48 – PRIVATE CAR PARK AND GARAGES R/O INVICTA HOUSE, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/046 – C48 Invicta House and Car park Canterbury

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20663)

- Objects to Invicta House & car park mixed use allocation; retain in employment use (Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)
- Existing car park. Private – loss of rear servicing.

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.139 Like Cluttons, in their report on the site in CD2.4, my viewing of the back land was restricted by limited access. The allocation is enlarged in the Revised Deposit Draft to

include a less than alluring run of post-war development in Lower Bridge Street. The Council comments in the revised Urban Housing Capacity Study (CD2.5) that this ambitious redevelopment would be "subject to the Planning Framework to be prepared as part of the Regeneration Zone allocation". My understanding is that the Council now agrees that the 16 dwelling units will not come forward within the Plan period, which accords with my own view of the time needed to achieve a good result on the ground.

Recommendation

3.2.140 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site C48 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION C61 – HALLETTS GARAGE, ST DUNSTAN'S, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/047 – C61 Halletts Garage St Dunstan's Canterbury

RD124 Stansfield (20338)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20653)

- Reduce number of houses proposed, possibly to zero. Incompatible with local road conditions for vehicles and pedestrians and with consequent needs to provide parking and delivery facilities on-site.
- Objects to Halletts garage mixed use C61 should remain in employment / roadside use

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.141 The objections have been overtaken by events. Planning permission was granted for 32 dwelling units here on 12 March 2004. However, for the purposes of calculations between the Council and the HBF-led objectors, a figure of 15 notional dwellings has been used.

Recommendation

3.2.142 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION C62 – FIRE STATION UPPER BRIDGE STREET, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/048 – C62 Fire Station Upper Bridge Street Canterbury

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20654)

- Object to fire station C62 mixed use allocation; should remain in community use

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.143 After the Housing Round Table, it was agreed by the Council and the HBF-led objectors that the site would not come forward in this Plan period.

Recommendation

3.2.144 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site C62 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

MIXED USE ALLOCATIONS INCORPORATING AN ELEMENT OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ARISING FROM THE URBAN HOUSING CAPACITY STUDY – HERNE BAY

ALLOCATION H10 – ADJACENT 177 HIGH STREET, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/049 – H10 Adjacent 177 High Street Herne Bay

RD137

MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20664)

- Land should remain undeveloped; if allocated, retail, employment and community uses should predominate here

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.145 The Council informed me that planning permission was granted for 17 dwellings on this site on 22 August 2003, more than the allocation for 10 dwellings.

Recommendation

3.2.146 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

ALLOCATION CA515/ H19 SEA STREET INDUSTRIAL AREA, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

RN129

Hoppers Farmhouse Bakeries (116)

RN130

Herne Bay & District Residents Association (1616)

RN156

BSF Planning Consultants (1873)

RN271

Montravia (1727)

- Objects to housing allocation of Sea Street Industrial Estate, Herne Bay: loss of employment in the local economy, commercial viability, other more suitable sites for housing and lack of facilities to sustain development
- Sea Street should not be developed, as it is important to the local economy

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Objects to the housing allocation of Sea Street Trading Estate due to difficulty of relocating and maintaining the existing business operations

Re: Aa3/032 – H19 Sea Street Industrial Area Herne Bay

RD129 Second Site Property Holdings (20480)

- deletion of housing allocation fails to optimise the redevelopment opportunities & regeneration of a substantial brownfield site. Should be redeveloped in advance of greenfield sites for housing

Re: Aa3/050 – H19 Sea Street Industrial Area Herne Bay

RD129 Second Site Property Holdings (20481)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20659)

- Objects to mixed use allocation at Sea Street Industrial estate - should remain in employment use (Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)
- Wahl will not relocate. The allocation is not agreed for this Plan period

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.147 Cluttons describe this as a large site that forms the heart of the commercial/industrial employment area of Herne Bay. There is a mix of freehold and leasehold ownership, and some enterprises appear quite substantial. The Council changed its attitude to the site in the Revised Deposit Draft, recasting it as a mixed-use allocation, with a yield of some 60 dwellings. That move disposed of any case for removing an entire set of uses on grounds of non-conformity with predominantly residential surroundings.

3.2.148 I do not regard the presence of the railway south of the allocation as a real inhibition on new residential development, although it hardly helps to make this a first site choice for housing. However, not only is the site now fairly robust commercially, but its central area is dominated by a substantial gasholder without positive visual attributes. No party has suggested that there are convincing operational reasons why this object should disappear in the near future. In common sense terms, this suggests to me that only small developments on the east and west extremities of the allocation could be considered potential sources of housing in the Plan period. I do not see even these areas being attractive to private house builders, without the firm prospect of the wider allocation becoming vacant soon. Unless the Council can bring about the removal of the gasholder, the planning justification for the whole of this allocation appears to me to be flimsy. I feel no confidence that any significant number of dwellings would appear by 2011 here.

Recommendation

3.2.149 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete Site H19 from the schedule of Housing Allocations in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

ALLOCATION H24 – FORMER METRIC SITE, HILLBOROUGH

Objections and Key Issues

RN251 The Metric Group, represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2137-2141)

- Object to the non-allocation of 1.45 ha of land south of Hillborough Farm for residential development, and to its allocation for employment purposes

Re: Aa3/052 – H24 Former Metric Site Hillborough

RD049 Bradford (20095)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20665)

RD144 The Metric Group represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20746)

- Objects to mixed use allocation at Metric site. Development could be overbearing lead to loss of privacy and value for bungalows within the site frontage
- Object to Metric mixed use allocation - site should remain in employment use
- Owners consider the whole site should be allocated as residential, without employment on the southern boundary; would help enable new road linking Sweechbridge and Reculver Road, via this site and Hillborough Farm to the south

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.150 The Council sees a yield of C.40 dwellings coming from a mixed use scheme on this 1.45 ha site within the defined urban area of Herne Bay. The owners envisage a development of between 44 and 73 dwellings, at PPG3 densities. This would have residential on the north side, and employment to the south, perhaps developed together with the Hillborough Farm allocation (H11). In the current emerging Local Plan, the Council first allocated the site as part of an employment cluster with Keat Farm and the Hillborough Business Park. It then acceded in part to the owners' representations for the site to be shown for residential use, they no longer intending to occupy the site, including it in draft Policy TC2a as a mixed use site. The boundary of the local employment cluster was amended to exclude the site. The Revised Deposit Draft no longer applies the protective employment policy ED1 to the Metric site. In coming to its decision, the Council does not seem to have been under any illusion that the site owners would definitely relocate the business carried out here to another site in the District. It makes the point that relocation to nearby Blacksole Farm is ruled out, because Blacksole is unlikely to be developed in the short-term.

3.2.151 This site lies just north of the Hillborough Business Park, the owners of which also seek an entirely residential allocation on their land. I consider their objection below (in paragraphs 3.3.39-3.3.42). In that case I conclude that the land continues to serve a very useful planning purpose as a basic business site, and that its status should not be changed in this Plan period. Thus, it would be premature to draw the conclusion that amenity, traffic or other planning reasons exist to an extent that should encourage the Council to seek the effective abandonment of a useful local business presence in the Hillborough area, which provides jobs for Herne Bay residents.

3.2.152 The Council's evidence is that is preparing a Development Brief for the Metric Site and Hillborough Farm, with an element of business use on about a third of the former, of about 2,000 m². If it is well designed and located this need not cause any environmental harm to existing and new local residents. There seems no reason why a mixed use should inhibit the provision of part of a link road envisaged to run through from Sweechbridge Road to Reculver Road. Combined with a gain of about 40 new dwellings, the Council's allocation seems to me to be beneficial. I cannot see clear evidence that the development mix is either unbalanced or inherently uncommercial. The owners nowhere advance convincing arguments that the proposed mixed use here would bring in insufficient profit to enable it to relocate operations to a better site. When the owners/developers are ready to bring forward detailed proposals, I have no doubt that the Council will pay careful attention to all the relevant factors about viability and the long-term prospects for a significant employment element on the eastern periphery of Herne Bay.

Recommendation

3.2.153 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

ALLOCATION CA561 – TALMEAD, MILL LANE, HERNE BAY
OMISSION SITE: LAND AT AND ADJACENT TO TALMEAD, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

RN174 Mr & Mrs Brealy (213, 214)

RN097 Wilson Connolly (50, 51)

- allocate the land at the west end for housing, to reflect the association with the Mill Lane site, and for commercial/employment purposes at the east end, consistent with the adjacent commercial allocation on this site close to Thanet Way

RN307 Sands (2316)

- Support allocation of land at Mill Lane for housing subject to a proposal to provide road access through the Talmead land from the Thanet Way roundabout and reducing Mill Lane to cycle path

(Amplified objection formulated post Housing Round Table)

- Recent application refused on sequential test. Post 2011. The recent application was 100% residential and not mixed use.

Re: Aa3/053 – CA561 Talmead Mill Lane Herne Bay

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20666)

RD147 Wilson Connolly South East represented by David Hicken Associates (20720)

- Talmead Site should remain open & undeveloped; limit redevelopment to the residential curtilage of Talmead
- Status of amendment is unclear, but in any event the contribution needs to be assessed and placed in the schedule

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.154 The Revised Deposit Draft allocates the Talmead island site under policy TC2a: for housing within the residential curtilage of the house called Talmead, and for commercial use on the 0.54 ha of open land immediately adjoining to the east. Significantly, that TC2a text talks of the housing being “linked to Mill Lane housing allocation if necessary”. The site is in reality one part of a linked set of land holdings. The 8.5 ha Mill Lane site – allocated for housing in the Adopted Local Plan, and in the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan downgraded to the status of a “reserve housing provision” under draft Policy H1a - is owned by Hollamby Estates. Mr J Brealy of Hollamby Estates owns the Talmead site. Wilson Connolly, the objectors above, have since merged with Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd, and the latter would like develop Mill Lane.

3.2.155 The Blacksole Farm site to the north-east of Talmead was removed from the Revised Deposit Draft as an employment allocation and employment cluster because it had been given a planning permission. However, evidence to the Inquiry from Kitewood Estates, the prospective developers of Blacksole Farm, is that nothing has started because of what are said to be very significant infrastructure constraints on the site: an expensive electricity mains connection, and the requirement for a footbridge/cycle bridge over third party railway land, constraints which would be lessened by cost-sharing with development of the Mill Lane site. There is also a Kitewood argument that an hotel allocation at the east of the Blacksole site would aid its development. The Council view

is that development of the Blacksole site should occur in the later part of this emerging Plan's life

3.2.156 Planning permission was refused for residential development of the Talmead site in January 2004. At the end of my Inquiry, an outline planning application for part residential, part commercial development of Talmead and land to the east remained undetermined. An application for outline planning permission, for housing on both the Mill Lane site, and the house and garden area of the Talmead site plus part of the neck of land to the east, was to go to a called-in planning Inquiry in later 2004.

3.2.157 All the sites I have mentioned lie within the defined urban area of Herne Bay, both in the Adopted Local Plan and the emerging Local Plan. I am writing this report before the results of appeal proceedings are known about planning applications affecting the Mill Lane site. My conclusions on the appropriate allocation for the Mill Lane site are to be found in paragraphs 3.3.8-3.3.15 and Section 3.4 below. Whatever the outcome of the appeal, the status of the residential curtilage area of Talmead as previously developed land is acknowledged by the Council. In the discussions with the HBF-led objectors about allocations at and after the Housing Round Table, the Council acknowledges that the site can produce some 20 dwellings from the housing element of this mixed-use allocation, which is the figure that Wilson Connolly put forward in their objections. I see no reason to doubt that 20 dwellings could be realised on the site by 2011, whatever the result of the 2004 Inquiry, as there would be adequate time for a revised application to be made on the Talmead site, alone if necessary, in accord with a Revised Deposit Draft allocation that is not challenged by the owners.

Recommendation

3.2.158 I recommend that a notional capacity figure of 20 dwellings be added to the Talmead entry in Appendix 3, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

MIXED USE ALLOCATIONS INCORPORATING AN ELEMENT OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ARISING FROM THE URBAN HOUSING CAPACITY STUDY – WHITSTABLE

ALLOCATION CA562/W07 – GAS WORKS, BELMONT ROAD, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/054 – W07 Gas Works Belmont Road Whitstable

RD129 Second Site Property Holdings (20479)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20667)

- Mixed use allocation should be residential in accordance with government guidance; most beneficial use
- Site should remain in employment use

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.159 The Council and the HBF-led objectors agree that 20 dwellings can be delivered on this site by 2011. I know that a planning application has been under consideration for the site recently. The Council's evidence is that subject to a planning obligation, a

predominantly residential scheme of 42 sheltered housing units will be given planning permission. I have no good planning reason to dissent from the Council's opinion, set out in Policy TC2a, of what is appropriate: housing, open and play space, and parking.

Recommendation

3.2.160 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

CONCLUSIONS ON ALLOCATIONS

3.2.161 For the sake of brevity and clarity, my conclusions on the tables of disagreed sites put forward by the Council and the HBF-led objectors are as follows overleaf:

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

INSPECTOR'S CONCLUSIONS ON THE NOTIONAL DWELLING CAPACITY OF THOSE ALLOCATIONS DISAGREED PRIOR TO THE HOUSING ROUND TABLE BY THE COUNCIL AND THE HBF-LED OBJECTORS (TABLE 1)

Site Ref	Site Address	Town	INSPECTOR'S CONCLUSIONS
CA312	Station Road Depot	Whitstable	0
CA506	C04 Land at Roper Road	Canterbury	13
CA508	C07 Scrap Metal Yards Parham Road	Canterbury	0
CA483	C22 Land @ Dane John Works Canterbury East Station (South side)	Canterbury	25
CA486	C32 Unigate depot	Canterbury	0
CA498	C50 Land @ Westgate Gr / St Peters Place	Canterbury	5
CA501	C53 Puckle Supplies Land at Old Dover Road	Canterbury	0
CA532	C02 Clarkson House & Canterbury Motors	Canterbury	0
CA563	C04a Tyre Garage, Roper Road/St Dunstan's	Canterbury	10
CA562	W07 Gas Works, Belmont Road	Whitstable	20
		TOTAL	73

INSPECTOR'S CONCLUSIONS ON THE NOTIONAL DWELLING CAPACITY OF THOSE ALLOCATIONS CONSIDERED AFTER THE HOUSING ROUND TABLE BY THE COUNCIL AND THE HBF-LED OBJECTORS (TABLE 2)

Site Ref	Site Address	Town	IN SP E CT O R
CA031	Between 254 & 260 Reculver Rd	Herne Bay	7
CA039	The Tannery Stour Street	Canterbury	30
CA043 B	Rosemary Lane Car Park	Canterbury	20
CA278	Northgate Car Park	Canterbury	21
CA279	The Tannery, Mildred's Lane	Canterbury	37 0
CA281	Hawks Lane	Canterbury	9
CA284	Church Street St Paul's	Canterbury	0
CA295	York Road/Sea Street	Herne Bay	11
CA303	Diamond Road	Whitstable	26
CA305	Adj. 15 Hamilton Rd	Whitstable	12
CA477	Holmans Meadow Car Park	Whitstable	20
CA323	Regent Street	Whitstable	12
CA346	Havelock St	Canterbury	0
CA347	Ivy Lane North	Canterbury	10
CA310	Beresford Road North and South	Whitstable	20
CA507	C05 Castle Street Car Park	Canterbury	54
CA377	East of Westmeads Road	Whitstable	14
CA478	C13 Jewson Yard, Market Way	Canterbury	0
CA552	C38 Lenleys Roper Road	Canterbury	24
CA490	C42 Builders Centre, Sturry Road	Canterbury	0
CA553	C43 ATS Sturry Road	Canterbury	0
CA492	C44 Invicta Motors, Sturry Road	Canterbury	45

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

CA495	C47 Office Block & car park (Adj. 1 Ivy Lane)	Canterbury	0
CA497	C49 Scout Hut & land, Heaton Road	Canterbury	0
CA500	C52 Land at Puckle Lane Sea Cadets Centre	Canterbury	9
CA505	C54 Air Cadet Centre, inter 1b and 11 Cossington Rd	Canterbury	0
CA509	H08 Former White Horse PH	Herne Bay	0
CA516	H20 Westbrook Industrial Park, Sea Street	Herne Bay	15
CA529	W16 Car Park, Middle Wall	Whitstable	21
CA557	R01 Land opposite Chartham Paper Mill	Rural	0
CA537	C33 corner of Northgate/ New Ruttington Lane	Canterbury	0
CA487	C36 Land @ Jewry Lane / White Horse Lane (West side)	Canterbury	0
CA488	C37 Land East of White Horse Lane	Canterbury	10
CA496	C48 Invicta House & private car park	Canterbury	0
CA515	H19 Sea St (Between Claremont & Beaumont south side)	Herne Bay	0
CA523	W08 Land Adj. Shipwrights Lea (The Vines)	Whitstable	6
CA561	H25 Talmead, Margate Road	Herne Bay	20
C20	Canterbury West	Canterbury	40
C61	Halletts Garage	Canterbury	15
C62	Fire Station, Upper Bridge St	Canterbury	0
		TOTAL	84 1

3.2.162 Following the Round Table Session on 6 May 2004, the Council and the HBF-led objectors compiled a Table summing up allocation sites in Appendix 3 of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan, showing sites mutually agreed, those disagreed, and quantifying the disagreement over notional site capacities. From my own conclusions on the allocations above, I have added my own figures to my Table 3 below.

TABLE THREE

**Summary of City Council, HBF and
Inspector
Assessments of Housing Land Supply**

HLS 2003	CCC	HBF	INSPECTOR
Structure Plan Requirement			
1 1991 to 2001	5,300	5,300	5,300
2 2001 to 2006	2,500	2,500	2,500
3 2006 to 2011	2,500	2,500	2,500
4 Total SP requirement 1991 to 2011	10,300	10,300	10,300
Dwelling Completions			
5 Completions 1991 to 2001	4,693	4,693	4,693
6 Completions April 2001 to March 2003	787	787	787
7 Total completions 1991 to 2003	5,480	5,480	5,480
8 SP residual requirement 2003 to 2011	4,820	4,820	4,820
Housing Land Supply (31/03/03)			
9 Permissions (n/s & u/c) Large sites only	1,627	1,627	1,627
1 Losses	27	27	27
0			
1 Net gain	1,600	1,600	1,600
1			
Allocations (pre 2011)			
Agreed allocations (Table A)	1,538	1,538	1,538
Disagreed (Table B)	467	58	73
"To be considered" (Table C)*	1,075	497	841
1 Total allocations	3,080	2,093	2,452
2			
1 Total identified supply	4,680	3,693	4,052
3			
1 Discounted windfall sites @ 72.125pa	577	577	577
4			
1 Total supply	5,257	4,270	4,629
5			
1 BALANCE OF LAND SUPPLY	+437	-550	-191
6			

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

(now includes consideration of Allocations C20, C61 [15 dwelling figure used agreed by all parties], and C62, following Sept 04 adjustment of the Table by Mr Watler)*

3.3 OBJECTIONS SEEKING DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESERVE SITES, AND OF SPECIFIC OMISSION SITES FOR, OR INCLUDING, HOUSING

Preamble

3.3.1 In this section I consider the merits of all the omission sites put forward by objectors to the Draft Plan, and of the two Reserve Sites – Mill Lane, Herne Bay, and land adjoining Richmond Drive, Beltinge – put forward in Policy H1a. I treat sites in the following sequence:

- 1) Land Within Defined Urban Areas – first the two Reserve Sites, then others in ascending plan respondent number; the category includes greenfield sites within urban areas;
- 2) Extensions Directly Bounding Defined Urban Areas, in ascending plan respondent number;
- 3) Sites at and Around Hersden, in ascending plan respondent number;
- 4) Other Land Not Directly Adjoining Defined Urban Area Boundaries, in ascending plan respondent number;

3.3.2 Although this order of treatment seems the best to me in Canterbury District, when looking at particular sites I have had in mind the preferred search sequence set out in Paragraph 30 of Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: i.e. first, previously developed land/buildings within urban areas identified by an urban capacity study; second, urban extensions and, third, new development around a node in good public transport corridors. I have already mentioned the need for the Council to make some reference to the place of urban greenfield sites in its search sequence in paragraph 3.1.13 above.

3.3.3 Having found deficiencies in the Council's allocations, I have the task of identifying enough housing land to meet the Structure Plan requirement. As well as sites in the "right" places, in terms of national policy guidance, I look for sites that I am reasonably confident can be developed – the proviso is that house builders have the will to build on them, and that the Council adopts a sustained, pro-active stance of encouraging site assembly in the more problematic locations. That was a principal criterion of my assessment of the allocations in Section 3.3 above. Thus I find a crude deficiency of sites for some 200 dwellings.

3.3.4 In reality, that deficiency will be have been understated if certain desirable things do not happen. For example, the Council can set a really good example to other developers if it moves promptly to implement the housing schemes it has endorsed on its own urban car parks. If it does not, the market may take that much longer to seize on opportunities on privately owned sites in the urban areas. If the Council lags with its own car parks (Ivy Lane North, Rosemary Lane, Northgate, Castle Street, Middle Wall at Whitstable), the deficiency of sites rises by c.100 dwellings. I should like to think that the Council is fully aware of the amount of human resources it will need to put those schemes promptly into operation. Some other schemes may need to be driven hard to help private initiative off the ground; I think here of allocations I have endorsed, like C37 – Land East of White Horse Lane, and C4 – Invicta Motors, together capable of achieving c.55 dwellings. However, encouragement, exhortation and recourse to Compulsory Purchase Orders may all be necessary on other sites as well.

- 3.3.5 At the end of the Inquiry, the Council's stance was that it had made allocations capable of producing 400+ dwellings over the Structure Plan Requirement. By the same token, I consider it an appropriate aim to identify what I consider truly feasible sites, in line with the thinking in PPG3, which can produce a crude numerical surplus of a similar amount. My reasoning is that I must recommend a total of allocations that enables house builders to build out the whole of the Structure Plan requirement from among them. I hope that this will remove the need or excuse for the market to resort to a further process only too familiar to the Planning Inspectorate: i.e. identifying unallocated green-field sites, meeting understandable resistance, getting a planning refusal or no decision at all, and then proceeding to further rounds of tedious and expensive "Planning by Inquiry". In addition, I consider that it is commonsense to allocate sufficient land to provide some residual development in the years immediately following 2011.
- 3.3.6 As the Council has stated that this Plan, once adopted, will be succeeded by a Local Development Framework before it has run its full course, I do not believe it would be appropriate or sensible to make provision for at least 10 years' supply of housing from the time of adoption of this final Local Plan. Looking ahead in this manner is best done in the Council's first Local Development Framework, as part of the Housing Trajectory process (see PPS12, Annex B, Paragraph B25). That Framework will be informed by a new adopted Kent and Medway Structure Plan, in which it will be clear – as it is not to me at the time of writing this report – whether future housing requirements for Canterbury will be lower than those contained in the 1996 adopted Structure Plan.
- 3.3.7 Though I recommend outright rejection of the majority of the omission sites below, I carry my recommendation of a few strong candidates into my final consideration of the necessary additional housing allocations, in Section 3.4 below. Into that final consideration must also go the Council's two deleted allocations carried over from the Adopted Local Plan, which I have addressed in Section 3.2 above: CA420 – Chaucer Road Barracks, Canterbury, and CA428 – Lawson Close, Chartham.

LAND WITHIN DEFINED URBAN AREAS

RESERVE LIST OF HOUSING SITES

Re: A2/017 New Paragraph 2.17a – Reserve Housing Sites

- | | |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| RD077 | Hillreed Homes Ltd (20154) |
| RD095 | House Builders Federation (20228, 20229) |
| RD130 | Rydon Homes (20482) |
| RD137 | MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20605) |
| RD147 | Wilson Connolly South East represented by David Hicken Associates (20719) |
- Mill Lane should be classified as 'other sites within the urban area not otherwise protected' as shown in Appendix 5 and 'Tapping the Potential', allowing its release as a major windfall site
 - Should not select limited number of reserve sites; either extend list or delay list until housing review
 - Inappropriate to select reserve sites in same settlement; more realistic to locate some of provision at another settlement
 - Object to inclusion of any greenfield site for housing when sites such as colliery land at Hersden are suitable accessible & immediately available for development
 - Reserve sites are needed to maintain average annual completion rates. Need more than 300 dwellings; should be double

Re: A2/018 New Policy H1a – Reserve Housing Sites

- | | |
|-------|--------------------------|
| RD118 | Kitewood Estates (20461) |
|-------|--------------------------|

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- RD130 Rydon Homes (20483)
- RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20606, 20607)
- RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20704)
- RD147 Wilson Connolly South East represented by David Hicken Associates (20717)
- More realistic to locate some of reserve site provision at another settlement
 - Delete reference to greenfield sites in light of availability of former colliery land at Hersden
 - Delete references to new Policy H1a or include those to Hersden
 - Decision to release reserves dependent on need to maintain average annual completion rates
 - The list of reserve sites inadequate in numerical terms to deal with the potential shortfall of land over the 10 year period. Additional sites should be included
 - Greenfield sites needed now to achieve SP target; greenfield provision should be 1000 not 300 units. Mill Lane should provide pedestrian/cycle bridge over railway, if development occurs before later phase of Blacksole Farm
 - Delete Mill Lane as a reserve site and add as full allocation

ALLOCATION CA422 – LAND AT MILL LANE HERNE BAY – RESERVE SITE

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/055 – land at Mill Lane Herne Bay – Reserve site

- RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20655)
- RD147 Wilson Connolly South East represented by David Hicken Associates (20718)
- Should be deleted given availability of remainder of colliery land
 - Should be classified as 'other sites within the urban area not otherwise protected' as shown in Appendix 5 and 'Tapping the Potential'. The plan would allow its release as a major windfall site. Delete Mill Lane as a reserve site and add as full allocation

ALLOCATION CA313a – RICHMOND DRIVE, HERNE BAY – RESERVE SITE

Objections and Key Issues

Re: Aa3/056 – Richmond Drive Herne Bay – Reserve Site

- RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20656)
- Should be deleted, given availability of remainder of former Hersden colliery land

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.3.8 The 8.5 ha Mill Lane site was recommended as an allocation in the Adopted Local Plan by Inspector O'Rourke. Her reasoning took account of a current Council view that the grade 3b farmland should be kept open for reasons of its visual importance; she found that it did not have the visual or recreational amenity value to warrant being kept permanently open, and that it would anyway have to be considered for housing in the near future, as a site within the Urban Area Boundary.
- 3.3.9 The planning situation today is that the Mill Lane site would not even directly link to open countryside, if developed with other adjoining land, either allocated or benefiting from a planning permission. To its north-east lies the undeveloped Blacksole farm site, which enjoys a planning permission for employment. Immediately east is the mixed use Talmead allocation in the emerging Local Plan, to which I find no valid objection. In sustainability terms, its position in this north-east part of Herne Bay is reasonably close to primary and secondary schools, shopping, existing and planned employment opportunities, and bus/rail connections.

- 3.3.10 There is a benefit from developing the Mill Lane site which, though it would not be enough to overcome major policy objections if they existed, I find significant. The site owners/objectors are willing not only to satisfy the Council's drainage and flood alleviation requirements in developing the site, but also to enter into planning obligations to carry out off-site works on land in their control, providing a workable solution to nearby flooding problems experienced regularly in residential areas west of Mill Lane near the Plenty Brook. Enough agreed evidence was produced to my Inquiry to convince me that these problems are indeed serious, and likely to increase without expensive physical works. Though the Council is actively investigating a publicly funded solution, there is nothing to convince me that this work, dependent on substantial DEFRA grant and land acquisition, would be implemented in the very near future. Prompt action on this flood problem might produce useful windfall developments on otherwise flood-blighted urban land.
- 3.3.11 A further significant benefit from the allocation of this site for housing would be valuable opportunities, for synchronised mutual action and diminished development costs, in planning and constructing access roads and shareable infrastructure with the Blacksole Farm and mixed-use Talmead sites. This factor could be used by the Council as a lever to expedite delivery of the commercially less enticing employment elements, which would be so desirable for residents in the District, and useful in accommodating enterprises from sites in the inner areas of Herne Bay, Canterbury and Whitstable that the Council wants to see redeveloped.
- 3.3.12 The Richmond Drive site is the unbuilt residue of the "Reculver Road Caravan Park/Richmond Drive" allocation in the Adopted Local Plan, carried over into the First Deposit Draft of April 2002. Inspector O'Rourke considered objections to the Council's draft allocation, but found positive factors: its status as a previously developed site within the urban boundary (in fact this part of the Adopted Local Plan allocation is green-field), avoiding land take outside, closeness to a primary school, and closeness to local employment at Hillborough and the proposed Blacksole Farm site.
- 3.3.13 However described, Richmond Drive has very strong claims to being re-instated as an allocation, filling an open area of no visual distinction within the Urban Area Boundary., for which no other land use suggests itself as superior.
- 3.3.14 Both sites fit within the second category of the sequential approach within the Revised Deposit Draft's Appendix 5 – "Managing the Release of Housing Sites". There it comes after the first category – "other non-identified brown-field sites in the urban areas", in the category of "other sites in the urban areas that are not otherwise protected". In evidence about the Mill Lane site the Council agreed that a better term for that second category might well be "vacant land not previously developed in urban areas". I agree with that point. The Council's stated stance is that if I find a shortfall in housing allocations, I should look first to these two reserve sites to meet the shortfall before considering others, and that Mill Lane is the prime choice for initial construction. The two sites are consistent with the criteria of adopted Structure Plan Policy H3, as the Council now takes the view that they do not constitute what is meant in the Policy by "fresh land". They were both allocated in the 2002 First Deposit Draft. I have found a shortfall, and I agree with the Council's sentiments.
- 3.3.15 These very strong candidate sites must be considered with other feasible alternatives, when I make a decision on the most appropriate locations to achieve the Structure Plan

target. I do this at Section 3.4 below, and therefore make no recommendation at this stage.

OTHER OMISSION SITES WITHIN DEFINED URBAN AREAS

OMISSION SITE: LAND SOUTH OF JOHN WILSON BUSINESS PARK, RIDGEWAY, CHESTFIELD

Objections and Key Issues

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (381-383, 399, 401)

- Land should be allocated at the John Wilson Business Park for mixed development, including residential
- Land to the south of the John Wilson Business Park should not be allocated as protected open space

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.3.16 The objector argues that this 17.2 ha site, a grass covered private field, is a highly sustainable location for residential and employment uses; 5.5 ha should go to employment, some 200 dwellings being realised on 5 ha of housing land, with the remainder being used for public open space. It was stated at the Inquiry that the land, which has no formal public access rights, was subject to a Grazing Agreement which will require the whole site to be fenced in the immediate future.
- 3.3.17 Road access to the land would be through a straightforward extension of Reeves Way, which joins the A2990 Thanet Way via a large roundabout. This good quality, single carriageway road already serves a superstore and B & Q retail warehouse. From the technical evidence before me and personal observation, I see no reason why this site should have serious access drawbacks, if developed in the manner sought. No doubt there are particular technical deficiencies which could be improved, but nothing suggests itself as a problem incapable of solution by conventional or Grampian style conditions if the site received a planning permission.
- 3.3.18 As to flood risk, the objectors have modelled this and designed alleviation proposals. It appears that, in considering any planning application for this scale of development, the Council could be assured that a system of on-site bunding in the southern part of the site, and physical measures to control flows in the Swalecliffe Brook would be implemented. Thus, the majority of the site would not be at risk of flooding. There is unchallenged evidence that such works could also protect some 30 existing dwellings in Chestfield. A letter of April 2004 from the Environment Agency confirms that position. The creation of a substantial area of public open space in the western and south areas of the site, in the floodable area, would solve the technical problem. I consider the usability and attractiveness of that new open space should not be affected, if the landscaping is of good quality.
- 3.3.19 Sustainability is not a serious argument against development. The site is 1 km from a rail station, very close to a substantial out-of-centre superstore and a major employment area, and just over 1.5 km from Swalecliffe Primary School.
- 3.3.20 The area proposed for employment is 5.5 ha. That is the same amount as the emerging Local Plan's proposed employment allocation south of the Joseph Wilson Business Park – (Policy ED2 and Appendix 4). Both sites are equally well related to main road

connections and to the population of the urban area. There would be an easy and logical road connection southwards here into an expanded business park area. It would be a far less tortuous arrangement than at the Joseph Wilson site, and the same extended road could be used for access to the new housing further into the site.

- 3.3.21 While finding all these positive factors in favour of development, I am very conscious that the site has the status of Protected Open Space, and that its present size and tranquillity make it an obvious local asset. Inspector O'Rourke's report referred to this site, "Grasmere Pasture", along with the cricket club to the south as "valuable open spaces used for recreation that are worthy of protection under Policy D39" of the Adopted Local Plan. I have visited the site during the Inquiry, and once later, in April 2005. I saw that it is a semi-natural, grassed space, which is no longer conventional farmland. The land is bounded by thick hedging with some trees on the north and east sides. Boundary housing to the south and west is separated from the site by hedges or fences, and there are also some areas of tree planting along these boundary areas. In April 2005, I saw that the site boundaries adjoining public access ways had new post and wire fencing, but that this fencing had already been torn down in several places. Nevertheless, the site is not a public space, and its owners can at any time repair the vandalised boundaries to prevent further informal recreational access/benign trespass. The land seems to fall into the category of "Amenity Greenspace" defined in paragraph 7.90b of the Revised Deposit Draft.
- 3.3.22 A development brief could assure the delivery of an optimum layout, with natural-looking public open space, retaining and enhancing the existing landscape planting on boundary areas, and ensuring the protection of the character or appearance of the area which adjoins the Chestfield Conservation Area. There is enough land area to ensure that new residential and employment could be designed as compatible neighbours, with a relatively small loss of ambience – principally long open views – for residents in existing housing adjoining the site. I am also conscious of the footpath network on the north and south sides of the site. Clearly, the northern path would be interrupted by an extended Reeves Way, but this is a problem that could be minimised by good detailed design.
- 3.3.23 I turn to the planning need for development that could justify loss of some two thirds of the site area to building. I find that the visual implications of development on this omission site are less adverse than building out into the open countryside south of the Joseph Wilson Park. South of this John Wilson Park at Chestfield the open land is physically contained, and its southern boundary adjoins further land within the Urban Area Boundary. Its absolute amenity value is less. There is no Special Landscape Area to be violated on the Chestfield site; the proposed expansion of the Joseph Wilson site would create an unnatural and arbitrary extension of the urban area, unrelated to natural features or field boundaries. Sited near a crest of land, it would require elaborate landscape screening which would only partially mitigate the intrusion, and take a decade or more to mature. It would adversely affect the enjoyment of users of the Crab and Winkle Line pedestrian/cycle route by developing somewhere that is now clearly part of the open countryside.
- 3.3.24 The case for allocating a site that could yield some 200 dwellings within the urban area is obviously strong, since I gave found a shortfall in the Council's housing allocations. This yield should be fully achievable, with good landscaping, within the 30-50 dwelling per hectare net density endorsed in PPG3.

3.3.25 My conclusions on employment land in the District (paragraphs 4.1-4.8 below) are that no more sites are needed than have been allocated by the Council. It would therefore be quite realistic and reasonable for development here simply to supersede the draft allocation for the Joseph Wilson Park.

3.3.26 This very strong candidate site must be considered with other feasible alternatives, when I make a decision on the most appropriate locations to achieve the Structure Plan housing target. I do this at Section 3.4 below, and therefore make no recommendation at this stage

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT CHURCH STREET/THANET WAY, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN005 Kemp (604, 605, 606)

- Small parcel of land, inappropriately zoned. Effectively a brownfield sites, which should be allocated for housing
- Though zoned as protected open space, virtually no visual amenity value

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.27 This is a site designated as protected open space by the Adopted Local Plan's Policy C38, which is restated in the emerging Local Plan as Policy C20, with the addition of one extra criterion. This would not be an intrinsically difficult site to develop, and it would be possible to leave some landscaped fringe adjoining the busy A299. However, the land is publicly accessible by pathway, and though not of high visual quality it is pleasing to the eye, has a positive local value as a clear stop to development north-west of a busy road, and acts as a green, visual counterpart to another, much larger area of protected open land across the A299. Those factors together give it positive amenity value, and in my opinion slightly outweigh the modest potential housing gain.

Recommendation

3.3.28 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: VINCENT NURSERIES, EDDINGTON LANE, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

RN121 Vincent Nurseries (903)

RN319 Courtley Consultants Limited (2309, 2310)

- Object to the non-allocation of a part brownfield plot land at Vincent Nursery, Eddington Lane, Herne Bay for residential development

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.29 The site lies north of the Urban Area Boundary in this part of Herne Bay, but it is quite clearly an urban site, north of the busy Thanet Way. The site lies within a conservation area, but such a designation on this site location seems generous, to say the least, and

well designed residential development would not detract from the character or appearance of the local area. There is a substantial local context of housing to the north and east. This is a site of nearly 2 ha and its development should be able to yield at least 60 dwellings, with adequate landscaping and good siting to minimise road noise. The Council nowhere states that the nature of existing uses on the site would be considered a bar to future redevelopment for housing.

3.3.30 However, I have no detailed evidence before me to refute the Council's contention (CD1.16, pages 53-54) that the site has potential flood problems. The north-west part is stated to be an Environment Agency Area at risk of Tidal Flooding; it is also stated that the site would drain to the Plenty Brook, already over capacity and known to flood. The Council says that the situation may change when a Plenty Brook flood reservoir is operational

3.3.31 I regard this site as a useful potential source of urban housing, but it will be necessary for the site's owners to explore the detailed technical aspects of the flood risk position with the Council and the Environment Agency, before a worthwhile planning proposal is formalised. Thus a formal housing allocation, implying reasonable certainty of development within the Plan period, is not justified.

Recommendation

3.3.32 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: SEASIDE CARAVAN PARK, STANDARD AVENUE, STUDD HILL, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

RN151

Mr & Mrs Smedley represented by BSF Planning Consultants (952, 954)

- allocate 0.58 ha site, long used as a static seasonal holiday caravan site, for residential development
- Object to the extent of Coastal Protection Zone protected under Policy C31 - inland boundary should be moved further north.

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.33 The evidence before me is that a planning application for residential development on this site, undecided in early 2004, has subsequently been given a planning permission for 15-18 housing units within the overall site; I am not in possession of the precise details of the case. The site borders the sea coast on its northern side, close to a re-graded slope down to the beach. The northern part of the site lies beyond a boundary line common to the definition of the Urban Area Boundary and the start of the narrow Coastal Protection Zone, within which draft Policy C31 states that new development will be refused.

3.3.34 The bulk of the site lies within the Urban Area Boundary, and is agreed by the Council to be previously developed land. It has no objection in principle to residential redevelopment. It says that work on surface drainage in furtherance of the application is being carried out. It adds that an allocation was not considered appropriate at the time

of the First Deposit Draft, because of uncertainty about development impact, but that its thinking was that the site could come forward as a windfall.

- 3.3.35 As I understand the matter, Council officers have (or had) a technical objection to the applicants/objectors' preferred method of draining surface water. Presumably, that has been resolved somehow. I can say nothing useful about a development control issue of this kind.
- 3.3.36 As to the joint boundary of the Urban Area Boundary and the Coastal Protection Zone, the draft Proposals Map is consistent in its cartography with the Proposals Map for the Adopted Local Plan. The Coastal Protection Zone is an area of potential instability, which cannot be defined at too detailed a level, for obvious reasons. It is commonsensical for a shared boundary to exist in this area of Herne Bay. The Council is adamant that the defined area of the Zone has been constant since it was first revealed to the public in draft form in 1991. I find no good planning reason to seek any change to the definition of the Zone in this area of Herne Bay, or to the wording of the Policy or its supporting text
- 3.3.37 In all these circumstances, a formal housing allocation, implying reasonable certainty of development within the Plan period, is not justified or particularly helpful to anyone. It may well be that events after the closure of my Inquiry have made the thrust of the objections academic.

Recommendation

- 3.3.38 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: HILLBOROUGH BUSINESS PARK, SWEECHBRIDGE ROAD, HILLBOROUGH, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

RN153

Mr Bryant and Mrs Robinson (966)

- The Park is adjoined by existing and proposed housing, with more proposed for Hillborough Farm to the north; as a brownfield site in the urban area, the site is appropriate for residential use
- Amend the southern boundary of the employment cluster, allowing peripheral land to be developed for housing

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.3.39 The second objection made has been satisfied by the amendment A3/018 made in the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan, which I see no reason to question.
- 3.3.40 In development terms this is a previously developed land site within the Urban Area Boundary. This is an edge-of-settlement, former agricultural site, where useful, affordable, basic employment accommodation has been allowed since 1988 in former agricultural buildings. As other land to the north – Hillborough Farm and the Metric site – has received allocations in this emerging Local Plan, the owners here have naturally wished to share in the good fortune of developing their low-key site with the much more profitable land use of housing. They are right in arguing that the accessibility of this site to shops, schools, other employment areas and town centres is essentially little different from these two allocated sites; however, this local, affordable

employment resource in eastern Herne Bay would go. The real question here is how much that would matter, and how great are the disbenefits.

3.3.41 In considering the objections on the Metric site immediately to the north, I mentioned that even the Council acknowledges that the Blacksole farm employment site to the west is unlikely to be developed in the short-term, though it hopes for some development activity towards the end of this Plan period. It is also doubtful if Blacksole would provide anything like the same kind of cheap, basic facilities available at the objection site – accommodation for 34 users, most with 2-4 employed persons per enterprise. From what I saw on my site visits, I take the point that there will come a time, perhaps in the next 10 years, when the physical, capacity or access deficiencies of these converted premises will make major change on the site inevitable; whether this would be in the form of rebuilt employment premises, mixed development, or another use is a question to which I have no present answer, lacking knowledge of the progress that will be made on the two adjoining Hillborough allocations, and at Blacksole Farm (and also about the extension of employment land south of John Wilson Business Park which I favour). In this context, I acknowledge that the economics of running the objectors' business, and the realities of local business, have made them hold back from implementing a planning permission, first granted in 1990 and since renewed, for redevelopment of the site with new industrial units. However, this affordable, useful employment resource in eastern Herne Bay should not be lost, for the next few years at least.

Recommendation

3.3.42 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND NORTH OF ST LUKE'S CLOSE, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN194 The Strand Family (233)

- Allocate 0.9 ha of land within the Urban Area Boundary for c.36 dwellings, including affordable housing

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.43 This irregular quadrilateral of disused farmland, said by the objectors to be of Grade 3b quality, is surrounded by existing housing to the south-west, north-west and north-east. Its south-east boundary is the line of the Urban Area Boundary established in the Adopted Local Plan, and farmland stretches from there to the line of the A2990. Though open land, neither the objection site nor the farmland to the south is covered by any policy designation concerning visual or environmental quality.

3.3.44 There was a planning permission of 1989 for housing that covered this land. It appears to me to be an obvious infill site, without obvious planning drawbacks, or real sustainability drawbacks. It best fits within the second category of the sequential approach, in the Revised Deposit Draft's Appendix 5 – "Managing the Release of Housing Sites" – as one of the "other sites in the urban areas that are not otherwise protected". In evidence about the Mill Lane site the Council agreed that a better term for that second category might well be "vacant land not previously developed in urban

areas". The Council's opposition to an allocation here appears to be its contention that adequate housing allocations exist to meet the Structure Plan target. However, I have found that not to be the case.

- 3.3.45 This very strong candidate site must be considered with other feasible alternatives, when I make a decision on the most appropriate locations to achieve the Structure Plan housing target. I do this at Section 3.4 below, and therefore make no recommendation at this stage.

THREE OMISSION SITES ON LAND FRONTING THE OLD THANET WAY (A2990), WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN200 The DC Bartlett Partnership (1544-1546)

- Allocate two smaller sites: (1) of 0.53 ha, and (2) of 1.29 ha, for housing; and (3) The Stackyard of c. 13 ha – for mixed use to include residential, educational, recreational/public access, employment/ commercial, and possibly retail

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.3.46 These are three sites all in active arable farming use, all with a frontage to the A2990. Principal arguments are that the sites suffer in terms of efficiency, and that there are inevitable conflicts attendant on having borders with urban housing. All are designated in the Adopted and emerging Local Plans as Protected Open Space, and the Stackyard site (3) has a public footpath running centrally through it from north-west to south-east. It is suggested that replacement areas of open space could be made available from other areas owned by the objectors outside Whitstable's defined urban area. It is put that the land is all Grade 3b quality.
- 3.3.47 Site 3 is a large green area, with a substantial amount of housing between it and the southern Urban Area Boundary in this part of Whitstable. In size, it is not very different from the Grasmere Pasture site, which I deal with in my paragraphs 3.3 16-3.3.26 above, and section 3.4 below. However, Grasmere is not an actively farmed area, and it has the special property of being able to accommodate a significant and needed addition of employment land to the established John Wilson Business Park, as well as providing housing and a large area of public open space. Site 3 is also much more in the public domain, visually, and its accented landform – a domed topography in the Council's words – adds significantly to the amenities of local residents and the view enjoyed by those driving on the A2990. On the other hand, there is no obvious planning or highway reason why a well designed scheme could not be devised on this site.
- 3.3.48 Sites 1 and 2 are both agricultural sites, with long frontages to Thanet Way. The long and very narrow Site 1 is very much a remnant, squeezed between housing to the north-west, and Thanet Way. There is public access on to the land by foot, from a pathway running east from Bartlett Drive. It is difficult to estimate what the realistic dwelling yield from the site could be, given its narrowness and the nearness to Thanet Way, but it would be unlikely to be more than a handful of dwellings. The best area to develop appears to be the southernmost tip, where the land is broadest.

- 3.3.49 As for Site 2, its western and south-west boundaries adjoin housing, and there is a further run of agricultural land to the north, bounded by Thanet Way. It would not be too difficult to design a housing development here, with appropriate landscaping, and perhaps some land contouring near the A2990 to diminish road noise intrusion.
- 3.3.50 Both Sites 1 and 2 are visually pleasing to the eye. They both have positive local value as a clear stop to development west of a busy road. Site 1 acts as a green, visual counterpart to another, much larger area of protected open land across the A2990. A wider planning perspective becomes apparent when looking at the local area. These three sites have more than the individual merits I have briefly spelled out. They are part of a larger entity of good quality open land, playing fields and farmland, both sides of Thanet Way, which still has coherence, and which mitigates much of the inevitably adverse environmental effects of a major highway running through an urban area of no great visual distinction. For this Plan period I see no strong reason or need to allocate any of the three individual omission sites for housing. Apart from the positive aspects of their present status, they are all close to the Grasmere Pasture site, which has much greater short-term development benefits for the District.

Recommendation

- 3.3.51 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

EXTENSIONS DIRECTLY BOUNDING DEFINED URBAN AREAS

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT HILLBOROUGH

Objections and Key Issues

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (385)

RN267 Persimmon Homes (South East) Ltd (1959)

- allocate land at Hillborough as a strategic development; some peripheral development could be undertaken in the later period of the Plan

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.52 This is essentially a continuation of matters dating back over a decade. The objectors acquired land in response to a proposal for comprehensive development in the Draft 1991 Canterbury Local Plan. That proposal petered out, and formed no part of the Adopted Local Plan 1998. The objectors' present stance is that comprehensive development hereabouts should be pursued in the context of a Local Development Framework looking forward to 2021. Hollamby Estates are also anxious that I should look as far ahead as 2016 in recommending housing allocations but, in the event that I do not, that I should support sites on which development can be continued into the 2011-2016 period.

3.3.53 The land area in question is set out by Persimmon in their objection. Its northern boundary hugs the Urban Area Boundary line in the Beltinge/Hillborough areas. Its

southern boundary is the A299, with development extending east of the Talmead/Blacksole Farm sites. This is a very large tract of flattish agricultural land.

3.3.54 There are already two Reserve Housing Sites at Herne Bay, and the Council's allocations south of Reculver Road, plus the challenge of getting a start to new employment-generating activities at Blacksole Farm and Talmead. Hence, I find the prospect of allocating even more development land at this eastern end of the District has little, if any, merit in the next few years. Canterbury is the key settlement in the District in terms of employment and people-attracting functions. New development there, or very close to the City limits makes much more planning sense than here, but with the onus that such development should not materially harm the historic City and its sensitive environs. In short, there is a total absence of real need for any development on this omission land in this Plan period.

Recommendation

3.3.55 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND SOUTH OF GREENHILL

Objections and Key Issues

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (378, 379, 384)

RN145 Kitewood Estates, per Goddard Planning Consultancy (447, 450, 454, 457, 458, 459, 460)

RN174 Mr & Mrs Brealy (449)

- Allocate 6 ha of land south of Greenhill for residential development
- Site allocation for community use inappropriate, too large
- Development of land at Greenhill would make a contribution to the housing land shortfall and should be allocated within the 2001 - 2006 period or reserved for the 2006 - 2011

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.56 This area of omission land – variable between the objections, as can be seen in pages 47-52 of CD1.16 – is arable farmland, south of a strong, clear Urban Area Boundary. Inspector O'Rourke considered the area in her report, and I agree with her descriptions. The urban edge here is stark; the agricultural land south of it is vulnerable, open countryside between that urban edge and the A299 to the south. This open land is exposed in views from the north, south and east.

3.3.57 The Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan allocates this land, within a somewhat wider area, for community purposes under policy C10a. This heading encompasses a wide range of potential land uses, many of them not involving building permanent structures. Whatever the progress made with such an allocation in the Plan period, it would seem to me to serve the physical characteristics of the land much better than a housing scheme, however well landscaped. Though I identify a shortfall, in Council's proposed housing allocations, there are a number of better, less sensitive locations than this to accommodate the deficiency.

Recommendation

3.3.58 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT STUDD HILL, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

RN007 Mr MJ Bremner (43)

- Allocate the land, now accommodating 54 seasonal caravans and two permanent chalets, for residential/retirement housing

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.59 The First and Revised Deposit Drafts of the emerging Local Plan both show an amendment to the Urban Area Boundary, as it was defined in the Adopted Local Plan, on this western tip of Herne Bay. This caravan site is now located in land considered as open countryside, but the location within the Herne Bay and Whitstable Green Gap is common to both Plans. As I make clear elsewhere, I support the principles behind the Green Gap policy R7, and its aim of resisting what would diminish the open character of a Gap, or contribute to coalescence between existing settlements.

3.3.60 I also agree with the Council's planning reason for a readjustment of the Urban Area Boundary hereabouts. The combination of caravans and a few other permanent structures on this land does not really equate to permanent development, in my opinion. The site is in reality neither town nor country in terms of its visible characteristics, but the important aim of retaining a narrow and vulnerable gap between settlements is best helped by a non-urban designation. There is a strong common-sense case against allowing permanent housing here.

Recommendation

3.3.61 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE: LAND ADJACENT TO RAYHAM ROAD, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN081 Mrs Birks (143, 144)

- 1.32 ha of land should be allocated as a future possible housing site and removed from the Special Landscape Area

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.62 Save for a few dwellings west of this omission site, the line of Rayham Road, running east from its junction with South Street, is a clear delineator of urban housing to the north, and open countryside to the south. The increasingly track-like character of Rayham Road as it goes east emphasises this transition in physical character. The

visual quality of this site and its surroundings is good. However, even if it were not in the Blean Woods Special Landscape Area, the site's location within a wide swathe of rural land would signal that any incursion of development should only be allowed if planning need was truly overwhelming. Though I identify a shortfall, in Council's proposed housing allocations, there are a number of better, less sensitive locations than this to accommodate the deficiency.

Recommendation

3.3.63 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

TWO OMISSION SITES FRONTING GOLDEN HILL, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN106 Mr D Ingram (914)

- Allocate for two houses at Mon Abri Farm

RN200 The DC Bartlett Partnership (1541, 1542)

- Remove a 1.25 ha field of Grade 3b farmland fronting Golden Hill from the Special Landscape Area designation and allocate it for housing

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.64 These are two adjoining sites. The Bartlett site lies immediately south of the Whitstable Urban Area Boundary, with the Ingram site bounding the Bartlett site. The former is agricultural, the second described as a house with garden land. Though the draft Proposals Map shows the Urban Area Boundary extended to the east of these two omission sites to enclose an enlarged Joseph Wilson Business park, I have elsewhere in this report recommended that that particular proposal should be abandoned in favour of another site south of the John Wilson Business Park at Chestfield. If accepted by the Council, the consequence would be that the land would stay agricultural.

3.3.65 A further consequence of my recommendation is that any house building on these two omission sites would now be even more clearly revealed as an extension of linear development along a rural road outside a settlement. That rural road contains sporadic buildings on the east side south of the Boundary, in what is indubitably open countryside. Though I identify a shortfall in the Council's proposed housing allocations, there are a number of better, far less sensitive locations than these to accommodate the deficiency.

Recommendation

3.3.66 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: COURT LEES FARM, BOGSHOLE LANE, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN116 Mr D Stewart (905)

- allocate 22.5 ha of agricultural land for housing, north of Old Thanet Way, and employment to the south, for relocations from the three urban areas; access indicated off the A299, via a new roundabout

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.67 This area of land is divided in two by the A2290, Thanet Way. Though it has a boundary with the urban area south of St Luke's Close, the omission site would in no sense be an integrated addition to the developed urban area. It is in the form of an expanding wedge, running south from a junction with St Luke's Close, its south-west boundary extending to the edge of the A299. The Council's evidence in CD1.16 (page 137) sets out the past history of planning applications.

3.3.68 The site is very open, and development would extend Whitstable significantly southwards in a manner completely at variance with the way it has grown recently. Moreover, it would establish a new, and in view of the local topography, very visible southern point of development on the line of the A299, lacking defensible boundaries. An allocation would have the effect of inviting other developers to stake claims to fill in adjoining prominent open land to the east and west as far south as the road edge. Though the objector indicates the use of copious new landscaping around new housing and employment, development in the manner proposed would amount to a text-book example of how not to undertake an urban extension.

Recommendation

3.3.69 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT COCKERING ROAD, THANINGTON, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1593, 1594, 1596)

- Objection to Cockerling Road, Thanington site being designated at risk from fluvial flooding
- Allocate this land for housing

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20360, 20362, 20363, 20364, 20379)

- Neither Reserve Site addresses problem of shortfall at Canterbury. Due to constraints of redeveloping sites within the city, it is here that sites are not coming forward or yielding fewer houses than expected is likely to occur. Revise and add land at Thanington.
- Due to the deletion of sites in Changes to H1 and the proposals map, a need to allocate this further land as an urban extension to Canterbury.

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.70 This omission site is a direct urban extension and, save for the site at Hollow Lane, Canterbury, is considered by the objector to be the most sustainable site in this category. The closeness to a proposed office node at Milton Manor, Thanington is stressed, but that allocation never seemed to me very significant as a major employment location, and it has now been deleted by a Proposed Change, which I find acceptable and comment on elsewhere. The site is now arable farmland, all classified as Grade 3 or below. It is

adjacent to a Special Landscape Area, and inside the Plan's proposed Area of High Landscape Value.

- 3.3.71 At a housing density of 35 dwellings per hectares, the site is estimated to yield some 450 dwellings. The objectors would provide a site for a primary school. A landscaped structure of public open space, play areas and planted areas would follow NPFA standards.
- 3.3.72 The evidence suggests that a new roundabout junction on the A28 could be used as the main access, without significant detriment to the free and safe flow of traffic, and without harming the amenities of occupants of Warren Lodge, near the entry point. The Highway Authority and the Council would expect the impact of added vehicle numbers generated from this development to be mitigated by improving the traffic situation in the area of entry to Wincheap, some 800 m away. Funding of the construction of north facing slip roads to the A2, or a significant and equivalent easing of congestion is accepted as a reasonable contribution by the objectors. I find that there are no obvious traffic problems that could not be addressed satisfactorily at the planning application stage, and the envisaged planning obligation appears proportionate to the size and impact of this scale of development. Access to public transport facilities is already reasonable, and there seem realistic prospects of some bus re-routeing to a point or points within the development. Cycling and walking opportunities into the City centre, and to local facilities such as the Wincheap local centre and industrial estate, are also reasonably good. There would be no particular difficulty stemming from a secondary access fronting Cockering Road.
- 3.3.73 I agree with some of the objectors' planning argument: Canterbury is the core location for jobs, shopping, education and services in the District. If I find the Council's assumptions about building housing on in-City previously developed land allocations over-optimistic (which I do), I agree that I should be looking to find certain other appropriate sites, with good sustainability characteristics, in or very close to the built-up area of Canterbury.
- 3.3.74 This is an undulating site, predominantly arable land, classified as an Area of High Landscape Value in the emerging Local Plan, like all other open land immediately around Canterbury. I agree with the objector's evidence that the sited is located in a character area of moderate, rather than high, sensitivity: also that it does not significantly contribute to the setting of the historic City, nor have any impact on significant views of the historic city or the Cathedral. That is not to say that the Cathedral's Bell Harry Tower, over 2 km away, cannot be caught sight of from the higher south-west part of the site, but I am satisfied that this is no more than an insignificant visual matter. Development confined to this site need not have an adverse effect on the Special Landscape Area immediately south-west of it. Consequently, the principal adverse consideration here is that building in open countryside which is not allocated for development in a Local Plan should be strictly controlled, and that competing omission sites of this kind should be assessed for relative merits and demerits. Structure Plan policy RNV1 states the matter plainly and well: "The countryside will be protected for its own sake".
- 3.3.75 The objectors have already carried out a significant amount of boundary planting of native species, to provide a degree of screening for the envisaged development. It is true that the intended boundary edge would look less raw than the present westward edge of housing development adjoining. But there are strong adverse aspects of

building on this omission site. It would be a major extension south-westwards of an isolated wedge of development along the axis of the A28. It would be another advance of housing over open agricultural land, which would terminate in an arbitrary straight-lined western boundary, however well bounded by trees and hedging. The lack of a clear, defensible or "natural" western boundary would give a future developer a plausible case to argue that little logically stood in the way of an extended housing scheme, approaching the line of Cockerling Road, in the vicinity of Milton Manor.

- 3.3.76 This very strong candidate site must be considered with other feasible alternatives, when I make a decision on the most appropriate locations to achieve the Structure Plan housing target. I do this at Section 3.4 below, and therefore make no recommendation at this stage.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT PILGRIM'S WAY, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN144 Persimmon Homes represented by Tetlow King Planning (488, 490)

- Allocate 3.27 ha green field orchard site bounding the Barton Estate for between 90-160 dwellings, and remove it from the AHLV

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.3.77 The premise for this objection is the objector's confidence that the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan fails to meet the Structure Plan housing requirement. That accords with my own conclusions. This is a site considered previously by Inspector O'Rourke (CD1.8, pages 297-299). I agree with her description and appraisal of the site and its setting, which the intervening years have not changed. It remains true that the "Barton Estate forms a distinct and hard edge to the city, sharply defining the break between the town and the countryside, while the Business Park appears as an isolated group of substantial buildings away from the urban area". Also, building on the site would be "an intrusive form of ad hoc piecemeal development, extending the urban area into the countryside, and impinging visually into the green band on the valley side", which would not really be made less intrusive by existing hedging.
- 3.3.78 The obvious new factor in considering this submission in 2004 is the Council's Proposed Changes Nos. PC3/007-008, in which the concept of an extended "Office Node" at Little Barton Farm is fleshed out on a 20 ha site east and south-east of the existing, unsightly Business Park. I deal with this matter in detail in paragraphs 4.30-4.60 below, and I recommend that these Proposed Changes should be incorporated into the Adopted Local Plan. This concept of a major facility for Canterbury District depends not only on a position well related to the City, to park and ride facilities and the major road network; it also depends on achieving high quality development surrounded by open land, so that the built area remains visibly separate from the existing urban edge to the north-west. The necessary open area to achieve separation includes the sloping land of this omission site (see CD3.14, Section 3 and Plan 1).
- 3.3.79 Since the achievement of a successful business allocation would be a key aim of the Plan, the arguments that led Inspector O'Rourke to recommend no modification in respect of the previous objections are now further reinforced. There are other, less

visually damaging locations for additional housing to be sited on the periphery of the City. My views on the AHLV aspects of this site are to be found in paragraphs 6.13-6.25 below, and in paragraph 6.23 in particular.

Recommendation

3.3.80 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND EAST OF HOLLOW LANE, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN149 Pentland Homes represented by BSF Planning Consultants (962, 963)

- Object to land east of Hollow Lane being included in AHLV
- Allocate the land for residential development, for between 60-100 dwellings at PPG3 densities, with related open space etc, within the Canterbury City urban area

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.81 This is a 2.32 ha site, currently used as pasture, with adjoining agricultural land to the south, and allotment land to the east. The 7 ha Wincheap Farm site west of Hollow Lane is currently being developed for 170 dwellings.

3.3.82 The site is about 260 m from Wincheap, a major bus route, and near Hollow Lane's junction with that thoroughfare there is a local parade of shops. Commercial and retail premises are near by at the Wincheap Estate, and a major retail park is about 250 m away. The City centre and Canterbury East rail station are some 700 m away. As a location, it is obvious that the sustainability credentials of the site are high, equal to the Wincheap Farm allocation, and I agree with what Inspector O'Rourke said on this matter, when considering 10 ha of omission land at Wincheap. She, of course, recommended that this omission site should be developed for housing together with the Wincheap Farm site, but the Council took the view that only the latter should be developed.

3.3.83 Canterbury has a very tightly drawn Urban Area Boundary around the limits of built development, so any new housing allocation has to expand the drawn boundary, or to be sited in the least damaging areas, very close to the City boundary. I have found a shortfall in the housing land supply for the District. This is chiefly because I cannot agree that some of the allocated sites on un-vacated, previously developed land in the City area will actually be available for development by 2011. There are no easy ways of solving the shortfall, and I acknowledge that there need to be additional housing opportunities at Canterbury, as well as at the District's two other urban areas.

3.3.84 The Wincheap Farm allocation, carried over from the adopted Local Plan (CA424), produces an angular extension of the Urban Area Boundary south-east along the line of the A2. Both on the ground and when viewed on the map, the development of this omission site would fill in what has now become a gap or left-over site; it would not be difficult to create a strong and relatively defensible landscaped boundary with open

countryside, using the line of Hollow Lane, and then the public footpath following the eastern boundary of the omission site, and that of the adjoining primary school to the north-east. The perception of the site as an obviously rural entity has somewhat diminished since the start of work on Wincheap Farm, with its attendant urban roads and street lighting. The recently built roundabout on Hollow Lane, already provides an easy and good point from which to access this site.

- 3.3.85 This site, like all open land adjoining the Urban Area Boundary, is covered by the emerging Local Plan's Area of High Landscape Value designation. It is an expanse of relatively flat grassland, with stretches of mature boundary hedging at the City's edge. I see it as having the value of unspoiled, open land on the urban fringe, but not as possessing unusual visual or topographical quality. The presence of useful but un-beautiful allotments to the east emphasise that fact, only a small area of the site boundary adjoining farmland. I can see a plausible case for arguing that open land, rising to the east of the site, represents as good an urban/rural boundary as is shown on the Proposals Map in the Adopted and emerging Local Plans.
- 3.3.86 I do not find that the views that can be gained from within the site of certain tall structures in the City centre, notably Bell Harry Tower and parts of the cathedral's upper area, add significantly to the intrinsic quality of the land or its immediate surroundings. Having made all these caveats, the land is still undoubtedly open countryside, and its surrender to housing must only be made if real planning need exists. My views on the AHLV designation generally are to be found in paragraphs 6.13-6.25 below.
- 3.3.87 This very strong candidate site must be considered with other feasible alternatives, when I make a decision on the most appropriate locations to achieve the Structure Plan housing target. I do this at Section 3.4 below, and therefore make no recommendation at this stage.

OMISSION SITES: ADJOINING LAND NORTH OF MAYDOWNS ROAD/AT BODKIN FARM, CHESTFIELD, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN167 Mrs A Payton-Smith & Mr D Blatchford (932)

- Remove 4.6 ha of grazing land from its Green Gap designation, and allocate as a partial development site for housing, with some public usage

RN204 Eton College represented by Fuller Peiser (1514, 1515)

- allocate c.23 ha of farmland for housing after 2006, and remove the land from the proposed Green Gap designation

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.3.88 The triangular wedge of open land formed by these two sites is part of the designated Green Gap separating Herne Bay and Whitstable that was in the Adopted Local Plan and is carried into the emerging Local Plan. Inspector O'Rourke considered an Eton College objection here in the previous Local Plan Inquiry Report. She found that it would not be possible to release 3b Grade land here for building, without undermining the objective of separating settlements espoused by the Council. Nothing has changed in the interim period to diminish the realities of that judgement. There is indeed a

present need for me to find land for housing to supplement the Council's proposed allocations; however, there are many other possible house building locations in the District to fill that deficiency which have fewer, less adverse planning consequences than these sites.

Recommendation

3.3.89 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT MILLSTROOD FARM, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN195 The Strand Family, Mrs A Baxter and Mr N Green (234, 235)

- Allocate 11 ha of Grade 3b farmland for either solely residential development, or for residential + employment/commercial uses

RN211 Mr Strand (796)

- Allocate for low cost housing

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.90 This is a large and prominent area of farmland, adjoining an Urban Area Boundary that has indisputably been drawn along the obvious limit to development in the locality. It forms part of a wide swathe of farmland running along the southern boundary of Whitstable to the north of the A299. This site is visible from a large part of Thanet Way, the A2990, so the effects of encroaching suburbanisation would be magnified if it were developed. The evidence is that some of the north-west part of this site was given planning permission for housing in 1989, but that the permission has long since expired. I do not find this old planning permission a major factor in assessing the present objections, which cover a much larger area. There are sites with stronger planning merits to help meet a housing deficiency in this Plan period; locally these include Grasmere Pasture, which would be more effective in accommodating housing and employment, and lies within the Urban Area Boundary.

Recommendation

3.3.91 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND WEST OF GOLDEN HILL, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN233 Little (1623)

- Allocate 5.51 ha of agricultural land, mainly for housing, with the potential for a school and play areas

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.92 Development here would produce an isolated westward extent of buildings, at variance with the more "natural" form of the Golden Hill allocation in the Plan. It would amount to a marked protrusion of this part of the settlement into open countryside, in a prominent sloped location widely visible from points to the south. This kind and amount of protrusion would doubtless also lead to future attempts to "round out" the settlement boundary to the north of this omission site. The proposal has no planning merits that I can discern.

Recommendation

3.3.93 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE: LAND EAST OF BROOMFIELD, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

RN246 SE Estates Ltd represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2087, 2088)

- Object to the non-allocation of 5.47 ha of agricultural land to the east of Broomfield, for residential development, together with open space/village green accommodating sport and community facilities

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.94 This site consists of unfarmed land immediately adjoining the Urban Area Boundary. It would involve a marked eastward extension of development into open countryside just south of the A299, an extension unrelated to the existing urban form of this area of Broomfield. Whatever the shortages of community facilities locally, this large-scale loss of open land would be a disproportionately large price to pay. The Council's two reserve housing sites, at Mill Lane and south of Richmond Drive, are both located not far away. They have much better claims to development, are within the Urban Area Boundary, and provide quite enough housing to meet reasonable market need in this eastern part of Canterbury District up to 2011.

Recommendation

3.3.95 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND EAST OF THE DRIVE, CHESTFIELD

Objections and Key Issues

RN250 Messrs Barnes, McNeil, Halsey & Adamson represented by BSF Planning Consultants
(2126, 2128, 2129, 2131, 2136)

- Object to the non-allocation of 2.71 ha of land to the East of the Drive, Chestfield, for residential development within a redrawn Urban Area Boundary

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Object to the designation of land to the east of The Drive, Chestfield as Green Gap.

RN053 Mr Barnes (068)

RD073 Mr Barnes (20148)

- Objects to Herne Bay & Whitstable Green Gap, as the boundary cuts through the garden of Badgers End.

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.3.96 This omission site was outside the Urban Area Boundary in the Adopted Local Plan, but in the emerging Local Plan the open countryside designation of the site has an added designation of Green Gap. There is an area of recent low density housing some distance to the south of the site, the established suburban housing of Chestfield to the west, and more recent housing at Churchwood Drive to the north.
- 3.3.97 Despite this pattern of development, the omission site does not appear to me to be an obvious “jigsaw” piece of land that would round out the settlement in a “natural” way locally. There is a large area of open land immediately south of the omission site, which is divided by an attractive public right of way leading through paddock-style land. I find that the character of the open space is truly rural once the observer has passed “Badgers End”. I consider it a logical part of a not over-generously designated strategic Green Gap between Herne Bay and Whitstable, which is necessary to prevent creeping coalescence. The fact that the wood named Rabbit Shaw is a transitional landscape feature, blocking direct views between the omission site and other open countryside to the east, does not diminish the value of the omission site as a legitimate component of a wider, strategic Green Gap.
- 3.3.98 I have read Inspector O'Rourke's report and her reasons for recommending allocations nearby. I have considered the present matter after viewing the physical results of building on the housing allocations she supported. I have also considered the quality of the remaining open land, in the context of the landscaping of both allocation sites. Our two contexts for considering development at Chestfield are changed by time and circumstance. I find that there are now better and less damaging green field sites to build on than this, in order to meet the Structure Plan housing allocation figure.
- 3.3.99 I turn to the way that the Urban Area Boundary has been drawn along the eastern boundary of Mr Barnes's garden at Badgers End. Mr Barnes received a planning permission in 1991 to incorporate adjoining green land into his domestic garden, and erect a greenhouse. That permission removed development rights within the newly created garden area, save for the specifically permitted greenhouse. The Council says that it has chosen a Urban Area Boundary line based on the axis of a row of garden trees near the edge of his (post-permission) garden boundary. It is not disputed that this Council-chosen line was never the boundary of the domestic garden pre 1991. As drawn in the Revised Deposit Draft the Council's chosen line goes through part of a car port.
- 3.3.100 I consider that it would be appropriate for the line of the Urban Area Boundary/Green Gap to be drawn tightly around the main buildings at Badgers End, rather than along the actual boundary of the large garden because, as the Council said in a letter to Mr Barnes of 2 July 2004, the Urban Area Boundary defines the limits for development. However, I consider that a very small, logical adjustment should be made, just sufficient to include the whole of Mr Barnes' carport within the UAB.

Recommendation

3.3.101 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate the action suggested in my paragraph 3.3.100 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND TO THE REAR OF MILTON MANOR AND SOUTH OF ASHFORD ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN351 Robert Brett & Sons Ltd (2464)

- Allocate 5.88 ha site as an unobtrusive small residential development sitting behind an existing sheltered housing scheme; probably to be accessed via adjoining open land to the east

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.102 This is a substantial, essentially rectangular area of agricultural land, located at the very end of Canterbury's south-western built-up area, south of Ashford Road. While the City's built form now terminates in a line of ribbon development, building on this omission site would create a very different, incongruous form of extension into open countryside provisionally designated as Area of High Landscape Value. It would also bring Milton Manor, now set in open countryside into a new and unwelcome context: that of an edge-of-settlement site. The proposal appears to me devoid of any compensating planning virtues.

Recommendation

3.3.103 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

SITES AT AND AROUND HERSDEN

THE CONTEXT TO OBJECTIONS CONCERNING OMISSION SITES AT HERSDEN: POLICY ED5 - HERSDEN – AND PARAGRAPHS 3.32-3.37

Objections and Key Issues

Re: A3/024 – Amended paragraph 3.32

RD077 Hillreed Homes Ltd (20157, 20161)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20627)

- Proposed text should be replaced by Hillreed's suggested amendments to first draft
- Hersden Regeneration Zone should be reinstated. Opportunities for wider community benefits will be overlooked by this strategy
- Retain, but boundary for Hersden Zone should be tightly drawn around colliery land. Regeneration Zone a key plank in PAER strategy

Paragraph 3.35

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (295)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1864)

- Object to the extent of the Zone Area of Study. Any decisions on additional land release must be taken through the statutory local plan process. The area should be reviewed and the text amended

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Could add some 500 dwellings on the former colliery land at Hersden

Paragraph 3.36

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (296)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1562)

RN006 Whitlock (41, 42)

- Paragraph fails to recognise the limitations of Hersden for residential development in terms of the requirements of PPG3. Reference to housing should be deleted
- Take no further greenfield for development in Hersden. Recycle remainder of colliery land mainly for housing to achieve the Councils regeneration objective
- Add after "development" on line 3 "particularly on the remainder of the Former Colliery Land to the south of the A28"
- Protect high quality agricultural land and landscape north and east of the village from any development

Re: A3/025 – Amended paragraph 3.36

RD077 Hillreed Homes Ltd (20158)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20376)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20628)

- Reinstate deletions with amendment that will grant planning permission for more mixed use development on remainder of former colliery land at Hersden & work with partners in on the LSP. Consultation identified; need for housing community facilities & environmental enhancements
- Hersden proposals should be formally made as part of the Local Plan process for proper consultation
- Proposed text should be replaced by Hillreed's suggested amendments to first draft

Paragraph 3.37

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (297, 298)

- After "at present" add "(but it has been estimated that the remainder of the Former Colliery Land to the south of the A28 could accommodate circa 500 dwellings)".
- The quantity and location of development should be identified in the plan as a firm proposal.

Policy ED5

RN074 CPRE (46)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1564)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1863)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (243, 251, 299, 300)

RN208 Thanet District Council (758)

RN266 Hennell (1618)

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2336, 2337)

RN322 English Heritage (1779)

- Refer to unsustainable residential development and need to restrict residential development to brownfield land, unless greenfield proposals succeed others sequentially
- Boundary of Regeneration Zone should be redefined to retain agricultural land to the north of the settlement
- Identify location and quantity for Hersden as a potential village to incorporate significant housing development
- The policy should set out a vision for Hersden
- Would support small scale allocation of employment land at Hersden to facilitate regeneration for locals; new industrial/business park seems disproportionately large. Specify quantity of employment land to be released
- Object if development is on agricultural land
- Examine Regeneration Zone access; incorporate into Development Brief
- Regeneration Zone/Study Area should have a clear and more tightly drawn regeneration zone notation
- After "Hersden" on line 6 add; "this is expected to include provisions for substantial and additional housing over and above the allocated area to the west of Hersden at the former colliery site"
- Give due consideration/weight to the historic/archaeological environment in Hersden
- Extend Zone to include properties along Bredlands Lane, Hersden
- Landscape implications must be considered from a distance i.e. from Stodmarsh
- First priority must be to clear up the industrial buildings on the existing site
- Additional land release must be through the statutory local plan process. Review area and amend text

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Re: A3/026 and A3/027 – deleted para. 3.37 and amended policy ED5

RD056 Thanet District Council (20107)

RD077 Hillreed Homes Ltd (20160)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20371)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20630)

- Deleted para should be replaced with para recognising status, opportunity & capacity of former colliery land as housing /mixed use
- Object to community plan as sole vehicle for identify housing/mixed use development land at Hersden. Overlap this with development brief
- Details of the community plan must be made part of the Local Plan process so a comprehensive approach can be taken to development in the district. Any substantial residential, employment or retail uses which are proposed must be identified
- Object to the deletion of last sentence of Policy ED5. No significant development in advance of Community Plan
- Proposed text should be replaced by Hillreed's suggested amendments to first draft

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.104 Hersden was built as a planned settlement in the 1920's to house the mining workforce of Chislet Colliery and its families. Only 364 of the planned thousand dwellings were constructed, nearly all north of the A28, while the colliery buildings were on land south of that road. In its heyday Hersden was relatively well provided in terms of schools, places of worship, shopping, public house (now closed), club and recreational facilities. However, it was always an isolated settlement in a rural area, 7 km east of Canterbury city centre, and 3 km east of Sturry.

3.3.105 Since the closure of Hersden colliery in 1969, a village built for a particular purpose has languished, and its inhabitants have not generally fared well economically, while social problems and recordable crime have increased. There is now a substantial development of 209 dwellings – Chislet Gardens – nearing completion on a site west of the original village, built on an extended allocation site in the Adopted Local Plan. These will all be houses for sale at market prices, as the Council, in giving planning permission, was concerned to vary the existing tenure patterns of the original village. South of the A28, and just east of the village's estate housing, there have arisen two important employment sites. The earlier is the Canterbury Industrial Park, an unattractive but well functioning group of structures built in the 1970's. The later site, still under construction, is the 22 ha Lakesview International Business Park, a much more visible gateway development with a conscious design presence, also an Adopted Local Plan allocation. Both these schemes occupy previously developed land.

3.3.106 In the First Deposit Draft of this emerging Local Plan, the Council defined a large area of land around Hersden Village, enclosed by a boundary line on the Proposals Map. It was called a "Regeneration Zone Area of Study". In that Area, initiatives would be identified to regenerate the area, and to identify the scale and format of any new development, and the means of delivering projects and programmes. In the Revised Deposit Draft, the Proposals Map showed no demarcated Zone around Hersden Village, and the Plan text was altered radically about future action at Hersden, envisaging a "Community Plan", and deleting previous reference to a Development Brief. The Community Plan process would "set objectives and bring about investment into the

community". Another significant change of mind is evident in the changed text of paragraph 3.36, where the Revised Deposit Draft removes references to intentions to allow "more mixed use development that will lever further investment into the community".

- 3.3.107 The Council obviously felt that its First Deposit Draft text and mapping was misconceived. It explains its changed attitude to the concept of a Zone, by saying that it wanted to avoid any impression that the Zone could be considered as equivalent to an allocation for new housing or other activity; the Zone had given some physical focus to the fact that Hersden lies within a Priority Area for Economic Regeneration (PAER) and has been designated, as part of the Kent coal-fields, as a Rural Priority Area (RPA) in RPG9. It admits that it would have done better merely to put some sort of symbol, such as an indicative star, on the Proposals Map, rather than define an area of land which encouraged potential developers to imagine that new physical development might be achievable on large areas of open land.
- 3.3.108 I held an Inquiry in February 1989 into proposed residential and employment development at Hersden. The Secretary of State subsequently refused planning permission for that development in mid 1990. I have long since forgotten the details, and most of the main arguments, put at that Inquiry. Since then, the whole planning policy context has evolved in successive Structure and Local Plans, and in national and regional policy guidance. I have been able to re-acquaint myself with arguments put forward concerning Hersden at this 2004 Local Plan Inquiry afresh, without any preconceptions or personal prejudices. Nevertheless, my experiences give me added insight and knowledge about the extent of change in the last decade and a half at Hersden.
- 3.3.109 In 1989, the village was already in serious decline, the colliery long closed. Then, I found the absence of substantial, good quality development since the initial development of the Canterbury Industrial Park to be quite striking: I was also struck by the unattractive state of that Park, and the absence of any sign that the situation would remedy itself without a significant development catalyst. Today that former state of affairs is changing quite dramatically. A settlement of 364 dwellings and some 1,000 inhabitants is receiving a 50%+ increase in dwellings; there will inevitably be significant socio-economic change in the expanded Hersden, simply because the new dwelling are owner-occupied, in contrast with a majority of Council/private sector rented dwellings in the older stock. The potential of the new employment provision, still building and expanding, to attract some of its workforce from Hersden residents is obvious. The Council's evidence is that some two thirds of the 22 ha Business Park is developed, committed for forthcoming development, or at the formal application stage.
- 3.3.110 The Council has also provided unrefuted evidence for this Inquiry of a significant number of regeneration projects in Hersden since the 1990's. Even if the results are not yet fully clear, a wide range of continuing, focused projects are providing or expanding facilities in the following fields: school learning, nursery and childcare provision for under-5's, a neighbourhood centre, a community centre, a youth club/youth sports facilities, community enterprise, and community policing. The Council says that something over £4 million of public money has been invested so far.
- 3.3.111 Hersden in 1989 was a large village in rural surroundings. It still fits that basic categorisation, despite its very recent growth. Paragraph 2.54 of the First Deposit Draft, deleted in the Revised Deposit Draft, stated specifically that Hersden is the only village

in the District that can accommodate more than minor residential development, in line with Structure Plan policy RS3a. This major development has now come about, and evidence from the Council is that the appropriate policy treatment for Hersden would be through Structure Plan policy RS2. I hold that any proposed further extension to Hersden would come within the PPG3 categorisation of "village expansion and infill" outside urban areas (paras. 69-71).

3.3.112 The Zone definition in the First Deposit Draft appears to me to have no planning merit, even if the village continues to grow further in future, because the Zone was so extensive. I find no flaw of reasoning in the Council's decision to drop the Regeneration Zone concept. However, I can only conclude on the merits of the "Community Plan" concept, after I have considered the pros and cons of specific omission sites within the Zone, and I now deal with these in ascending Respondent number.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT ISLAND ROAD, WESTBERE

Objections and Key Issues

RN035 Mr M Shepherd (672)

- Allocate for housing 0.54 ha of land, now used as car show rooms/workshop/open car sales and parking

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.113 This is a site outside any urban boundary, subject to normal countryside restraint policies. The land is occupied by a vehicle sales operation, with its forecourt and sales building at the northern end, fronting the A28, and a workshop building some distance to the south. A large proportion of the site is not actively used for the enterprise. Though it adjoins another developed site to the east, I see the two entities as amounting to no more than a small group of buildings outside the main village. I can find no positive planning advantages stemming from this proposal, only a diminution of the rural character of the locality.

Recommendation

3.3.114 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT THE FORMER HERSDEN COLLIERY, HERSDEN

Objections and Key Issues

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (245, 252, 288)

- Policy H1 should recognise the former colliery land at Hersden for mixed use development:<400 dwellings
- 18.34 ha of the land south of A28 at Hersden should be allocated as part of the Regeneration Zone. Mixed uses to include housing, various employment uses, landscaping/ remediation/restoration of site, recreational land, nature conservation enhancement/preservation, £2.5 m investment in a Sturry Transport Hub, enhancement of village facilities etc.
- As a last resort, identify site for development with a deferred phasing

Re: Aa5/002 – Managing the Release of Housing Sites

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20669)

- Include a specific reference to Hersden as a favoured site for release in Appendix 5

Re: Aa5/003 - Managing the Release of Housing Sites

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20670)

- Do not rely on SPG on housing site release rather than clearly stated principles that can be tested in public

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.3.115 By the time of the Inquiry, the MHP Partnership (RN198 and RD137), owner of the undeveloped area of the former colliery site south of the A28, sought to redevelop an area of 18+ ha, between the road and the railway line to the south of it, with up to 400 dwellings, employment, public open space, local shopping facilities, recreational areas and community uses. There is an aspiration to re-open a former rail station at Hersden, but if this proved impossible the objectors wish to make a financial contribution towards relevant local transport infrastructure. The Council, though thoroughly opposed to development here, would not have a specific or material transport objection to the proposals for the omission site, if a contribution up to £2.5m were made towards improvements in operation at the nearby Sturry Rail station level crossing. If that was not feasible the contribution could go to other appropriate measures identified in the Canterbury District Transport Action Plan, or the emerging Walking and Cycling Strategy.
- 3.3.116 The objectors' case is heavily based on there being an imperative to press ahead with development on their site. That site is stated to be previously developed land in the East Kent coalfield that has a regional-level significance and priority for regeneration. My identification of a shortfall of some 200 dwellings in the Structure Plan Housing Allocation is obviously relevant to this case.
- 3.3.117 The Council considers the MHP land should not be regarded as previously developed land for the purposes of implementing PPG3. It relies on the definition in Annex C of PPG3 excluding "...land that was previously developed but where the remains of any structure or activity have blended into the landscape in the process of time (to the extent that it can reasonably be considered as part of the natural surroundings), and where there is a clear reason that could outweigh the use of the site – such as its contribution to nature conservation – or it has subsequently been put to an amenity use and cannot be regarded as requiring redevelopment." The Council adds that it would not have included the land in the previously developed land category for National Land Use Data purposes in 1999, as it did, had the Annex C amplification of the matter then existed. It also suggests that in present circumstances Inspector O'Rourke might not have regarded the land as "former colliery land which has been cleared and is now vacant", or as brownfield land.
- 3.3.118 I saw that the land now shows no signs of having been restored in any formal way, since it was cleared in the early to mid 1970's. It is virtually unchanged in appearance from what I first saw in 1989, though obviously shrub and tree growth has occurred. I have now walked it extensively on two separate occasions with a 15 year gap between the walks. This omission site contained the main complex of colliery buildings. On this second detailed site visit I noted the presence of remaining areas of roadway, concrete retaining walls, and odd areas with surface pieces of concrete and rubble. Concrete shaft caps and hoppers are discernible. The excavated sidings land on the lower plateau of the site, below steep and partially eroded banks, is a large area which has not remotely been re-absorbed into a natural state, and has only patchy grass cover. The sparse vegetation of the areas of the site north of the plateau is generally agreed to stem from the partial spreading of colliery spoil/shale, and other spreading of degraded top

soils over buried structures. There is certainly a marked visual contrast with other nearby open land outside the colliery limits. The undisputed evidence is that little general contamination of the ground is to be expected, though certain hotspots are much more likely to emerge if development occurred.

- 3.3.119 I can only conclude that the land, though looking quite green from a distance, is still only objectively describable as previously developed land, and likely to remain as such for many years to come. It has definitely not blended into the surrounding rural landscape. Only expensive major restorative work, entailing the import of very large amounts of topsoil, could change this situation to a marked degree.
- 3.3.120 The site is now covered by a non-statutory designation as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest, following a survey by the Kent Wildlife Trust. The most significant habitat identified is the lichen heath, predominantly in the lower southern part. The objectors are confident that development could take place avoiding the lower plateau of the site, leaving the nature interest of the lichen heath and other elements, such as divided sedge, unscathed. They declare themselves willing to found and endow an ecology trust for this purpose. It does appear to me that if all other planning factors pointed to the desirability of development, this nature designation alone would not be a major inhibition to achievement of a well laid out development scheme that paid due attention to nature conservation concerns.
- 3.3.121 Against these positive points for the objectors – no major transport objection, and the status of previously developed land – I find others which are more important against development here, for this Plan period at least. This is not an urban or urban-extension site. It is previously developed land in open countryside, well separated by the A28 and other intervening land from the old and new residential areas of a large village. It is 7 km from the centre of Canterbury, and thus no real surrogate for a development within or very close to the Urban Area Boundary.
- 3.3.122 Unlike the colliery land, the village of Hersden is visibly growing and changing due to the large recent residential and employment developments. The whole picture is greatly different from when I first visited and studied Hersden. The Chislet Gardens housing is due for completion of construction by the end of 2005, bringing with it a modest retail boost to the village's existing meagre provision. The Lakesview development is aiming to develop on 22 ha of prominently sited land at the eastern entrance to the village. Evidence was given that about two thirds of the development was either constructed/committed/occupied in 2004. It is unarguable that these very large additions to the existing building stock, and to residential numbers and workers, will have profound effects on local society, and that these effects will only begin to be calculable after they are complete and occupied – or largely occupied in the case of the new employment. All this development, together with the extensive and continuing social investment in the community, amount to a major regeneration effort already. I therefore see no strong case for any allocation on this omission site in the present Plan period to 2011. I would add that it might well be positively un-helpful to the beneficial evolution of a better Hersden to add materially to already-permitted developments in this period.
- 3.3.123 The 1993 Kent Minerals Subject Plan's allocation for an aggregates depot remains technically alive, though it has never been suggested to me in evidence from any party that this is likely to come about, and it is made less likely by the recent Lakesview development. As a large area of previously developed land, very close to significant

employment sites to the east, it is conceivable that at some future period the local planning authority may see positive planning merits in some extension of similar or compatible activities on to part, or all, of the omission site. That would depend on future economic and social factors, not current ones, as well as the environmental acceptability of developing further on an exposed valley slope. In saying this, I recognise that there is some argument whether former planning permissions allowing development within the site may be capable of being taken further. In reality, any fall-back position seems to me to be threadbare in the real world, given present day market realities and prospects.

Recommendation

3.3.124 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND NORTH OF HERSDEN

Objections and Key Issues

RN142 Hillreed Developments Limited (502, 503, 509, 510, 512)

- Agricultural land north of the built up edge of Hersden should be allocated for a mixed use scheme, including up to 800 dwellings over a period extending beyond 2011, with 400+ in Plan period. Other elements include community facilities, formal/informal public open space incorporating the woodland on site, some educational provision, small retail element, and leisure uses.

RN202 David Sayer & Associates (15490)

- allocate 13.03 ha and for mixed use: housing/community/open space/employment

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.125 The objections relate two sites: one of some 110 ha north of the A28, embracing the existing settlement, and the second of 13.03 ha, set within the first site in an area north-west of Hersden Primary School. The overall area is mostly arable agricultural, with some pockets of woodland, having no national or local designation of landscape quality, and subject to normal countryside restraint policies. The larger site has irregular boundaries, some drawn across open land, others based on tracks, hedgerows and tree belts, with the southern boundary butting against property boundaries. The northern and eastern boundaries are open to the adjoining countryside. The central and western parts have a high degree of containment and enclosure, while the eastern and southern parts are more exposed to distant views. The best place for major housing is seen as the central southern portion of the site, and this would be screened by new belts of tree planting. The objectors contend that the development could be considered a natural extension to Hersden village.

3.3.126 The Hillreed submission seeks a very large extension to a village of which had 364 dwellings before the start of construction on Chislet Gardens, which is currently adding another 209. It would mean almost doubling the number of Hersden dwellings in the Plan period, with the intention of adding a further 300 thereafter. Even if masked to

some extent by new and existing planting, the most casual observer would perceive a much larger settlement than now exists.

3.3.127 The Council, though thoroughly opposed to development here, would not have a specific or material transport objection to the proposals for this omission site if a contribution up to £2.5m were made towards improvements in operation at the nearby Sturry Rail station level crossing. If that was not feasible the contribution could go to other appropriate measures identified in the Canterbury District Transport Action Plan or the emerging Walking and Cycling Strategy.

3.3.128 Hersden is no more than a large village, 7 km east of Canterbury city centre, which is now receiving a considerable increment of housing and employment growth. It does not occupy a high position within the PPG3 search sequence, and I fail to see how its present socio-economic problems would be most efficiently addressed by the addition of very large amounts of new development. I found no good planning reasons to allocate any of the previously developed colliery land south of the A28 for further large-scale mixed development; consequently, it is not hard to guess that I see no strong or convincing planning arguments to suggest that a large area of visually pleasing agricultural land north of the village should be given over to development in this Plan period.

Recommendation

3.3.129 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND EAST OF NORTH VIEW, ISLAND ROAD, HERSDEN

Objections and Key Issues

RN270 The Church Commissioners for England represented by Cluttons (1990)

- Allocate 1.14 ha of agricultural land for mixed use as part of the Hersden Regeneration Zone strategy; land capable of being accessed from North View Road

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.130 This site is at the eastern end of the village. Though two isolated dwellings adjoin it to the east, this is a farmland site that appears entirely rural. Its development would mean that the present, long-established eastern end of Hersden, well screened by mature planting, would be extended in an arbitrary fashion into a prominent open area. The omission site has no organic relationship with the layout of the developed village in this vicinity. I see no convincing planning justification for the release of this site for housing, when so many new units are now under construction at the western end of Hersden.

Recommendation

3.3.131 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE: WALNUT TREE FARM, WESTBERE

Objections and Key Issues

RN308 Mr J Seath, represented by G.W. Finn & Sons (794, 795)

- Extend Area of Regeneration Zone to include 13.03 ha area of low quality agricultural land, some previously worked for gravel, at Walnut Tree Farm, Westbere, as a possibility for mixed use

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.132 This area lies immediately west of the border of the former Regeneration Zone. It is farmland, and has no real connection with the functioning of Hersden, or with its immediate environs. It is an entirely rural site, subject to normal open countryside policies of restraint, and the objections have no apparent planning merits.

Recommendation

3.3.133 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

CONCLUSIONS ON HERSDEN

3.3.134 The Council's evidence is that the Community Plan would be a non-statutory document that would not usurp the functions of the forthcoming Local Development Framework about planning decisions. It is seen more as a vehicle for identifying new regeneration needs, to be produced by or before mid-2007.

3.3.135 Construction of the new Chislet Gardens housing is due to be completed by the end of 2005, and has been planned so that it connects into the village's street network. It will be some little time after that that social inter-action between the existing and new inhabitants becomes capable of worthwhile analysis. The effects of new population on local school rolls will also not be apparent until 2006 at the earliest. The usage of community facilities, the prospects for the planned retail element at Chislet Gardens, the effects on the trading of existing village retailing, are all matters that will take a year or more after completion to assess. Any illuminating assessment of the real changes to local economic vitality produced by the continuing take-up of employment space at the Lakesview development may take even longer.

3.3.136 These factors make me sure that no further allocations at Hersden should be contemplated in this emerging Local Plan. The devising of the Council's first Local Development Framework will be the first opportunity to make an assessment of the adequacy of existing allocations. Assessment of the pros and cons of any material increase in the developed area of Hersden will need to consider whether such growth would actually make any difference to the inadequacies of shopping and services common to settlements whose population falls below the economic and population thresholds to sustain local enterprises. If not, growth at Hersden, rather than at the three urban settlements in the District, could be an inefficient and non-sustainable way of proceeding.

3.3.137 Likewise, the previously developed land owned by the MHP Partnership should not be considered as land in any urgent need of development for the sake of Hersden's wellbeing. It is no more than land on the edge of a large village. It may be that, in time, successful development of the Lakesview International Business Park, and continued beneficial occupation of the Canterbury Industrial Park, suggests to the Council that further land might beneficially be given over to employment activities on the southern edge of Hersden. However, the Council's perspective would be District-wide, taking account of the needs of the District economy in a County and Regional framework, rather than considering local concerns alone.

OTHER LAND NOT DIRECTLY ADJOINING DEFINED URBAN AREA BOUNDARIES

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT HAWE LANE/HOATH ROAD, STURRY

Objections and Key Issues

RN016 Mr & Mrs McGahran (607)

- Allocate c.5 ha of rural land used to for horse keeping to build three dwellings

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.138 This is rural land disposed either side of a listed farmhouse. The site lies to the north of substantial woodland. The developed area of Sturry village lies south of the woodland. The site is consequently part of the wider countryside north of Sturry, and normal policies of countryside restraint obtain. The proposal has no obvious planning merits.

Recommendation

3.3.139 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT ST AUGUSTINE'S, CHARTHAM

Objections and Key Issues

RN118 Dept of Health represented by Inventures (496, 2626-2629)

RD119 Inventures, NHS Estates (20331)

- The KSP allows the LA to identify opportunities for larger scale development. Add Chartham (specifically St. Augustine's) and Hersden as a village that could accommodate more than minor development
- The development brief should mention the need for access arrangements for goods vehicle movements and access to public transport.
- Widen list of proposed uses in PolicyED4 : for "Care Village" development or housing generating care jobs
- Consequently, remove reference to Chartham in para.2.52 as a village suitable for minor housing development only; re-word that and 2.53 for clarity
- Proposals Map should identify approximate route of the new access road to the ED4 allocation

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.140 The Council takes the view that the substantial amount of new housing at Chartham now built makes it desirable that a widening of the uses – to include business and some leisure facilities – should be encouraged by policy on the remainder of the site, to mitigate the dormitory characteristics of what is now a quite large and loosely grouped rural settlement. NHS objections seek to add to the kind of mix that exists now, with the present housebuilding phase approaching completion.

3.3.141 This is not a disagreement that has a “right” or “wrong” answer, but I can find no persuasive planning reason why a village well beyond the boundaries of Canterbury City should accommodate ever more housing, even of a specialized nature, when national and Structure Plan policy point to urban or urban fringe areas having a clear priority. I think the Council is right at present to identify Chartham as a RS2 low-growth Village and to seek to vary the existing mix of uses on the remaining previously developed land, though the precise outcome is naturally still uncertain. Furthermore, I see no real gain to any party in marking out what would only be an appropriate access route to the ED4 allocation, on the Proposals Map

Recommendation

3.3.142 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND SOUTH OF ISLAND ROAD, WESTBERE

Objections and Key Issues

RN141 Mr B Hart (424)

- Allocate for housing this 0.63 ha former playing field land with direct access to the A28

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.143 This site is beyond the effective eastern limit of Sturry village, in an open countryside location where normal policies of restraint obtain. Development here would produce an isolated nib of rural housing, which could only encourage further incursions into open land. The objection possesses no planning merits.

Recommendation

3.3.144 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT BROAD OAK FARM, BROAD OAK, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN146 Somerlee Homes represented by BSF Planning Consultant0s (2007-2010, 2012, 2013, 2017, 2018)

- Object to the inclusion of land at Broad Oak Farm, Broad Oak, within the AHLV. Should be deleted

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Object to the non-allocation of a 18.15 ha site, comprising agricultural orchard land (Grades 2, 3a and 3b) + associated buildings, some used for storage, at Broad Oak Farm, for residential development and public open space
- Object in paras. 2.52-2.54 to the list of villages limited to minor development. Delete Broad Oak from list; add to para. 2.54 as a Structure Plan Policy RS3(a) village that could accommodate more than minor development

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.3.145 This site lies south of Broad Oak, which is a substantial piece of essentially linear development on both sides of Sweechgate and Shalloak Road, like two arms of an uncompleted triangle. The proposed housing development would in essence complete and fill that triangle with some 300 dwellings, at densities in accord with PPG3. There would be some 270 dwellings on open land south of the Broad Oak farm complex (Site "B" – 7.283 ha), with about 30 within that complex (Site "A" – 1 ha). A broad band of open space (c. 5 ha) would run south of the filled-in triangle, through which the objectors propose a link and service road, connecting the A291 Herne Bay Road and Shalloak Road. A further element of housing is identified south of the envisaged public open space (Site "C" – 3.906 ha); this could accommodate a further 200 dwellings. Site "C" is seen by the objectors as a final phase of development here, possibly a reserve site allocation, with the ability to contribute to the housing land requirement after 2011.
- 3.3.146 The Council, though thoroughly opposed to development here, would not have a specific or material transport objection to the proposals for the omission site if a contribution up to £2.5m were made towards improvements in operation at the nearby Sturry Rail station level crossing. If that was not feasible the contribution could go to other appropriate measures identified in the Canterbury District Transport Action Plan, or the emerging Walking and Cycling Strategy. The Council does not dispute that the proposed provision of a through route linking Sturry Hill and Shalloak Road would reduce traffic in the main residential part of the latter, and allow further local environment enhancement such as traffic calming, new paving and planting. It agrees that the provision of a relief road within the development area of the site would perform many of the duties of an effective Sturry Bypass.
- 3.3.147 The objectors contend that their proposals are more than the extension of a modest settlement close to Canterbury – at its nearest point the site is c.1200 m straight line distance from the Urban Area Boundary in north-east Canterbury. This is because there is very little scope for making acceptable urban extensions to the defined boundary of the Urban Area. Consequently, it is argued that the standard search sequence set out in paragraph 30 of PPG6 needs to be adjusted for the particular circumstances of a great historic city.
- 3.3.148 The emerging Local Plan states in Paragraph 2.17 that a potential housing site needs to have sustainability and environmental criteria applied to it. This site is argued by the objectors to be a proxy for the conventional urban extension, performing exceptionally well in terms of closeness to higher order facilities, yet being relatively well served by more local facilities. Emphasis is put on the following factors: closeness to the transport node of Sturry rail station, and to a good quality public transport corridor; closeness to the two major transport corridors of the A28 and A291; closeness to frequent bus services; closeness to the park and ride facilities on Sturry Road; closeness to local employment at Canterbury or Hersden; closeness to local shopping in Sweechgate, Sturry Hill, Hoades Wood Road, and Sturry High Street; and the ability to contribute to additional school places, upgrading and expansion of village hall/meeting

room facilities, and local affordable housing. I have no quarrel with this assessment of the scheme's potential planning and transportation merits, though the local shopping is of a very minor size and range.

- 3.3.149 The farm complex (Site A) west of the listed farmhouse had, at the time of my Inquiry, just been given planning permission for the change of use of operationally redundant storage and agricultural buildings thereon to Class B8 use. It is also accepted that a part of the site contains great crested newts, a protected species. However, evidence produced on the matter suggests to me that the measures envisaged to ensure the safety and continued existence of the newt population are not incompatible with a development of c.30 dwellings.
- 3.3.150 I find that combined sites "A" and "B" are very strong candidates to provide a source of readily developable housing to meet a sizeable deficiency in this Local Plan period. This may seem surprising, given that the location does not fit the given description of favoured sites in PPG6, paragraph 30. Nevertheless, Canterbury City houses the bulk of employment and higher level services and facilities in the District, yet has a physical character – as a great historic city of modest size – that makes direct urban extensions of large size extremely problematic.
- 3.3.151 Though the present form and shape of Broad Oak, in functional terms more a small commuter settlement than a conventional village, would never have been allowed under established town planning controls, it is a reality. I see it as a significant element of what could almost be termed "Greater Sturry", an entity comprising the almost contiguous settlements of Broad Oak, Sturry, Fordwich and Westbere. Given the need for more development to meet the housing land requirement, Broad Oak has undoubtedly strong locational virtues, and it is the nearest element of "greater Sturry" to the city. I find that at present it does not possess the visual or layout qualities that make extension unacceptable. In fact, the form of the ribbon development along Sweechgate and Shalloak Road provides a ready made physical enclosure for relatively inconspicuous development within. Broad Oak's essentially linear character is not a feature of visual or planning merit. Careful, detailed planning could ensure that the amenities of the listed farm house on the site and the lines of dwellings enclosing the site would be protected from adverse effects. There is a close functional link with the other small settlements in "Greater Sturry"; however, an enlarged Broad Oak resulting from the development of the objectors' sites "A" and "B" with c.300 dwellings could still retain a small but meaningful physical separation over open land from Sturry, not dissimilar to the gaps between Sturry, Fordwich and Westbere.
- 3.3.152 In contrast, I find that any development of the objectors' site "C", south of the proposed open area and extending to Den Grove Wood, would amount to a direct eastern extension of Sturry across Herne Bay Road. That road is a clear, strong boundary to the existing settlement, and bridging it seems to me tantamount to the encouragement of untidy sprawl. Development on site "C" would also have a distinct adverse effect on the setting of the attractive and dense ancient woodland of Den Grove Wood.
- 3.3.153 In terms of agricultural land classification, the proposed development would involve the loss of Grades 2 and 3a land on site "B", and largely Grade 3B land on the southern site "C"; all are now cultivated as orchards, but are only part of a far larger commercial operation. It is a highly relevant fact that much agricultural land in the District is of high quality, including the two reserve sites within the Herne Bay Urban Area Boundary, shown as Grade 2 on the Agricultural Land Classification Map.

3.3.154 In terms of landscape and topography the whole omission site is well enclosed, without any visually sensitive ridgeline, and with limited external views to and from the site. At its closest it is about 3.6 km from the City centre. The presence of substantial woodlands east and west of the site means that there is no inter-visibility between the omission site and any part of Canterbury City, and that it forms no part of either the foreground or the backdrop to any view of the City. Therefore the site has no need to be within a landscape designation of the kind defined in the Area of High Landscape Value policy in the Revised Deposit Draft. at R6. My findings on that policy are relevant to a full understanding of my conclusions on this omission site, and are to be found in paragraphs 6.13-6.25 below. Any eventual designation in the Adopted Local Plan on landscape protection around Canterbury City should exclude the site.

3.3.155 I find no real planning case for making a separate allocation of site "A" as a specific housing site for c.30 dwellings, as the objectors wish, merely because it contains farm buildings now given a B8 planning permission. That permission is for a land use entirely unrelated to housing. If the proposed use fails to materialise, for whatever reason, it will be open to an owner or prospective developer to make a reasoned planning application for another land use.

3.3.156 This very strong candidate site must be considered with other feasible alternatives, when I make a decision on the most appropriate locations to achieve the Structure Plan housing target. I do this at Section 3.4 below, and therefore make no recommendation at this stage

OMISSION SITE: LAND NORTH OF POPES LANE, STURRY

Objections and Key Issues

RN148 Bryant Projects (961)

- Allocate 10.92 ha of agricultural land for housing

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.157 In discussing the Broad Oak Farm objections, I have identified that omission site's unusual merits, exploiting and capitalising on the existence of a large area of existing linear development. The proposal here lacks any such merits, as it would amount to little more than a large, isolated wedge of development, unrelated to the relatively compact form of estate development south of Pope's Lane. Hence, it cannot be recommended on any strong planning grounds that I can discern.

Recommendation

3.3.158 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE: LAND EAST OF UPPER HARBLEDOWN, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN155 Fisher Farms Group (928)

- Allocate 3.32 ha of agricultural land for residential development, with open space and woodland

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.159 The illustrative concept accompanying this objection shows a development of some 25 dwellings towards the northern apex of the site, and a southern woodland fringe evolving into dense woodland over the south-east area. The land lies outside the Urban Area Boundary, at the eastern end of Roman Road, where linear development in Upper Harbledown has petered out. This proposal would have the undesirable effect of making outlying development extend further towards the established western boundary of the City, and it would be the antithesis of a well-planned urban extension.

Recommendation

3.3.160 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITES: LAND AT CHAPEL LANE AND ELSEWHERE AT BLEAN COMMON

Objections and Key Issues

RN186 Strutt & Parker (171, 224)

- Allocate for housing one site of 4.31 ha north-east of the Royal Oak PH, and another of 1.17 ha west of Chapel Lane

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.161 Development of these two flat agricultural sites would have the effect of extending yet further to the north the straggling linear settlement of Blean. The larger site would transform what is now an irregularly developed linear frontage with an entirely rural hinterland into a deep wedge of development. At present this open land, and the wooded area north of it, constitute a clear end to the northward growth of development. I see no planning merits in developing here.

3.3.162 Development of the smaller site on Chapel Lane would push the outer limits of housing further north-east into open countryside. The omission site is deep, and I cannot regard it as an infill site in the sense that the term is commonly understood: the gap between the existing line of dwellings on the north side of the Lane and the single isolated dwelling north-east of the omission site is at least three dwellings wide. Development here would also have no planning merits.

Recommendation

3.3.163 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT SOUTH CANTERBURY BETWEEN STUPPINGTON LANE, NACKINGTON ROAD AND THE A2

Objections and Key Issues

RN186 Strutt & Parker (172)

- allocate for mixed development on the urban fringe with little impact on the open countryside
- A long term strategic solution for mixed development in southern Canterbury

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.164 This is a very large site, close to the Urban Area Boundary, but separated from it by a relatively narrow band of open land. The site's southern boundary follows the line of the A2. The concept in the objection has not been fleshed out to any marked degree, nor has the objector made any change of use. The evidence is that the site was a part of a wider objection to the Draft Local Plan that later evolved into the 1998 Adopted Local Plan, but was withdrawn before Inspector O'Rourke's Inquiry. It was withdrawn because the Council was then introducing a policy to allow for the expansion of Christ Church College.

3.3.165 In this south-east fringe area of the City, I am in this report supporting two substantial allocations on green land: one is the safeguarded land at Nackington Road, allocated under Policy C16a as a new college campus site. The other is the Business allocation at Little Barton Farm. There are particular planning reasons why these two sites are necessary and proper occupiers of land now in the open countryside, which I explain in my consideration of the two matters in my Chapters Four and Eight. There is absolutely no good planning reason for me to take a positive attitude to the present vague concept. Additionally, an allocation here would leave the strong suggestion in the mind of the property market that all the open land north of the A2 between Wincheap and Nackington Road could be considered fair game for development within a relatively short time.

Recommendation

3.3.166 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITES: LAND AT RENTAIN COURT FARM, CHARTHAM

Objections and Key Issues

RN187 JH & AM Picket represented by G W Finn & Sons (221, 223)

- Allocate two sites now arable farmland, for market and affordable housing, together with open space and landscaping: the western one of 6.33 ha to the rear of Chartham Paper Mill, Highland Road, within a conservation area; the eastern one of 10.48 ha south of Bakers Lane
- Both sites are close to the employment at Chartham Paper Mill and the village centre facilities
- The western site might be developed with other land to the west/north-west; neither site to be wholly developed

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.167 The first observation that comes to mind is the very major nature of expansion and physical consolidation that would occur in this scattered village from developing these

two sites. Chartham has already been receiving major residential growth from the redevelopment of the St Augustine's Hospital site. The result here would be a significant urbanisation of what is still a large disaggregated village well beyond the boundaries of Canterbury City. National and Structure Plan policies do not favour this kind of location, preferring urban development and urban extensions. Though Chartham could be described as a node in a good public transport corridor, the St Augustine's development is still under way, needs time to be assimilated, and has yet to have its eastern part developed for some form of desirable employment/leisure facilities to benefit Chartham. The development sought on these two agricultural sites is therefore inappropriate in this Plan period.

Recommendation

3.3.168 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND REAR OF DARGATE ROAD, YORKLETTS

Objections and Key Issues

RN206 Marks Demolition Company, through J T S Partnership (739)

- Allocate 0.92 ha of pasture and scrubland, to the rear of dwellings fronting Dargate Road, for housing

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.169 Yorkletts is a small linear settlement along Dargate Road, south of the A299 Thanet Way. The development of this open land, clearly outside the existing built confines of Yorkletts, would set a very undesirable precedent by condoning new development in depth behind frontage housing on the north side of the road. The proposal has no planning virtues that I can discern.

Recommendation

3.3.170 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

TWO OMISSION SITES IN LITTLEBOURNE: (1) LITTLEBOURNE COURT, COURT HILL, LITTLEBOURNE; (2) LAND TO THE REAR OF JUBILEE ROAD, LITTLEBOURNE

Objections and Key Issues

(Site 1) RN193 PJ, CA & HJ Holdstock & OHW Twyman represented by GW Finn & Sons (185, 186)

- Allocate 2.33 ha site – agricultural land with actively used farm buildings/yard in the south-east part – for housing
- Littlebourne should be retained and identified as a village that could accommodate more than minor development

(Site 2) RN230 Rydon Homes (1714, 1716, 1717, 1718)

- allocate land to the rear of Jubilee Road, Littlebourne, which should be given status as a sustainable village capable of accommodating more than minor development
- allocate for mixed used: range of housing types and size, employment, public open space, community facilities and highway improvements

- take account of sites outside urban areas to meet supply shortfall

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.171 Littlebourne is one of the villages considered appropriate for minor development only, for the purposes of Structure Plan Policy RS2. It has been downgraded from its previous status of a village suitable for more than minor residential development in the Adopted Local Plan. It is about 4 miles from the City centre, with a population around 1500 people.

3.3.172 PPG3 of March 200 introduces new and important caveats against significant village expansion, save in stated circumstances, and national and adopted/emerging Structure Plan policies look primarily to urban areas, urban extensions and nodes in good public transport corridors. Littlebourne has little claim to be a strong candidate in the last category, being only on a bus route, a very long walk from a rail station, and possessing a single village convenience store whose fragility is shown by its recent closure before re-opening in the village hall. The village has already been the recipient of a significant amount of affordable housing in the last 10-15 years. I consider there are a number of better locations to achieve the Structure Plan housing target than here, using the favoured categories of urban extension and more obvious nodes in good public transport corridors – Broad Oak Farm being the leading example close to Canterbury. Policy H6 of the emerging Local Plan does exempt previously developed land sites in villages from the restriction to minor development only in certain circumstances, but neither of these sites fits convincingly into this category. Moreover both of these sites are large by village standards, which is another obvious planning count against them.

Site 1

3.3.173 This proposal would spread the built extent of the village significantly north-eastwards. The site is subject to normal countryside policies of restraint, and it is not argued that the site serves no viable agricultural purpose. The submission that its mere use for farming is somehow incompatible with nearby housing I find unconvincing and facile. The existing farm buildings contained within the site do not make it in any recognisable way a previously developed site. In terms of village form, it could be argued that development of the site would round out this part of Littlebourne, and respond to the layout of housing on the other side of Court Hill. However, this would only be a strong argument if there was a pressing need to expand Littlebourne substantially, which is not the case.

Site 2

3.3.174 This site is put forward if I find a deficiency in housing supply, with the argument that as a large village closer to Canterbury than Herne Bay or Whitstable it has strong claims to an allocation. The omission site is 6.63 ha in extent. Littlebourne, four miles east of Canterbury, is held to be a more sustainable option than the coastal urban areas, given the overwhelming importance of Canterbury city in the District. It is considered that the village should be restored to its RS3a status, to accommodate more than minor development.

3.3.175 The land is admitted not to be previously developed land, but is held to be within the village confines, effectively contained by existing development. The concept scheme envisages a site divided into four developable areas: "A" producing 56 dwellings on 1.6

ha: "B" producing 46 dwellings (at less than 30 dwelling per hectares); "C" accommodating 2,000 m² of B1/Community uses including live/work units; and "D" of 1 ha for public open space.

3.3.176 The site is a very substantial agricultural field. Also, because of the open vistas it provides within the overall village structure, it is a substantial visual amenity to the village, one enjoyed on a daily basis by villagers using the footpath along its edge on a seamless route into open countryside. As a large open area separating the older development along the axis of The Hill from the more recent development, it prevents the creation of a solid urbanised tranche of development that would not greatly benefit the village's form and character. The objector's concept plan does little to alter this perception, although I recognise that the layout there is only one of a number of possible options. I do not question that the site could be given suitable access for vehicles and pedestrians. In the absence of real need to expand the settlement, these considerations amount to an overwhelming case against this form and scale of development.

Recommendation

3.3.177 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT LOWER HARDRES FRUIT FARM

Objections and Key Issues

RN244 Lower Hardres Fruit Farm represented by Angela Hirst Surveyors & Valuers (2079)

- Policy H1 is limited to brownfield sites, but previous paragraphs refer to minor development on land which has not previously been developed. Amend policy to include land not categorised as brownfield
- This land, outside the Conservation Area, is suited to mixed development, including housing, to serve a modest village expansion, to make it more self-contained and sustainable

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.178 This is an understandably tentative objection, made in respect of a 9 ha land holding. The holding, which has a farm shop and other agricultural buildings at its northern end, occupies land to the west and south of the main run of linear housing facing Hardres Court Road. This is a modest and scattered village, which is by no stretch of the imagination a significant transport node. The objectors' agent acknowledges that it is not a higher order village, and the Council rightly places it in the long list of villages in the District limited to minor developments, for the purposes of adopted Structure Plan Policy RS2. The objection also acknowledges that only if I find a wider distribution of growth across the District appropriate will I favour an omission site like this. Such is not the case; I have found only one acceptable development site appropriate for housing outside the District's three Urban Area Boundaries – at Broad Oak – and that only as a reserve site, justified by the special circumstances resulting from constraints on direct expansion of the historic City.

3.3.179 This is a site washed over by the AONB and County-level SLA designations, so that development of any kind has to be considered rigorously, and the presumption must be that anything permitted would be modest and not destructive of the natural character of

its surroundings. Development of this site as a whole would amount to very much more than the scale of building countenanced by Policy RS2, and would irrevocably change the character of Lower Hardres. A significant number of daily vehicle journeys would be the consequence.

3.3.180 Further points against these vague and large-scale proposals are that the former agricultural buildings on site now enjoy a planning permission for light industrial and equestrian uses, that there is a farm shop at the front of the site, and that the remainder of the site is agricultural land, seemingly of good quality with a significant orchard area.

Recommendation

3.3.181 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT SHALMSFORD FARM, CHARTHAM

Objections and Key Issues

RN245 A C Hulme & Sons represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084)

- Objection to inclusion of land at Shalmsford Farm within the area at risk from fluvial flooding (Policies C28 and C29)
- Object to the non-allocation of:
 - the previously proposed Site A – 1.71 ha, and
 - the balance of the farmyard site Site B – 3.22 ha, together with Site A – of farmyard area and meadow land at Shalmsford Farm, for residential development

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.182 The level Site A was allocated for housing in the previous draft Local Plan, but the allocation was not confirmed by the Inspector O'Rourke, because of unresolved concerns over potential flooding. Part of the site is within an Environment Agency Area at Risk of Fluvial Flooding. At the time of my Inquiry, however, the Environment Agency accepted the principle of development on the site, subject to various criteria being met. Inspector O'Rourke saw a case for "the redevelopment of the frontage and farmyard which could enhance the appearance of the conservation area". The Council then envisaged c.20 dwellings on the site, with extensive landscaping, on an area not extending outside the area covered by existing farm buildings.

3.3.183 These sites are adjoined to the west and north by agricultural land. There is a quarry-derived lake to the north-east. To the south and east are the buildings lining both sides of this part of Shalmsford Street, but the Street becomes much more open to the west. The objectors assume that a development on the footprint of the main building on site could achieve 20 dwellings. The objectors would wish any allocation to include the Site B land surrounding the main buildings footprint; the latter has been used for parking of haulage vehicles and bulk storage of agricultural produce and other materials. Site B is restored quarry land, held by the objectors not to be a green site, though not strictly previously developed land in terms of PPG3. I saw that it appears to have been fully assimilated back into the local landscape.

3.3.184 The Council's stance is that there is limited scope for redevelopment of the street frontage and farmyard, and that a good quality, well landscaped scheme could enhance the conservation area within which this part of the omission site sits. At the time of my Inquiry, the Council had produced a Draft Development Brief in February 2004, but this was yet to be formally approved. That Brief covers an area larger than Site A; I find it significant that the objectors have not asked for a bigger area of housing than the Brief shows.

3.3.185 The Council prefers that the site should come forward as a windfall element following eventual approval of the Development Brief. I saw that this is a sensitive site, with a number of significant constraints. I consider that a good result is much more likely to result from a detailed scheme, with a limited amount of new building tightly confined to the existing developed footprint of the core farm structures, submitted in the light of the approved Brief and sensitive to the constraints of this semi-rural location. Consequently, I see no planning need to make a formal allocation in the Local Plan. The realistic expectations of the objector would not really be affected by this omission.

Recommendation

3.3.186 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITES IN THE WESTBERE/STURRY GREEN GAP: (1) LAND SOUTH OF WESTBERE LANE, WESTBERE, AND (2) LAND AT STAINES HILL, STURRY

Objections and Key Issues

Site 1

RN247 Mr Mavaddat represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2096, 2097, 2104)

- Object to the non-allocation of 5.44 of open grassland sloping southwards to the rail line at Westbere for a well-designed and landscaped scheme, well related to the public transport network
- Object to designation of land south of Westbere Lane as a Green Gap under policy R7

Site 2

RN356 M S Pars Company Ltd (1311, 1312)

RN357 Howard Hutton & Associates (1309, 1310)

- allocate 8.55 ha site, unused and overgrown land for some time, for residential (12 acres), with the remainder as amenity land to be donated to Sturry

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.187 Site (1), unused agricultural land, lies within the generously designated Westbere No. 2 Conservation Area, and also within the designated Green Gap between Sturry and Westbere. As the undeveloped land was presumably designated to preserve or enhance the setting of the village within the conservation area, its loss to development would, on the face of it, detract from the area's qualities, though the degree of detraction would depend on the way development was planned and landscaped.

3.3.188 The Green Gap designation as shown on the Proposals Map seems entirely logical to me as a perhaps belated attempt to prevent total coalescence between the built-up area of south Sturry and Westbere village. Such coalescence has no planning justification or benefits, and would needlessly diminish local community loyalties and historic

distinctions. The argument that the land is not easily visible to the passer-by on the A28, and would leave a substantial remainder of open land, is unconvincing. The gap has shrunk to such a small degree that further diminution – by about 50% if Site (1) were developed alone – would bring into question the utility of any such designation here.

3.3.189 As to Site (2), which is unused open land with its north-east portion within a conservation area, I find that similar considerations are relevant. Its western boundary is the precise point where housing development in depth south of Island Road halts. Its development would bring the mass of residential South Sturry significantly nearer Westbere, even if the eastern part of the site was given over to amenity space. Since I consider that the proposed Green Gap is efficacious, but only just significant enough in extent to be worthwhile, I find no planning merit in the allocation suggested.

Recommendation

3.3.190 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND BETWEEN CANTERBURY ROAD AND BUSHYFIELDS ROAD, AT HERNE COMMON

Objections and Key Issues

RN248 Messrs Adams, Mount, Ridout & Hume represented by BSF Planning
Consultants (2106, 2107)

- Object to the non-allocation, as housing and open space, of 7.84 ha of open level land at Herne Common, between Canterbury Road and Bushyfields Road, now used for horse-related activities and livery on a network of fields + the curtilages of two houses

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.191 This site, between Canterbury Road and Bushyfields Road, Herne, is some distance beyond the Urban Area Boundary of Herne Bay, and about 1 km from the centre of Herne village. There is an isolated length of roadside housing north-west of the site on Canterbury Road, as well as the redeveloped Herne Hospital site at Canterbury Fields on the north side of that Road. South and south-east of the site along the southern side of Bushyfields Road there is more isolated linear housing; however, this is indisputably a site in the open countryside. Access to Canterbury Road would be gained through the house curtilages included within the site. Development is envisaged on some 4.5 ha, producing c.135-225 dwellings at PPG3 densities of 30 to 50 dwellings per hectare, with the rest of the site given over to public open space large enough to house a sports pitch and other benefits.

3.3.192 I find this to be a site entirely inappropriate for what is proposed. Major development in a countryside location like this finds no commendation in the Adopted or Emerging Local Plans, the adopted Structure Plan or the emerging Kent and Medway Structure Plan. I agree with the objectors that the presence nearby of a Special Landscape Area is not in itself an adverse factor. It is also probable that a satisfactory vehicular access could be created on to Canterbury Road. However, the site is part of the Herne Conservation Area; that extensive designation must reflect some desire to preserve and

enhance a former area of open common that gives a landscape context to the nearby historic village. The village core is some distance away and not well endowed with facilities. The site compares very poorly with the two Herne Bay Reserve Sites which, though on green field land, are established within the Urban Area Boundary in the Adopted and Emerging Local Plans.

Recommendation

3.3.193 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITES: LAND NORTH OF THE STREET, SOUTH OF STATION ROAD, AND NORTH OF POND HILL, ADISHAM

Objections and Key Issues

RN249 Mr & Mrs Wilson & Messrs Coleman & Partners, represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2117, 2118, 2124)

RN270 The Church Commissioners for England, represented by Cluttons (1986-1989)

- Object to the non-allocation of 0.44 ha of land (agricultural + frontage garden land) between 177 and 199 The Street for residential development: perhaps c. 8 linear dwellings
- Should be allocated before any review of the Local Plan
- Allocate two small Church Commissioners' sites north of The Street, and two larger areas of land (between Pond Hill and the railway line, and off Station Road near the station) as opportunities for small scale development, benefiting the village without damaging its character and the countryside (the two larger sites, now agricultural land, for a mix of housing/public open space/village facilities)

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.194 Adisham is a modest and essentially linear settlement, and the Special Landscape Area designation washes over the settlement and covers all the nearby countryside, emphasising the priority of landscape protection. The facilities – no longer any shop, but a public house school and nearby rail station – are reasonable for a modest settlement (126 households and a 2001 census population of 617 according to the Council). Adisham seems to me entirely appropriately included in the emerging Local Plan's category of villages where new housing should be limited to minor development only, in accord with adopted Structure Plan Policy RS2.

3.3.195 The site between Nos. 177-179 is a long undeveloped gap, about 100 m. To say that the site is bounded by development on three sides, as the objectors' agent does, inadequately reflects the open rural nature of this long gap in a street lined by individual houses. The fact that frontage land is used as garden behind a tall hedgerow does not in this instance make the site more appropriate in planning terms for development. It does not accord with any definition I have heard of an "infill site". Furthermore, the site is at the southern end of the village, where linear development is far from continuous.

3.3.196 The two smaller Church Commissioners' sites are both located at the rear of existing buildings on The Street. The southernmost site is on green field land, behind two pairs of semi-detached dwellings, with a vehicle access to the south of the latter. This would amount to backland development. Though a scheme might be designed that retained reasonable amenity standards, such as privacy and freedom from unwanted noise

disturbance, the principle of such development in a simple linear settlement, extending development into countryside, seems to me clearly undesirable.

3.3.197 The northernmost of the two smaller sites is directly behind the C of E primary school. I presume that access would be gained along the axis of the north-east boundary of the school site. Development would be on what appears to be mostly green land connected functionally with the school. I consider the same drawbacks exist on this site.

3.3.198 The two larger Church Commissioners' sites are at the northern end of the village, where built development peters out as it reaches the railway line. Both sites are of considerable depth, with the clear implication that, whatever detailed scheme was put forward for them, the result would be major development of a kind uncommon here. Moreover both sites are physically and functionally outside the established village, making major incursions into open countryside.

3.3.199 None of the various sites described above appears to be a suitable, unproblematic candidate for development in this modest village. There are other, far better sites in or adjacent to the Urban Area Boundaries to meet the housing shortfall in this Plan period.

Recommendation

3.3.200 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT MAYPOLE VILLAGE FARM, HOME FARM, HOATH

Objections and Key Issues

RN258 Sands (2172, 2173)

- Object to the non allocation of 3.41 ha of land, divided into two parts by Maypole Lane at Maypole Village Farm for housing, to overcome problems of developing allocated sites and to provide village housing
- Land only fit for rough grazing at best; not capable of ploughing

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.201 This site is an authentically rural location, north of the concentrated part of the small hamlet of Maypole, and just east of the Special Landscape Area. The land is not actively used for agriculture, and shows evidence of former hardcore tipping. Effectively, this amounts to proposed development in open countryside, well outside Herne Bay, and distant from local facilities. The objections have no planning merits, and there are many better alternatives.

Recommendation

3.3.202 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT OAK LODGE, CHURCHWOOD CLOSE, ROUGH COMMON, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN259

David Salvatori represented by Goddard Planning Consultancy (2175-2177)

- Object to non-allocation of 3.51 ha of grassland interspersed with trees at Oak Lodge, for partial residential development, with the opportunity to include a community facility
- Object to the inclusion of the land within the AHLV

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.203 This open land is to the east of one of the small fingers of deeper residential development off Rough Common Road. The latter is an example of ribbon development well outside the Urban Area Boundary of Canterbury City. The area of open land between the Rough Common Road housing and the nearby north-western portion of urban Canterbury is important as a barrier to incremental sprawl. The objections portray the proposed development as a logical rounding-off of the developed eastern edge of Rough Common, which could provide a defensible urban boundary. However, I see the proposals as a further significant extension of development, east of an already large finger of housing, into open land at the narrowest part of the gap. These adverse factors distinguish the present omission site from the far less damaging Council allocation further northwards, about which I have written in section 3.2 of this chapter.

Recommendation

3.3.204 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT BARHAM

Objections and Key Issues

RN269

Cluttons (2237, 2238)

- Object to the non-inclusion of 1.34 ha of land at Barham, between Brickfield Road and Derringstone Hill within a village boundary with a view to some residential development

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.205 This site is within a village conservation area that has been designated with some generosity. However, the proposed development raises issues that have more to do with restricting housing hereabouts to linear, as opposed to in-depth, development than the more specifically architectural aspects of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Barham Conservation Area.

3.3.206 The omission site consists of the combined curtilages of two dwellings, but the buildings are sited so that a large undeveloped area of the site fronts on to Derringstone Hill and Brickfield Road. Although the development of the whole site with a more intensive form of development would be out of character with the immediate area, I consider that there might be an opportunity to build a very few well designed and set out frontage dwellings on Derringstone Hill, without detriment to the locality or the conservation area as a whole. However, any development of housing eastwards along the frontage of Brickfield Road would seem to me an undesirable extension of building into open countryside. The scale of development that I consider potentially achievable

without visual harm to the locality is so small that an allocation would be inappropriate and unnecessary.

Recommendation

3.3.207 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITES: (1) LAND ADJOINING 16 HOLLOW STREET, AND (2) LAND NORTH OF ELM COTTAGE, CHISLET

Objections and Key Issues

RN270 The Church Commissioners for England represented by Cluttons (1986-1992)

- Re (1), allocate this 0.28 ha site, the entrance area of a cricket ground, for housing toward the Hollow St frontage, with a recreational area at the rear
- Re (2), allocate this 0.19 ha agricultural site for housing

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.208 Hollow Street is a tiny hamlet set in a very rural context, and these two sites are at either end of the short run of dwellings – most of them on the east side – that comprise the hamlet. Both sites are effectively chunks of open land that extend outside the narrow frontage buildings of the hamlet, which has high visibility from surrounding countryside. Both sites lie within the conservation area that wraps round Hollow End, and must therefore have been seen as significant parts of its setting at the time of designation. Both sites have a worthwhile present land use. Effectively, these objections seek to promote development in open countryside, well away from any urban area or development/transport node, and distant from local facilities. The objections have no real planning merits, and there are many better alternatives to meet a housing supply deficiency.

Recommendation

3.3.209 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT HARDRES COURT ROAD (EAST SIDE), LOWER HARDRES

Objections and Key Issues

RN279 Mr M Baker-White, represented by Strutt & Parker (1768)

- Allocate this 1.23 ha site (agricultural/paddock) for housing, as the only site in the village capable of taking development

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.210 This is a site washed over by the AONB and County-level SLA designations, within a conservation area. Lower Hardres is a village where neither the objector nor the

Council disputes that a policy framework opposed to other than minor development is appropriate. The objector sees the achievement of between 5 and 10 dwellings with landscape screening as fitting within that restriction. A change of heart by the Parish Council in 1999 over the acceptability of developing the land is referred to by the objector, but meaningful details of what occurred are not before me, so I gain almost nothing from this information.

3.3.211 The site is open rural land with a strong hedge boundary on to Hardres Court Road. It is a large site in the context of this modest village, one not remotely akin to an infill site. Given the clear national policy guidance in PPG3, paragraphs 57-58, something like 40 dwellings would be the kind of dwelling yield expected from an allocation of this size, which is drawn in such a way as to exclude the possibility of restricting the development to frontage housing only – and even frontage development would produce a far more than minor yield, in this small village with few facilities. The present agricultural character of the site has positive visual benefits for this southern part of Lower Hardres, another major planning factor against the proposals.

Recommendation

3.3.212 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT BOLTS HILL, DEANERY FARM, CHARTHAM

Objections and Key Issues

RN280 Strutt & Parker (1769, 1770)

- Allocate a 1.38 ha agricultural site with a few agricultural buildings and dwellings for residential development
- The character of the disparate elements on site is a built-up section of Bolt Hill from the main residential part of the village to the railway

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.213 This site is at the north-east extremity of a discrete section of the village, and contains the sort of mix of dwellings and agricultural buildings one would expect to see at a village edge, as development peters out. The Council has already exercised planning flexibility by giving recent planning permissions for the conversion of an oast and granary within the site to residential use. However, the open agricultural character of the backland on the site, and the rural land behind it, are positive elements in the local scene, helping to keep Shalmsford Street, Bolts Hill and Chartham separate and distinctive.

3.3.214 Chartham has already received major residential growth from the redevelopment of the St Augustine's Hospital site. The result of an allocation here would be a significant urbanisation of what is still a large, disaggregated village, well beyond the boundaries of Canterbury City. National and Structure Plan policies do not favour this kind of location, preferring urban development and urban extensions. Though Chartham could be described as a node in a good public transport corridor, the St Augustine's development is still under way, needs time to be assimilated, and has yet to have its eastern part developed as desirable employment/leisure facilities to benefit Chartham.

Recommendation

3.3.215 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND NORTH OF BLEAN HOUSE, WHITSTABLE ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN302 Mr C Ochs (2268, 2269)

- Object to the non-allocation of 0.95 ha of open land to the north of Blean House, Blean for market and affordable housing, with additional school car parking

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.216 This land forms a distinct gap in the long and generally unmemorable ribbons of roadside housing along and leading off the A290 in the Rough Common/Blean area. The Council has devised a Green Gap in the emerging Local Plan, to prevent coalescence between the settlement known as Rough Common and the long entity that comprises Blean. I support the principle behind the Green Gap policy elsewhere, in Chapter Six of this report. Though to the visitor or uninformed observer, there seems very little clear visual evidence to gauge the precise point where he or she is in Blean or Rough Common, I have no doubt that the bulk of the local population has no such problem.

3.3.217 The Gap defined on the Proposals Map does define an area of open local land that appears to me the precise amount needed to maintain a meaningful separation hereabouts. It includes all but a small southern part of the omission site, and the latter – an area of open countryside in planning terms – is far too large to be confused with what is commonly referred to as an infill site, or to be classified as minor development. Consequently I see no strong planning justification for housing development here, with or without a parking element dedicated to the Primary school (which is still some distance away from the nearest part of the omission site).

Recommendation

3.3.218 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT GOOSE FARM, SHALLOAK ROAD, BROAD OAK, STURRY

Objections and Key Issues

RN305 Mansfield Farm Ltd represented by J Norris (2273, 2277, 2278)

- Object to the non-allocation of land at Goose Farm, Shalloak Road, Broad Oak, part of a developed frontage, for residential development

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.3.219 This is a wedge-shaped site of 0.52 ha of “set aside” open land, formerly an area of orchard, claimed by the objector to be part of the developed area of Broad Oak village. It is seen as suitable for about 10 “good quality houses”. The density of approximately 20 dwellings per hectare would be below the PPG3 indicators which, the objector says, would suggest a development of 16-22 dwellings. The site is argued to be visually constrained by surrounding built development, though with some restricted open views to the north-west. It is said that development would conceal unsightly existing views of industrial units to the rear. There have been previous applications for housing on this site, in 1979 and 1983, both refused, and the Council’s stance has been upheld at appeal.
- 3.3.220 The settlement of Broad Oak, surrounded by open agricultural land, has developed in the C20th along minor roads north-west of the larger village of Sturry, somewhat in the shape of an inverted and hollow “Y”, from an original core at the Sweechgate/Shalloak Road junction. I saw that the main run of closely spaced housing at the south-western end of the inverted “Y” comes to an end north of this omission site, at the southern edge of the group of new and old housing at Nos. 21-29 Shalloak Road. The perception of an effective termination of the settlement at that point is reinforced by the presence of the high brick wall boundary of Mellow End Farmhouse, marking the northern edge of the omission site.
- 3.3.221 Of course, the omission site is seen in the context of the visually indifferent group of extended farm buildings, now in a variety of uses, bounding its west side. Yet it is a substantial piece of open land which strikes the observer as being part of the Goose Farm complex; that perception is not lessened by the absence of easily obtained views through from Shalloak Road to the open orchard land to the rear. Goose Farm house, south of the omission site, is a building well set back from Shalloak Road, behind a high evergreen hedge, indisputably distinct and apart from the close spaced frontage housing on the other side of that road.
- 3.3.222 In policy terms, the emerging Local Plan places the settlement of Broad Oak in that category having potential for some minor housing development or infill development, consistent with the scale of the village. It does not choose to define a village boundary, avoiding the implication that any vacant plot might be suitable for development. However, because I perceive this quite large site – inevitably involving development in depth – to be outside the effective confines of the linear settlement, it would not come within the emerging Local Plan’s conception of acceptable village development. I find no strong planning justification for the objector’s argument that new housing here would have the beneficial effect of masking the complex of employment buildings around the farmhouse. The buildings are without any visual merit, but structures of this sort at the edge of a village are not uncommon, and their impact here is diminished by their position well back from the road edge, forming part of the farm complex rather than of village housing to the north. The fact that linear housing development on the east side of Shalloak Road continues to run opposite to, and south of, the omission site is irrelevant to the situation on the west side of the road.

Recommendation

- 3.3.223 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITES: LAND EAST OF PALMERS CROSS HILL (SITE 1 - 1953), LAND AT AND ADJOINING THE GROVE, NORTH OF HALL PLACE (SITE 3 - 1955), LAND EAST OF GARDEN CLOSE (SITE 2 - 1954), LAND SOUTH (SITE 4 - 1957) AND EAST (SITE 5 - 1956) OF VERNON HOLME SCHOOL, HOSPITAL FARM, HARBLEDOWN

Objections and Key Issues

RN331 Mr A Finn & Trustees of W Colthup (1953-7)

- Allocate this range of sites for: residential development (1 and 2); residential and/or commercial/hotel/leisure development (3); residential and/or commercial/ hotel/leisure/ sports facilities development (4); and residential development (5)

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.224 Three of these omission sites are on open land that separates the extensive linear development known as Rough Common from the nearby north-western portion of urban Canterbury. Land north of Hall Place within Site 3 is identified in the Revised Deposit Draft in New Policy C5a as a fourth park and ride facility for north-west Canterbury, and I support that proposal in this report in paragraphs 8.25-8.26 below.

3.3.225 Though the objectors oppose the designation of the park and ride facility, they still argue that it is a signal that larger site next to the commercial use at Hall Place is suitable for development. In reality, I find that all the sites north of the A2050 are on open land that is very important as a barrier to incremental sprawl; development would effectively extend built-up Canterbury as far west as Rough Common. This would be a significant, unnecessary and visually destructive urban extension, and the greater part of it would be prominent to any observer from the A2050 and parts of Harbledown.

3.3.226 The other two sites are south of the A2050, but part of a considerable area of open land west of the Urban Area Boundary. Site 5 would have the undesirable effect of directly extending an existing finger of residential development at Harbledown village westwards along the southern side of the A2050. Site 4 would transform a local area, where a school sits in a context of green land between the A2050 and the A28, into a visually prominent but isolated mass of development well outside the Urban Area Boundary. I see no planning advantage in either proposed allocation, whereas the visual and planning disadvantages are glaring.

Recommendation

3.3.227 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: THE DURITE PLANT, ADJOINING WESTBERE LAKES, STURRY

Objections and Key Issues

RN350 Robert Brett & Sons Ltd (2463)

- Allocate this industrial site for housing in the later part of the Plan's life; no intention for it to come forward until after 2007

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.3.228 This is a site in open countryside, south of the rail line, within a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and also within an Environment Agency Area at Risk of Tidal flooding. It adjoins a RAMSAR Special Protection Area and a Special Area of Conservation. The presence of the railway means that the site is not effectively connected to the southern part of Sturry, either visually or in terms of land use. Moreover, the environmental and planning context described above makes this far from a clear choice for any housing development. Since the enterprise is functioning and providing jobs at present, and the objectors' intentions for it are not spelt out in any detail, I find there is no clearly useful planning purpose in considering a future for the site in this Plan period.

Recommendation

3.3.229 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

3.4 CONCLUSIONS ON NECESSARY ADDITIONAL HOUSING ALLOCATIONS

3.4.1 The candidate sites I have brought forward for possible inclusion as housing allocations are:

- A) Land at Mill Lane, Herne Bay with a notional capacity of 260 units, for development within the Plan period to 2011. The supporting text should mention that the release of the site would be dependent on provision of an appropriate scheme to alleviate local flooding of the Plenty Brook, in accordance with draft Policy C30.
- B) Land at Richmond Drive, Herne Bay with a notional capacity of 40 units.
- C) Land South of John Wilson Business Park, Chestfield with a notional capacity of 200 dwellings.
- D) Land North of St Luke's Close, Whitstable - 0.9 ha of land within the Urban Area Boundary for c.36 dwellings, including affordable housing.
- E) Land at Cocking Road, Thanington – for c. 450 dwellings, at a density of 35 dwellings per hectares.
- F) Land East of Hollow Lane, Canterbury, for c. 60 dwellings.
- G) Land at Broad Oak Farm, Broad Oak, Canterbury, for c.300 dwellings on sites “A” – 1 ha + Site “B” – 7.283 ha; with a further 200 dwellings on Site “C” – 3.906 ha.
- H) Land at Chaucer Road Barracks, Canterbury for c. 30 dwellings.
- I) Land at Lawson Close, Chartham for c.15 dwellings.

3.4.2 The Council's stance, re-iterated in evidence on the merits of various omission sites, is that the two reserve sites of Mill Lane and Richmond Drive are the first choices for development if there is an identified shortfall in supply. They have the status of land within the Urban Area Boundary in the Adopted and Emerging Local Plans. The clear sub-text to Inquiry evidence is that the Council and other parties consider the key question about both sites to be “when” rather than “whether”.

3.4.3 In this report I am supporting the locational strategy of looking to the three urban areas of Canterbury, Whitstable and Herne Bay as the appropriate locations for the great bulk of new housing, and limiting all other small settlements to no more than minor housing development. All three urban areas are relatively close together, and only the presence of a narrow green corridor – requiring a Green Gap policy – prevents the two seaside towns from becoming one long settlement bounded by the sea and the A299.

3.4.4 The City of Canterbury is quite clearly the natural centre of the District. It is a great historic City, but one of modest size, which would be harmed by major expansion. Most objectors seem to subscribe to that broad concept, whatever the nature of their desired land development. At the same time Canterbury is the place where the District economy functions at the highest levels of prestige and vitality. Major town centre services and facilities are found there, professions require a presence there, tourist-related enterprises flourish, and its attractions as a shopping centre for the District and

places further afield were continuing to grow significantly during the period of my Inquiry. The great and growing service industry based around educational provision of all kinds concentrates, for reasons of history and choice, in and immediately around the City. Consequently, if no special considerations existed, the PPG3 search sequence for new housing sites in the District would point to Canterbury City as the prime location. Urban extensions would be favoured after: (a) re-use of previously developed land, and (b) examination of other land within the Urban Area Boundary had been pursued. However, a stance favouring urban extensions to Canterbury obviously conflicts with what is described in paragraph 1.11 of this Deposit Plan as the Council seeking the protection and keeping of the “important and historic setting and environment of Canterbury and the Canterbury image”.

- 3.4.5 Given the Council's premise in the Revised Deposit Draft that previously developed land will be able to satisfy the housing land requirement, it is not surprising that it does not spend time discussing the least bad places that could accommodate expansion beyond the City's Urban Area Boundary. The only site on Canterbury's edge that was de-allocated in the Revised Deposit Draft was the relatively modest 30 dwelling allocation at Chaucer Road Barracks.
- 3.4.6 As I said, the Council favours the two sites at Herne Bay, a few miles away to the north-east, as the least problematic way of solving the problem in this Plan period – or rather the first 300 dwellings needed to fill the shortfall. The Council did not produce a list of the least objectionable omission sites, nor did I ask it to. Consequently, although I appreciate the obvious sustainability argument that new population should live as close as possible to the City, as the District's main hub, I find the City's vulnerability to change and the relatively closeness of Herne Bay and Whitstable to be other and stronger factors prompting me not to recommend any significant urban extension to Canterbury City in this Plan period.
- 3.4.7 There is another very persuasive factor against recommending urban extensions to the City. This is my desire to support the Council's stance in favour of redeveloping a large number of sites on previously developed land within the City in the near future. My earlier analysis of the Plan's allocations on previously developed land within Canterbury (in Section 3.2), and my findings on which I could with good conscience recommend as firm allocations, and which I had to discard, were not easy tasks. Market factors and an instinct for what is feasible played a significant part in my own deliberations on particular sites. The guidance offered to me at the Housing Round Table and in subsequent site notes by the Council and the HBF-led objectors had a high subjective content. Even now, I consider that it will be a hard job to get building started before the end of the Plan period on all, or nearly all, of the sites that I have found to merit allocation as commercially attractive and feasible,. Of course, those allocations I support on previously developed land in the City would much more easily be perceived as problems that could be bypassed, or postponed for some later time, if “easy” green field sites were also allocated at the City edge. Therefore, I shall recommend no such allocations for this Plan period up to 2011.
- 3.4.8 Of the potential edge-of-City sites, I see the Chaucer Road Barracks allocation the easiest to turn down, for the reasons I set out in paragraph 3.2.31-3.2.32 above. It would not be not a “natural” rounding out of the existing densely built urban edge, but would create a substantial nib of development beyond it. This could well lead to further

attempts to build on green land in the vicinity, using arguments about creating some new, supposedly more “natural” edge.

- 3.4.9 The land at Cocking Road, Thanington, is a much larger development opportunity and thus, as an “easy” green field site, there would be even more of an inducement to developers to avoid previously developed land in the City. Also, I have real concerns that building on this pleasant area of open farmland would not only push an existing, isolated axis of urban development further out south-westwards, but would encourage subsequent attempts to develop even further out to the line of Cocking Road, near Milton Manor, after this Plan period.
- 3.4.10 Developing the land east of Hollow Lane has undoubted planning attractions. The case for “rounding out” of the urban form of the City hereabouts is made more plausible by the angular extension of the Urban Area Boundary enclosing the Wincheap Farm site allocated in the Adopted Local Plan. Also, the sustainability credentials of this site are high. However, this is another “easy” site which would deflect attention from more problematic previously developed land; also, it is open countryside of quite pleasant character at the City edge, valuable for its own sake. I do not find it hard to dismiss the site from consideration for development in this Plan period.
- 3.4.11 Given the planning disadvantages that I see in these direct urban extensions, one omission site appears to me able to perform some very useful planning functions to the benefit of the City, and also to what I earlier termed, with some trepidation, “Greater Sturry”, which functions as a dormitory area very close to the City. “Greater Sturry” comprises the almost contiguous settlements of Broad Oak, Sturry, Fordwich and Westbere; these all have some interests in common, despite the undoubted planning need to keep them physically separated and retaining their historic identity and local loyalties.
- 3.4.12 Designating Sites “A” and “B” at Broad Oak as a reserve housing provision for 300 dwellings would be a further spur to the City Council and private developers to get up and moving with previously developed land allocations within the City. The Broad Oak sites are there for rapid development if progress in the City itself is tardy. Over and above that consideration I see Sites “A” and “B” as a major source of City-related housing, worthy of release over the time period of more than one Local Plan or Local Development Framework. If the Council accepts this recommendation, it will be necessary for the Plan specifically to acknowledge Broad Oak as a positively desirable surrogate for the alternative: over-problematic urban extensions with major drawbacks for the historic City. A concomitant of such a stance would be a statement to the effect that the Council will not consider allocating any urban extension sites at Canterbury City until it is satisfied that feasible new housing opportunities on previously developed land within the Urban Area Boundary have been taken up by developers.
- 3.4.13 The Broad Oak development allows the creation of an east-west road south of the site, with many of the attributes of an effective Sturry bypass. Development would fund up to (at present prices, which could be adjusted to the date of a later planning permission) £2.5 million for improved functioning of the Sturry rail station level crossing, long a source of delays, problems and discontent to road-users. Failing that desirable end, the money would be available for other appropriate measures identified in the Transport Action Plan and the Walking and Cycling Strategy.

- 3.4.14 While the development of the Broad Oak Sites “A” and “B” allows an enlarged Broad Oak to retain a meaningful separation from the already nearby edge of Sturry, I believe a development brief could be used imaginatively by the Council to improve or create links between the individual elements of “Greater Sturry”, and to improve local services and facilities beyond Broad Oak itself. Just how that could be done, and what would be provided, would be for the Council and developers to discuss.
- 3.4.15 I have set out my views on the merits of the two Reserve Sites at paragraphs 3.3.8-3.3.15 above. I find no inherent weakness in the planning case made in support of the intrinsic merits of either site. The proponents of other omission sites have sometimes produced matrices or other evidence to show how their favoured site beats either or both in respect of nearness to a particular facility. However, I have no doubt that these are reasonable, sustainable locations that will serve the District's needs well.
- 3.4.16 The land north of St Luke's Close, Whitstable, is disused farmland within an established and sensibly drawn Urban Area Boundary, whose merits I discussed in paragraphs 3.3.43-3.3.45 above. It is a good site for development: vacant open land close to services, and I see no strong planning argument to justify not developing it in this Plan period.
- 3.4.17 The planning merits of developing the land South of John Wilson Business Park have grown on me during my Inquiry, as I have gained increasing familiarity with the District and have made critical comparisons of the various possible options for the location of new housing and employment. My thinking (in paragraphs 3.3.16-3.3.26 above) has admittedly been led by the planning merits that I see in adding land immediately south of that Business Park for extra employment space – instead of a significantly more damaging alternative extension to the Joseph Wilson Business Park, Whitstable, which would build on exposed open countryside within a Special Landscape Area. However, the land South of John Wilson Business Park is also good for the construction of houses, and for giving their occupants good access to jobs and services in this part of the District.
- 3.4.18 I realise that my thinking here will attract some local opposition, and that Council members may only overcome an initial disquiet by carefully considering the demerits of the alternatives to developing vacant open land within a Urban Area Boundary. This land is not public open space, and its owners can prevent it becoming so. With good design and landscaping it can accommodate needed housing, employment and a large area of new landscaped open space for the amenity of the local population. I assume that new text would be devised in the Plan, making it clear that any planning permission would be framed so that development of the housing element within the site could not proceed before specified amounts of work on the employment and public open space elements had been implemented.
- 3.4.19 Outside the three urban areas, the deleted allocation on land at Lawson Close, Chartham, is somewhat more than minor, on a green field site, and in a village. Given the recent major increment of housing at Chartham from the St Augustine's site, I think the Council is now right to identify Chartham as a Structure Plan Policy RS2 low-growth Village, and this is the decisive factor against a site that is not otherwise very controversial. I find that Lawson Close does not merit a specific allocation in this Plan period.

3.4.20 Lastly, I turn to those proposed allocations in the Revised Deposit Draft, derived from the Urban Housing Capacity Study, that the Council sought to include, but which I found too problematic, or too long-term, to include as formal allocations in an Adopted Local Plan. The objections these sites received were less about their intrinsic planning merits, than the lack of reliability that could be placed on them. I found none of the sites in question to be unacceptable in principle for what the Council wants to see realised on them in future. Thus, rather than have all mention of these sites disappear from the Plan, the Council may wish to consider action on the following lines: (1) mention of the problematic sites at an appropriate point in the Plan's text, as possibilities for development which cannot be relied on within the life of the Local Plan, but which the Council would wish to see brought forward as soon as possible; (2) an additional appendix, or sub-appendix to Appendix 3, listing these sites with relevant site notes and comments, and thereby giving them some formal status.

Recommendation

3.4.21 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate the following new Housing Allocations, to provide in the order of 530 dwellings:

Land at Mill Lane, Herne Bay, with a notional capacity of 260 units, for development within the Plan period to 2011. The supporting text should mention that the release of the site should be dependent on provision of an appropriate scheme to alleviate local flooding of the Plenty Brook, in accordance with draft Policy C30;

Land at Richmond Drive, Herne Bay, with a notional capacity of 40 units;

Land South of John Wilson Business Park, Chestfield, with a notional capacity of 200 units;

Land north of St Luke's Close, Whitstable - 0.9 ha of land for c.36 units, including affordable housing.

3.4.22 I also recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate a reserve housing provision, capable of providing up to an additional 300 dwellings on Land at Broad Oak Farm, Broad Oak, Canterbury, occupying sites "A" – 1 ha, and Site "B" – 7.283 ha.

3.4.23 Lastly, I recommend that redrafting on the lines I suggest in paragraph 3.4.20 be undertaken, to take account of the specific sites that I have been unable to recommend as reliable allocations likely to be developed in this Plan period.

3.4.24 I recommend that no other modifications be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of objections concerning all the sites discussed in this Section 3.4.

3.5 OBJECTIONS TO POLICIES H2 TO H6

POLICY H2 – AFFORDABLE HOUSING - AND PARAGRAPHS 2.25-2.30

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 2.25 – The Range of Housing Accommodation

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2500, 2501)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2211)

RN226 BT Group PLC represented by RPS (1675)

- There is a need for smaller houses
- Reference should be made to phasing, whereby part of a site can be released for housing
- Provision is an essential commitment but completely contrary to the real effects of the proposed methodology
- If land not suitable for houses not suitable for a permanent caravan site. True gypsies are nomadic and do not need a permanent site

Re: A2/024 Paragraph 2.25 – The Range of Housing Accommodation

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20611)

- Add criteria regarding the reuse of derelict & despoiled land as an absolute priority

Re: A2/025 Paragraph 2.26 – The Range of Housing Accommodation

RD128 Unite represented by Turley Associates (20350)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20612)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20699)

- Explanation of housing need in this paragraph is open to misinterpretation and it is not clear how the need for this specialised provision fits with the Council's Policy objectives. Include link to para 2.41 and 7.84
- No account is taken of the need to provide further student housing as part of the overall housing provision. If it is anticipated that element of the future housing land supply will provide accommodation for students, then the level of provision must be increased
- Amend to recognise expansion plans of Universities & Institutions In Canterbury & need for additional student accommodation. Policy should recognise student accommodation can be met through increase in market housing e.g. subletting

Paragraph 2.27 - The Range of Housing Accommodation

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2212)

- Affordable and local needs housing needs to be provided because of the market interference of policy that is inflationary, not sustainable. Need intelligent longer term ways of resolving problems

Re: A2/026 Paragraph 2.27 - The Range of Housing Accommodation

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20613)

- Policy should be amended to be brought more closely in line with DETR circular 6/98

Re: A2/027 Paragraph 2.28 The Range of Housing Accommodation

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20614)

- Object: Policy should not seek to control tenure: para 28, Circular 6/98

Re: A2/028 Paragraph 2.29 The Range of Housing Accommodation

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20615)

- Object to reference to "and tenures" contrary to Circular 6/98

Paragraph 2.30 - The Range of Housing Accommodation-Affordable Housing

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1883)

RN252 Arnold Park Ltd represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2145)

RN226 BT Group Plc represented by RPS (1676)

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (387)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- New sites coming forward in the Land Supply are insufficient to meet targets. A 10% discount should be factored for undeliverable sites
- The Plan lists a number of sites that fall under the threshold provision set by the Affordable Housing Circular. These should be deleted
- Delete the reference to 41 St. Georges Place, Canterbury. Residential development of marginal viability and affordable housing would affect viability. Exempt the site. Mixed use allocation preferred
- Provision of affordable housing from sites under 25 units is contrary to government guidance and is especially inappropriate for brownfield sites. This should be deleted
- Affordable housing. The proposed implementation on sites less than 25 dwellings amounts to policy. This is not justified by government advice

Re: A2/029 Paragraph 2.30 The Range of Housing Accommodation-affordable housing

RD092 BT Group Plc Represented By RPS (20219)

RD095 House Builders Federation (20233)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20366)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20616)

- Approach not in line with C6/98. Should be sought not required, applied to suitable sites and where evidence of local need. Threshold should be 25 dwellings, not 15. Define suitable sites
- Amend to include reference to "economics of provision" as being relevant to the quantum, with any greenfield allocations bearing a greater burden than brownfield sites.

Re: A2/030 Paragraph 2.30a - The Range of Housing Accommodation

RD092 BT Group Plc Represented By RPS (20220)

RD095 House Builders Federation (20234)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20367)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20617)

- Affordable housing approach not in line with C6/98. Should only be sought not required, applied to suitable sites and where evidence of local need. Threshold should be 25 dwgs not 15. Define suitable sites
- Amend para to acknowledge need for 450 affordable dwellings pa for plan period in addition to open market housing need.

Re: A2/031 Paragraph 2.30b - The Range of Housing Accommodation

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20549)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20618)

- Responsibility for social & community benefits, public transport, education & public services should not be regarded as developer obligations. Planning gains need to be reasonably related to development in scale & kind
- Weak; make clear to developers that they will be expected to contribute fully to additional community facilities needed as a direct result of their development unless exceptional circumstances

Policy H2 – Affordable Housing

RN068 Bellway Homes Ltd (701)

RN221 E Kent Hospitals Trust, represented by Broadway Malyan (1696)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1884)

RN252 Arnold Park Ltd, represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2144)

RN198 MHP Partnership, represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (255, 289)

RN344 Fishpool (2453)

RN255 GOSE (2644, 1724)

RN118 Dept of Health represented by Inventures (498, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd, represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1576)

RN003 Hollamby Estates, represented by Kitewood Estates (386, 388)

RN230 Rydon Homes (1717)

RN144 Persimmon Homes represented by Tetlow King Planning (484, 489)

RN196 The House Builders Federation (1553)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2345)

- SPG should be tested fully through this Local Plan process and expressed explicitly through the Plan
- Affordable housing on brownfield sites has proved very challenging exercise, particularly when sites are small
- Delete (a) of policy H6. Appraisals are not required for small scale developments in the RS2 policy villages
- The SPG on affordable housing mentioned in this policy should be open for review in light of local plan review
- Object to affordable housing requirement for Roper Close
- Should be more detailed and not rely too much on SPG
- If a need for significant housing growth, provide for affordable homes in particular for young people
- Supplementary planning guidance should be subject to full examination at local plan inquiry
- Affordable housing is needed, not more mansions
- Policy should define specific sites and affordable housing provision sought
- Policy should not refer to SPGs
- The policy does not go far enough in identifying and seeking to meet local housing needs
- Object to the provision of affordable housing at 41 St. Georges Place as this is likely to prevent mixed use proposals, incorporating residential development, coming forward
- The policy should make clear the quantum and type of affordable housing provision and should reflect more closely the provisions of the Government Circular
- Add "and other potential benefits delivered by the development of any particular site"
- Questionable whether the UHCS demonstrates that sufficient land is available to meet needs for a range of housing types e.g. key worker accommodation. Include supporting needs assessment
- Should seek to make provision for 30% of all housing to be affordable housing, of which 50% should be for key worker housing
- Special needs/ supported housing should count towards meeting affordable housing requirements
- Implementation of affordable housing targets should be flexible and applied on a site by site basis according to local circumstances and need
- Make commitment to undertake review of SPG and supporting housing needs studies in conjunction with NHS

Re: A2/032 Policy H2 Affordable Housing

RD079 GOSE (20174)

RD092 BT Group Plc Represented By RPS (20221)

RD095 House Builders Federation (20235)

RD118 Kitewood Estates (20464)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20369)

RD128 Unite represented by Turley Associates (20351)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20619)

RD145 Arnold Park Ltd represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20684)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20692)

RD149 Network Rail (20731)

- Object to provision of 30% affordable housing for 15+ dwellings. The exceptional local constraints listed in Circ. 6/98 are not applicable in the circumstance listed. Delete 2nd and 3rd sentences and list of sites.
- Re threshold of 15 dwellings, it is not demonstrated that requirements could be met on this list of sites. If it can be demonstrated should be separate site specific Policy. Policy is currently trying to address site specific and generally housing sites
- Policy should support the release for greenfield sites for affordable housing. This would enable brownfield sites to come forward as their development is more marginal economically if providing affordable housing
- 15 dwelling threshold too restrictive and inflexible, takes no account of nature & location of site; use alternative wording for final paragraph of Policy
- Policy H2 should clearly make reference to key worker housing as a form of affordable housing, therefore providing specific Policy backing for key worker housing, highlighting its important role within a City's development
- Economics of provision & land value need to be recognised; town centre sites more valuable than derelict & despoiled land. Economics of development needs to be recognised in amount of affordable housing which any development can expect to deliver
- Object to "appropriate"
- Policy unduly prescriptive and contrary to guidance in affordable housing

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- As set out in Circ. 6/98 the Council should take into account the economics of affordable housing provision. Refer to the exclusion of sites at Canterbury East and West where affordable housing will be negotiated in respect of high infrastructure costs

Re: A2/033 New policy H2a

RD078 JTS Partnership (20166)
RD092 BT Group Plc Represented By RPS (20222)
RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20550)
RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20700)

- After "shall" add words "where considered necessary" as existing infrastructure may be adequate
- Policy H2a is superfluous & covered adequately by other Policy. New Policy confuses & should be removed
- Policy is weak in referring to reasonable provision without defining it; word "social" could imply non-essential but desirable facilities. Should refer to essential community facilities. Say: "Developers of new housing of at least 5 dwellings will be expected to make contributions towards additional community facilities that arise as direct result of their proposal taking into account the pattern and nature of existing provision in the area."
- Policy H2a is superfluous and poorly worded. Specify what can be reasonably required/in what circumstances

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.5.1 The evolution of this section of Plan text and policies in the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan, and subsequent Amendments, has clarified its meaning and impact. I find that the Council has not gone beyond the spirit or letter of national policy guidance, and that it has allowed for local needs, following on from a recent formal consultant's study, in a reasonable and responsible manner. Policy in this area is dependent on a realistic estimate of what is possible, given the limited means that a Council today has to create new affordable housing stock.
- 3.5.2 The Government's "Consultation Paper on a Proposed Change to Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 Housing – Influencing the size, type and affordability of housing" (July 2003) indicates a new norm above which affordable housing may be sought: a site of 0.5 ha or more, yielding 15 or more dwellings. This is the same as the present minimum figure in Circular 06/98 that is considered appropriate for those local planning authority areas outside Inner London which are able to demonstrate exceptional local constraints when bringing forward a new local plan. The Consultation Paper envisages the possibility of an even lower threshold in future that would have to be justified by local planning authorities in their local plans. However, that lower threshold - only a possibility, given that the Consultation Paper has yet to be translated into official policy - would need judicious assessment to see that its introduction would actually bring about an increased supply of affordable housing, rather than having an adverse effect on the overall supply and pace of housing development in an authority's area.
- 3.5.3 Judged in the light of current national thinking, and given the kinds of affordable housing policies and thresholds that local plans now commonly exhibit, I find that Canterbury's thinking is worthy of my full support. The text strikes the right balance between being too cryptic and containing unnecessary detail. I find no tenable objection in principle about specifically mentioning the 30% figure in the words of the Policy, rather than in supporting text. I consider that the background to reasonable negotiation by a developer and the Council, for a detailed set of proposals on any particular site, is well set out.
- 3.5.4 I also consider that the New Policy H2a has a useful planning purpose, and that the wording of the policy and supporting text is concise, flexible and reasonable.

3.5.5 The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC2/001, amending paragraph 2.26 by mention of other Plan references to student and other accommodation. It has also put forward two Further Amendments. FA2/006 is in the form of a new paragraph to follow paragraph 2.30a, defining the components of the term “affordable housing”, in line with national policy. FA2/007 is an amendment of the wording of Policy H2, but does not change its substance. The only one of these Amendments that I find contentious is FA2/006; there is a degree of overlap with paragraph 2.27, and I consider the two pieces of text should be edited and integrated.

Recommendation

3.5.6 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes PC2/001 and Further Amendment Nos. FA2/007, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 3.5.6 above, but that no other modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY H3 - RETENTION OF HOUSING - AND PARAGRAPH 2.31

Objections and Key Issues

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1882)

- The criteria should be (a) or (b) or c) or (d); not applied together for each proposal

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.5.7 The wording of the policy in the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan meets the objection.

Recommendation

3.5.8 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

POLICY H4 - EMPTY/VACANT HOUSING - AND PARAGRAPHS 2.32-2.40

Objections and Key Issues

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (290)

RN255 GOSE (2641)

- Add: “(d) The vacant property is suitable for employment or industrial use and has been used for such purposes within the last five years.”
- Replace the word “encourage ”with something more definitive; will encourage owners to let non-residential properties to become derelict or disused

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.5.9 The Council has put forward Further Amendment FA2/001. This amends the Policy wording to include the category of “underused spaces above shops” in the first paragraph.

3.5.10 I find the aspirations behind this policy to be uncontentious. I do not consider that the Policy will amount to any kind of direct catalyst, encouraging owners to let non-residential property become empty. The suggested exception (d) is not really germane or helpful, since the policy bears on incontestably residential floorspace. The policy would meet GOSE criticism if it began: "The City Council will grant planning permission for otherwise acceptable proposals to bring..".

Recommendation

3.5.11 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment FA2/001 (see Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21), and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 3.5.10 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICIES H5 & H5a - GYPSY SITES/ SITE FOR TEMPORARY GYPSY ACCOMMODATION - AND PARAGRAPHS 2.41-2.48

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 2.42 – Other Housing Accommodation

RN107 The Friends of Fordwich and District (528)

- No mention of Circ. 1/94 advice re Council deciding level of provision and where possible carrying out studies and identifying suitable locations

Re: A2/037 Paragraph 2.45 Gypsy Sites

RD069 Mr S & Mrs A Jones represented by Hallett & Co (20144)

RD131 Kent County Council Social Services (20486)

- Unnecessary to afford same protection to areas adjacent to designated landscapes. Amendment severely restricts & reduces areas within locality suitable for gypsy accommodation
- All references to gypsies should have a capital "G". Clarify para 2.45, as guidance in Circ 1/94 says a needs assessment should be carried out & need for such sites be identified

Re: A2/038 Paragraph 2.45a Gypsy Sites

RD122 Browning (20334)

RD131 Kent County Council Social Services (20484)

- Not clear whether the site exists at the moment
- May become permanent arrangements, create harassment and stress for the local community; a threat to a beautiful area
- Between the words "convenient" and "without", insert "to them"
- Object to proposed temporary gypsy summer camp at land opposite Prospect Farm

Paragraphs 2.46-2.48 – Gypsy Sites

RN107 The Friends of Fordwich and District (524, 525, 526, 527)

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2346)

- Muddled; unclear on what basis decisions on applications for gypsy sites will be made
- What does "there is also single gypsy accommodation around the district" mean? Specify the policy objectives in the KSP relating to seasonal and temporary sites
- Council states that the existing gypsy caravan site sufficient to meet the long term need, yet set out a number of criteria for granting permissions for new permanent sites
- Sites should be seasonal and temporary and conditions should be enforced

Re: A2/039 Paragraph 2.47 – Gypsy Sites

RD131 Kent County Council Social Services (20487)

- Basis for CCC considering that the existing gypsy caravan site sufficient is unclear

Policy H5

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN054 Councillor Attwood (83)
RN107 The Friends of Fordwich & District (523, 529)
RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1881)
RN311 Bridge Parish Council (2285)

- Criteria for new gypsy sites not clear or realistic. Criteria should proceed from a) demonstration of status and need, b) to environmental and policy considerations to c) conditions and agreements sought
- Policy omits a requirement to demonstrate gypsy status and local need. As for agricultural dwellings, the justification for an exception to normal policy must be demonstrated
- Object to an absence of a requirement to demonstrate gypsy status and local need when determining planning applications for gypsy sites. 311
- Criterion (b) should include the wording "or adjacent to" to protect the sensitivity of the adjoining land/area
- Object to restriction on sites in areas of conservation importance

Re: A2/040 Policy H5 Gypsy Sites

RD131 Kent County Council Social Services (20485)
RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20711)

- No justification for limiting planning permission for gypsy sites to a temporary period only
- No justification for the words 'or adjacent to' within criterion (b).
- Keep criterion (d). It is derived from government guidance, and is key to current local plan Policy. Specifically considered in recent appeal and does not accord with Structure Plan Guidance and is fundamental to sustainability
- Sites should not be located remotely from such services. "Applicants claiming gypsy status" would be better after criterion (e)

Re: A2/041 New Policy H5a. Temporary gypsy accommodation at Prospect Farm, Greenhill

RD009 Mr A Delaney-Foot (20016)
RD035 Chestfield Parish Council (20071)
RD067 Petition – Delaney-Foot (20139)
RD076 Mrs Epps (20152)
RD079 GOSE (20188)
RD105 Shepherd Neame (20288)
RD122 Browning (20335)

- Objects to temporary gypsy accommodation. Detrimental impact on business, personal safety, crime; site not suitable (an order prohibiting travellers, history of Police intervention)
- Prompted by expediency and a willing operator
- Adverse impact on Share & Coulter PH resulting in loss of viability & reduction in amenity for local area. Will create significant difficulties in local area
- Policy H5a conflicts with: A2/037 as site is in SLA ; A2/038, did not consult immediate neighbour; A2/040, sensitive landscape. There has been no assessment of availability of other sites, no indication of number of caravans, justification for this field
- Support inclusion of the need to demonstrate gypsy status - to bring it into line with government guidance, say: "In assessing these criteria, the city Council may seek independent corroboration and will normally seek the advice of the County Council's Gypsy Liaison officer or similar authority"
- Say potential applicants will be expected to consult with the City Council before buying land on which they intend to camp and for which planning permission would be required. In particular, questions of road access, availability of services, potential conflict with statutory undertakers or agricultural interests, and any significant environmental impacts should be resolved at the earliest opportunity
- Conflict with part a) and b) of Policy H5. Site close to farm dwellings
- Unsustainable development, not accessible by public transport to jobs, education, health facilities shopping etc
- Used without approval in past causing unrest; detrimental impact on local businesses residents and property values; concern it will become permanent
- Creates harassment and stress for the local community and is a threat to a beautiful area.

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.5.12 The Council has put forward three Proposed Changes relevant to this matter. PC2/002 amends and amplifies paragraph 2.45, but it later put forward Further Amendment FA2/002, which further refined the paragraph, removing any reference to a location “adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty”. PC2/003 is a minor amendment to new paragraph 2.45a. PC2/004 reinstates criterion (d) to Policy H5, to the effect that a site should be well related to specific local services and facilities; Further Amendment FA2/005, expands criterion (b) to mention the unacceptability of a site having an adverse impact on the special areas mentioned. Further Amendment FA2/003 amends paragraph 2.47’s penultimate line to read “...is sufficient public site provision to meet..”. Further Amendment FA2/004 amends and expands paragraph 2.48 – in it I assume the word “seasonal” is intended instead of “seasonable”.
- 3.5.13 During the writing of my report the Government has published a Draft Circular on Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Sites (December 2004). Whatever its final form, the new Circular will surely show a significant change from Circular 1/94. However, if the final Circular closely follows the Draft, any allocation of sites for permanent accommodation would only follow a quite rigorous procedure connected with the local housing assessment, made in accord with the Housing Act 2004. This assessment would have to take account of Gypsy and Traveller needs in an area, and would also involve regional-level work.
- 3.5.14 The consequences of a new Circular, probably available to the Council by the time it considers my report and proceeds to an Adopted Local Plan, will mean a significant redrafting of this area of the Housing Chapter. It may be that the Adopted Local Plan will still state the Council’s current view that it sees no need in the Plan period for new permanent Gypsy/Traveller accommodation other than the existing Vauxhall Road site at Canterbury, and private provision. Nevertheless, the Council would have to make full mention in the text of the new procedures that it will be following to review need, and it will not be possible to retain the sentiments expressed in paragraph 2.47 in their present form.
- 3.5.15 The Draft Circular advises on the formulation of criteria-based policies. It is clear that national policy is evolving in a manner that requires Councils to draft policies without overtly negative criteria, and without a predisposition to favour only Gypsies and Travellers having local connections of some kind. The Council’s bevy of Proposed Changes and Further Amendment, mentioned above, already make some movement in this direction, but I consider that further redrafting is necessary. I do not put forward a detailed amended text, due to the current uncertainties I have mentioned, but I shall point to certain important factors.
- 3.5.16 In a redrafting that retains the essence of paragraph 2.45, I consider that criteria (2) and (3) are unobjectionable. Criterion (1) is over-restrictive, and I would have come to this conclusion without the Draft Circular. I prefer wording such as: “if location outside an existing settlement is unavoidable, the form and extent of the accommodation does not adversely affect the visual or other essential qualities of an AONB, SSSI, national or local nature reserve, or other area of landscape significance designated in the development plan.” This criterion should take third place in the list, not first.
- 3.5.17 The form of redrafting I suggest would also be pertinent to a redrafted Policy H5’s criterion (b), and I consider this should be done. The Policy itself would read better if it

opened with the words: "In considering applications for seasonal or temporary use of land by Gypsies and Travellers, planning permission will only be granted if the following criteria are met...". The words "Gypsies and Travellers" should be used in the last paragraph.

- 3.5.18 I turn to draft Policy H5a. I do not in any way underestimate the practical and political difficulties of finding "least contentious" sites for Gypsies and Travellers. I saw that the proposed site is in a very open landscape with relatively little tree cover, within a Special Landscape Area, where long views are the norm. Even with new landscaping, which would take years to mature, the presence of this kind of mobile home/caravan site – inevitably a loose knit arrangement on the ground – will be clearly discernible, at some distance, from roads and other viewpoints to the north and south.
- 3.5.19 The site was introduced only in the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan, and its characteristics do not accord with the criteria of H5. Indeed, the new policy was accompanied in the Revised Deposit Draft by the strange disappearance of criterion (d) of H5 – concerning the need for good relationship to local services and facilities – subsequently restored in a Proposed Change. The Council's evidence concedes that the site is not ideal within the context of H5, either in terms of landscape or nearby local services. Its principal practical virtues appear to be its location around a collection of farm buildings, controlled by someone who has operated unauthorised gypsy site occupations for the last few years. The farmyard area also houses non-agricultural uses, which apparently involve storage of building materials and reported wholesale activity. I have no reason to disbelieve evidence advanced on behalf of Mrs Epps, who lives just across Thornden Wood Road, that Gypsy and Traveller occupation to date has resulted in a growth of anti-social and unpleasing activities that severely interfere with those amenities which a householder should expect to enjoy in open countryside surroundings, near a farm.
- 3.5.20 I find the allocation to be expedient, and seriously out of kilter with the Council's other draft policies. Furthermore, it seems to me a distinct possibility that the site might attract further intensification, perhaps for permanent use and expansion, which would exacerbate its planning deficiencies.
- 3.5.21 I am concerned that, once allocated, the Council might be tempted to see this as the easiest candidate site for future accommodation of Gypsies and Travellers. I am quite certain that no site for temporary accommodation should be allocated without far more rigorous analysis than has gone into the choice of Prospect Farm. For all these reasons, I conclude that Policy H5a should be deleted from the Adopted Local Plan. Also, the whole text regarding accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers in the District in this section must be revisited; consequently I cannot endorse any of the Proposed Changes and Further Amendments put forward.

Recommendation

- 3.5.22 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording and the actions recommended in my paragraphs 3.5.12-3.5.21 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY H6 - NEW HOUSING WITHIN VILLAGE SETTLEMENTS – AND PARAGRAPHS 2.49-2.54

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 2.49 – Housing Outside Urban Areas

RN305	Mansfield Farm Ltd represented by J Norris (2276)
RN270	The Church Commissioners for England represented by Cluttons (1970)
RN187	JH & AM Picket represented by G W Finn & Sons (222)
RN331	A Finn Esq & Trustees of W Colthup represented by G.W. Finn & Sons (1949)
RN186	Strutt & Parker (176)

- Limiting villages to minor development is contrary to policy H6 which encourages the use of brown field land for development. Some villages may serve a wider need, e.g. St. Augustine's.
- Housing in villages should be important to rural strategy, improving vitality and viability as advised in PPG7 and PPG13. Text should be amended to be positive in terms of residential development
- Council commitment to concentrate development in urban areas fails to address the need for villages and the rural areas to be sustainable
- Chartham should be identified as a village that could accommodate more than just minor development
- There should be housing allocations within villages

Paragraph 2.50 - Housing Outside Urban Areas

RN198	MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (291)
RN260	Peter Jackson Architects (2214)

- Littlebourne should be retained and identified as a village that could accommodate more than minor development
- Add an exception to this policy to accommodate further mixed use development on the derelict remainder of the former colliery land at Hersden
- Wording should give emphasis to design quality and environmental improvement and allowing some small sustainable growth. Need to analyse how rural areas and villages have been degraded, and design for improvement

Paragraph 2.51 – New Housing in Villages

RN323	City and County Councillor Vye (1797)
RN269	Cluttons (2234)
RN270	The Church Commissioners for England represented by Cluttons (1972)
RN260	Peter Jackson Architects (2221)
RN206	JTS Partnership (741)
RN253	CJ Darby represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2148)

- A proactive policy of studying village boundaries is needed. A line on the map and detailed development control policies are required. These interfaces can be designed better; the plan makes no effort towards this
- A boundary round the built confines of villages provides clarity and certainty and could perform a role in revitalisation of villages
- Add a policy providing for infill development outside the boundaries of towns and villages
- Example given of acceptable minor development being 5-10 homes should be increased to up to 20 homes for suitable sites, in view of Government objective to increase densities on brownfield land
- Define boundaries, once village appraisals are completed, but restrictions in para.2.52 to apply

Paragraph 2.52 – New Housing in Villages

RN253	CJ Darby represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2147)
RN269	Cluttons (2235)
RN270	The Church Commissioners for England represented by Cluttons (1973)
RN316	Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2363)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- RN137 Peter Jackson Architects (100)
- RN096 Chestfield Parish Council (735)
- RN004 Chislet Parish Council (601)
- RN118 Dept of Health represented by Inventures (2626)
- RN280 Strutt & Parker (1769)
- RN067 The Whitstable Society (695)
- List of villages where new housing should be limited to minor development only excludes Chislet
 - Yorklets should be considered in a similar way to Hersden and should not be in the 'minor development' category of villages
 - Yorklets, though lacking scale or status to merit mention, could take some useful housing development
 - Wish to see Chestfield included in list of villages in para
 - Object to Herne Common (and particularly 0.176 ha of undeveloped land between 16 and 24 Busheyfields Road) not being included in the list of villages suitable for minor development
 - Herne and Broomfield Parish should be included in the list of parishes where minor development should be of a minor nature only.

Paragraph 2.53 – New Housing in Villages

- RN294 Rogate Holdings Limited (2248)
- Amend para 2.53 to include redundant farmyard sites

Policy H6

- RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (389)
- RN010 Wilks (356)
- RN054 Attwood (81)
- RN137 Peter Jackson Architects (101)
- RN141 Hart (426)
- RN186 Strutt & Parker (177)
- RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (292)
- RN206 JTS Partnership (738)
- RN226 BT Group Plc represented by RPS (1678)
- RN243 Mr & Mrs Jones represented by Angela Hirst Surveyors & Valuers (2075)
- RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2215)
- RN269 Cluttons (2236)
- RN294 Rogate Holdings Limited (2248)
- RN305 Mansfield Farm Ltd represented by J Norris (2274)
- Amend to give greater flexibility as to the form of development that would be acceptable. Delete criterion (e). Define "within village settlements"
 - Small scale development does not require a development brief
 - Brownfield sites in the rural areas should be treated in the same way as those within villages, subject to sustainability
 - Criterion (d) should be amended to; "does not give rise to major conflict..."
 - Criterion (c) vague: delete from the Plan or if not, should be a description as to relevant factors in deciding if development is in conflict
 - Need to design for improvement with some sustainable growth
 - Clarify what is meant by village settlements. Should include land both within or on the edge of settlements
 - Criterion (a). The appraisal should be carried out "By the Parish Council"
 - Preface "Save for the Regeneration Zones/Study Areas....."
 - Amend policy H6 to include redundant farmyards, and add an additional clause in relation to viability
 - Council commitment to concentrate development in urban areas fails to address the need for villages and the rural areas to be sustainable
 - The current policy too restrictive towards development and undermines one of the key objectives to the local plan - 'sustainable rural villages'

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Re: A2/042 Policy H6 Brownfield Sites within Villages

RD020 Wilks (20045)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20716)

- Object to inclusion of words "historic environment" - any such consideration would be taken into account where part or all of a village is included in the Conservation Area.
- Reinstate (c); should not be deleted; it is government Policy
- Existing Policy R22 recognised that there are certain villages are of such exceptional conservation importance that the primary planning Policy is conservation and enhancement. Reinstate Policy R22 in accordance with structure plan

Paragraph 2.54 – Hersden

RN248 Messrs Adams, Mount, Ridout & Hume represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2114)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (293)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1561)

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2217)

RN328 Westbere Parish Council (2411)

- Herne Common is a village which could accommodate more than minor development
- Add new paragraph and policy to single Hersden out as a village which can take more than minor development and to identify and quantify such development
- The area designated for the Study should not include greenfield area without reference to PPG3 and the sequential approach with respect to other greenfield sites in the district
- Yorkletts, like Hersden should be a rural priority area, contributing to the housing supply with dramatic potential for environmental improvement
- Housing development should only come forward following discussion with the Hersden residents. Insensitive or inappropriate development should not be allowed, i.e. south Hersden

Re: A2/043 Paragraph 2.54 Hersden

RD077 Hillreed Homes Ltd (20156)

- Reinstate para 2.54 on Hersden

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.5.23 A number of the objections to this section of the Housing chapter make their points about Council policy on housing outside urban areas and village development in connection with other objections about an omission site that is being promoted; I take into account the wider points made when considering the merits of a particular site in my section 3.4 above. The Council will need to do some redrafting in respect of the point it emphasises more than once: that the Urban Housing Capacity Study demonstrates that all the required new housing can be obtained from the Revised Deposit Draft's allocated sites within the urban areas. Admittedly those omission sites I recommend as additional allocations are, all but one, either within or directly adjoining existing Urban Area Boundaries which can be marginally adjusted. However, the exception is Broad Oak, which I recommend as a Reserve Site, but on the basis that Canterbury City is a highly constrained historic City of international renown, and that development of a nearby satellite location with particular planning merits can legitimately be considered an acceptable alternative to urban extension. If the Council accepts my recommendation about Broad Oak, it will be necessary to expand on that point. That expanded text could touch on the existence of the existing satellite to Canterbury formed by the closely spaced settlements of Sturry, Broad Oak, Fordwich and Westbere, its sensitivities and the opportunities. A Broad Oak development could add to local facilities without any impairment of these historic and still separate settlements.

- 3.5.24 I consider that the Plan would be improved if the Council drafted some brief text to say why the settlements of Chartham, Hersden, Littlebourne and Sturry are not seen as suitable for new housing in excess of minor development in this Plan period, whereas they were in the Adopted Local Plan. I happen to agree that none is an obvious candidate for such development in preference to other sites at the three major settlements, and my comments on the omission sites indicate why. It might be helpful to add that this judgement is made for this particular Plan period, in the light of such circumstances as the need for time to assimilate recent significant development.
- 3.5.25 The content of emerging Structure Plan policy HP4, with its particular search sequence, suggests that other considerations may affect the Council's future judgements on appropriate locations for new housing in its first Local Development Framework. I agree with the Council's stated reasons in its evidence for not including the very different entities of Hersden, Chislet, Herne Common, Herne and Broomfield Parish, and Chestfield in the list of villages in paragraph 5.52, or in any other category of settlement suitable for expansion. Its thinking entirely accords with national policy guidance on the sequential approach to identifying land for housing in PPG3.
- 3.5.26 Although I myself see planning advantages in defining settlement boundaries for villages, the Council's stance on the matter is perfectly defensible, and the implications of the Council's thinking are well expressed. I see no strong case for the Council to change its stance because I take another view. As to Policy H6, amended in the Revised Deposit Draft, I see no planning need to change its gist. However, I find the wording a little stilted, and feel it could be expressed more elegantly. Also, the Council should consider whether it continues to stick with the expression "brownfield" here and elsewhere in the Plan, or uses the PPG3, Annex C, expression "previously developed land", with an expanded clarification of what the term means in the Canterbury District village context. I see much merit in the latter course.

Recommendation

- 3.5.27 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraphs 3.5.22-3.5.26 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

HOUSING IN THE COUNTRYSIDE: PARAGRAPHS 2.55-2.60

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 2.55 - Housing for Local Needs in the Countryside

RN260 Peter Jackson Architects (2213)

RN010 Wilks (357)

- Affordable and local needs housing needs being provided because of market interference with policy is inflationary, not sustainable
- Need intelligent longer term ways of resolving problems
- Necessary to consider where the occupants of housing in villages and rural areas are going to work. Add this to list of points when deciding who are suitable local people to have your special housing

Re: A2/044 Paragraph 2.55 Housing for Local Needs in the Countryside

RD020 Wilks (20046)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Para 2.55 Delete "or local community"; what does community mean? Parish Council views should prevail as they are statutory authority, community participation could lead to abuse and corruption

Paragraph 2.58 - Housing for Local Needs in the Countryside

RN199 East Kent District Green Party (1519)

- Not all development in the countryside is unacceptable in principle

Paragraph 2.59 – Agricultural Dwellings

RN010 Wilks (336)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1880)

- Object to restriction to agricultural; include other rural activities, including forestry and equestrian businesses
- New dwellings are not required for the care of livestock. Say in a new policy: Housing for the care of livestock will not be granted

Reasoning and Conclusions

3.5.28 In these explanatory paragraphs, the Council's drafting seems to me to be helpful, without becoming over-digressive. Thus I only instance a few amendments. In paragraph 2.55 the last three words in the second sentence would be less confusing if replaced by "or local residents in places where no Parish Council exists", as this would remove a possible interpretation that "the local community" – whatever that means – was some sort of legitimate alternative to a Parish Council .

3.5.29 In the second sentence of paragraph 2.60, it might be more in line with national policy guidance to use the words "...new homes for workers in agriculture, forestry or like countryside occupations with a demonstrable operational need to live near to their rural enterprise". Of course, if the Council is confident that forestry workers are not a component of the Canterbury workforce, they could be omitted as a category. Lastly, the Council will, of course, be referring in the Adopted Local Plan to PPS7 of 2004 and its Annex A, rather than PPG7.

Recommendation

3.5.30 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraphs 3.5.28-3.5.29 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. OBJECTIONS TO THE CHAPTER ON BOOSTING OUR LOCAL ECONOMY

POLICY ED1 - SAFEGUARDING EXISTING EMPLOYMENT SITES AND CLUSTERS - AND PREAMBLE IN PARAGRAPHS 3.1- 3.25

Objections and Key Issues

Re: A3/001 – Our Objectives

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20275)

RD133 Reeves & Neylan (20492)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20620)

- Reinstatement objective to increase average earnings: a retreat from concept of closing earnings gap between Canterbury and rest of Kent. Reduces need to attract private sector high skilled employment & commitment to knowledge based economy
- Add to last bullet point and seek to ensure a sustainable balance of homes & jobs, particularly where major employment clusters & proposals such as Lakesview business park are being promoted

Paragraph 3.1

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2507)

- There should be a policy to safeguard Hospital in view of the size of population

Paragraph 3.6

RN207 Reeves and Neylan (748)

Re: A3/007 – Amended paragraph 3.6

- says 36% of workforce are knowledge workers and 3.7 states knowledge employment is concentrated in public sector organisations - this definition of knowledge workers falls outside DTI knowledge economic definition

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20621)

- The District's manufacturing base should be protected & encouraged

Re: A3/008 – Amended paragraph 3.7

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20276)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20622)

- Amendment deletes fact that local businesses need Improved Commercial Accommodation. Growth of local finance & hi tech sectors impeded by lack of modern accommodation. In 2002 Cluttons had enquiries for 100,000 sq ft of modern office accommodation
- The District's manufacturing base should be protected & encouraged

Paragraph 3.11

RN208 Thanet District Council (759)

- Makes no reference to Thanet business parks – Area Investment Framework notes that are too many sites & too few developers. Therefore no new sites should be promoted or carried forward

Paragraph 3.13

RN038 Girlings Solicitors (1849)

- The business community has been neglected in planning terms in respect of office development and new modern commercial development

Re: A3/010

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20277)

RD133 Reeves & Neylan (20494)

- Need for legal agreements will impose burden on new business development, putting them at a competitive disadvantage compared to those in surrounding districts

Paragraph 3.14

RN038 Girlings Solicitors (1846)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN207 Reeves and Neylan (744)

- Re part 2 - inadequate provision for knowledge based businesses & professional services & not enough employment or mixed-use allocations, which are needed to boost the economy
- Concerned there is no provision for new commercial business use and no provision for a Science, Technology or Business Park. There is a shortage of office space that is close to the City

Re: A3/011 – Amended paragraph 3.14

RD077 Hillreed Homes Ltd (20162)

- Hersden Regeneration Zone should be reinstated

Re: A3/013 – New paragraph 3.14b

RD004 Blean Parish Council (20212)

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20278)

RD133 Reeves & Neylan (20495)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20623)

- Allocation of sites on proposals map still inadequate to meet needs of local economy and CCC's strategy
- Refer to housing & employment development in PAERs. Concept of homes & jobs in close proximity is fundamental to concept of sustainable development. Discourage loss of employment sites to housing
- Supports creation of Business Innovation Centre, provided no increase in traffic volumes through Blean
- Allocation of sites on Proposals Map inadequate to meet needs of local economy

Paragraph 3.24

RN285 Strategic Rail Authority (827)

- In view of improvement of rail freight, refer to development for employment uses of sites next to railway: good connection to rail network

Re: A3/017 – Amended paragraph 3.24

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20624)

- Amend to read “employment land and mixed use allocations”

Re: PC3/004; new para 3.24a

APC044 Strutt & Parker (30050)

APC098 Amirage Properties (30126)

- Development excessive for a location of this nature, no prospect of a single occupier emerging from this complex
- Unsustainable, no study of employment rated demand in this area, businesses would not be attracted to this area.

Re: A3/018 – Amended paragraph 3.25

RD118 Kitewood Estates (20476)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20370)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20625)

- Objects to deletion of Blacksole Farm as an employment cluster
- Protect all existing employment areas within non-car based access of existing and proposed residential areas, to ensure that jobs in sustainable locations are not lost. Extend list to include these sites.
- Protection of existing and recently used employment sites should be of wider application and not just 9 identified sites

Re: PC3/005; amended para 3.25(A3/018)

APC044 Strutt & Parker (30051)

APC098 Amirage Properties (30127)

- Do not consider that there is a likely market demand to meet this floorspace provision in this allocation
- Unsustainable, no study of employment rated demand in this area, businesses would not be attracted to this area

Re: PC3/006; amendment to Proposals Map re Breach Farm

APC124 Highways Agency (30159)

APC098 Amirage Properties (30128)

- Support is subject to concerns regarding the transport impacts on A2
- Unsustainable, no study of employment rated demand in this area, businesses would not be attracted to this area

Policy ED1

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN034	National Grid represented by Malcolm Judd & Partners (1605)
RN098	Ms P Gibb represented by David Hicken Associates Ltd (922)
RN156	BSF Planning Consultants (1871, 1872)
RN163	The Roger Wenn Partnership (930)
RN197	Cluttons (237)
RN201	South Street Residents (1547)
RN208	Thanet District Council (754)
RN227	B&Q Plc Represented By RPS (1667)
RN255	GOSE (2660)

- Too restrictive; allow for alternative employment generating development on allocated employment sites
- Criterion (b) should be deleted from policy or the particular objectives specified in more detail
- Inadequate provision for economic development
- The Joseph Wilson Estate should not be included as a cluster business site
- Other employment sites of greater importance to the local economy, accessible to their local communities, and should not be redeveloped for housing e.g. Sea Street, Herne Bay.
- Should be a further allocation close to the New Dover Road Park and Ride
- Allocate land to the south of the John Wilson Business Park for mixed use development, inc. employment
- To improve clarity, the word 'or' should be added before criterion (b) in policy ED1
- Talmead site should be allocated for business use within the urban area
- Need to consult National Grid re the employment allocation at Vauxhall Road, Canterbury (overhead transmission lines)
- Object to the allocation of employment sites and the protection of existing ones. Plan is also vague regarding quantity of employment land allocated & expansions at existing sites
- Object to expansion of Joseph Wilson Business Park, as it includes SLA, close to Brooklands Farm and housing, would need landscaping and infrastructure. Growth could be accommodated in Herne Bay.

Re: A3/019 – Amended Policy ED1

RD118 Kitewood Estates (20465)

- Reword to state that all or part redevelopment of other uses will be supported to trigger development on key employment sites such as Blacksole Farm
- Rural priority area should focus on brownfield land. Insufficient emphasis is given to opportunities at Hersden to achieve objectives for PAER strategy

Re: A3/020 – New paragraph 3.22a

RD020 Wilks (20047)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20375)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20701)

- Welcome recognition that additional employment land is allocated to accommodate the loss of sites to housing development etc. but submit that insufficient land has been allocated
- The sites allocated for housing or mixed use and currently in use as employment sites have not been subjected to any analysis to determine whether the proposed uses will cause unsustainable development due to loss of employment opportunities. Delete para and reassess
- Para 3.22a after “within urban areas ” add new second sentence "No incursion onto new land; reused land only"

Re: A3/021 – Amended paragraph 3.16

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20626)

- Focus on brownfield land. Hersden can meet PAER opportunities

Reasoning and Conclusions

4.1 As with the Housing Chapter, this Employment Chapter has undergone significant alteration between its initial make-up in the First Deposit Draft and the version before me, following the Inquiry. The Council has had a change of mind on the composition, nature and significance of its key office locations – “office nodes”, and this change of mind was crystallised only after the Inquiry started. I consider the bulk of this changed thinking

below in paragraphs 4.30-4.60, discussing objections to Policies ED6 and ED7a. All the major objections concerning evolving Council policy to Hersden have been considered earlier in my report in my Chapter Three (paragraphs 3.3.104-3.3.137 and Section 3.4), as that appears to me the most appropriate place to look at this controversial location in the round. My consideration of Hersden matters in that chapter does not, of course, mean that I ignored the economic and employment context; my thinking on Hersden is informed by all the material in the emerging Local Plan, and all the evidence I heard or read that dealt with it, or alluded to it.

- 4.2 This initial tranche of objections covers the initial statement of objectives, then contextual and descriptive paragraphs that give a factual picture of the Canterbury economy. After that there is an account of the Council's economic strategy, and then Policy ED1 and its supporting text.
- 4.3 In this section of objections, the Council has made a number of Proposed Changes during the Inquiry, a part of its radical change of view on appropriate locations for new employment outside urban areas. PC3/004, PC3/005, PC3/006 and PC3/012 revise the Council's previous view that Breach Farm should be an office node, adding a new paragraph 3.24a to say that employment floorspace there should be capped at its present level, and amending paragraph 3.25, Appendix 4 and the Proposals Map to identify it as an existing employment site/cluster.
- 4.4 The Employment Objectives have not attracted major criticism, and the Council has agreed to reinstate a part of the last specific objective through Proposed Change PC3/001: "to increase average earnings in the District" which seems uncontentious to me. The revised factual text on the Canterbury economy in the Revised Deposit Draft also appears to me quite satisfactory.
- 4.5 The re-drafting of the text on the Economic Strategy has not attracted fundamental opposition, neither as regards its relatively conventional sentiments about protecting and promoting the existing economy nor, perhaps more surprisingly, in its (non place-specific) sentiments about promoting the development and growth of high quality/high value-added growth enterprises. Revised Deposit Draft objectors press for more such locations, if anything. Again I see no need for further alteration of this text.
- 4.6 Although some objections made to them make other points, Policy ED1 and its supporting text are no more than a straightforward expression of support for the protection of existing significant employment sites in the various parts of the District. I consider those objections that make other points under more relevant policy headings elsewhere in my report.
- 4.7 I turn last to objections about the material in paragraphs 3.22 and new paragraph 3.22a, concerning the provision of additional employment opportunities. I do not find a need to reword these paragraphs; however, it is necessary for me to state that I have looked with a proper degree of critical scepticism at all those sites mentioned in the Plan where Council proposals would remove unglamorous but apparently viable employment uses. This has been especially necessary in the urban areas, where the Council has been seeking to maximise housing yield from sites now occupied wholly or partly by employment. It seems to me that that a certain degree of scruffiness and diversity of uses can sometimes add to the life and vitality of places, and I have borne that factor in mind in my recommendations.

Recommendation

- 4.8 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes PC3/001, PC3/004, PC3/005, PC3/006 and PC3/012, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY ED2 – JOSEPH WILSON BUSINESS PARK EXTENSION – AND PARAGRAPH 3.26, PLUS NEW POLICY ED2a

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 3.23

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2159)

- Object to loss of employment sites from the town centres. Employment land should be close to town centres

Paragraph 3.26

RN067 Whitstable Society (688)

Re: A3/033 – New paragraph 3.26a

RD118 Kitewood Estates (20466)

- Objects to extension of Joseph Wilson business park - it is in the wrong location

Policy ED2

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (391)

RN114 Williams (909)

RN182 Little (220)

RN201 South Street Residents (1548)

RN298 McLachlan (2255)

- Object to the proposed allocation of the extension to the Joseph Wilson Business Park
- The allocation should be located on existing brownfield/industrial estates that remain vacant/underused, object to loss of countryside, more traffic and pollution
- Object to the extension of the Joseph Wilson Estate. It will lead to loss of amenity, loss of greenfield land and result in a deterioration of the visual and landscaping amenity of the area
- Object to extending the Joseph Wilson Estate. Loss of Special Landscape Area, habitats, impact upon infrastructure, poor access, increased pollution, sustainability scores badly, not needed

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.9 My findings have to be read in concert with my conclusions earlier in my report on the omission site on land south of the John Wilson Business Park, Ridgeway, Chestfield (paragraph 3.3.16-3.3.26). I am in sympathy with the Council's aim to diversify the District economy and to expand its capacity to provide more, high paid jobs. I also accept the case that the Council both wants to exceed the quantitative guidelines for employment floorspace. It perceives a need to demonstrate that there is a good supply of accommodation available, both to businesses wanting to relocate from less suitable sites in the District's three main settlements, and to new enterprises or footloose businesses coming from elsewhere. The success of the Council's ambitions for new urban housing on areas identified by its Urban Housing Capacity Study, in this Plan period and beyond, will be helped by adequate, diverse and realistic allocations, well related to the potential workforce and public transport, with good links to the main highway network.

- 4.10 This extension to the Joseph Wilson Park is on a site within an established Special Landscape Area, on the southern edge of Whitstable. Special Landscape Areas are: “recognised as being of a landscape quality and sufficient in scale to be of scenic significance in the county context”, in the words of the Structure Plan’s Explanatory Memorandum”. Its precise boundary hereabouts was devised by the District Council and fixed in the Adopted Local Plan. The Council’s defence of the allocation is that a careful assessment has been made of the site and its surroundings, and that it is well screened from longer views by the topography of the area – behind the 30 m contour and masked to a significant extent by the lie of the land from open land stretching southwards – so that it is better than other completely new sites on the edge of Whitstable.
- 4.11 I do not agree with the Council’s view that there would be a lack of adverse impact resulting from an allocation here. The extension intrudes southwards on to open agricultural land, with no real regard for the local topography. Its southern extent is delineated by a straight boundary unrelated to physical features, or even approximate land contours. Its western boundary marks another gap, of a geometrical rather than a natural looking kind, between the extension and the Golden Hill housing allocation. From walking the line of the Crab and Winkle footway/cycle network route southwards from the site, I find that the impact of such a large extension would be of a marked and adverse kind. This would be little improved by the sort of major screen planting acknowledged to be necessary, but which would take a number of years to mature. Some estimate of the much greater future impact on open countryside to the south can be gained from the fact that parts of existing buildings on the Industrial Estate are already visible to walkers on the Crab and Winkle Line, as it crosses the A299, and from further south.
- 4.12 I do not share the Council’s view that the impact of this scale of urban extension would be small, and I cannot believe that such a sanguine attitude to impact would have been taken if this had been a housing proposal, rather than a problematic, large employment site.
- 4.13 It is true that the proposal would build on success, in the sense that the existing Joseph Wilson Estate is successful as a traditional industrial estate of indifferent appearance. Vacancies there were minimal at the time of my Inquiry. What I saw and heard on several visits suggests that the estate is not a good neighbour to the occupants on the housing along South Street. The new extension land would not, admittedly, have the same problem of many nearby houses, being in open countryside. However, this would be a very large extension, bigger in overall area than the existing estate. The Council is adamant that direct access would not be permitted off South Street, although this does not mean that there would not be more commercial traffic overall using South Street to access the existing vehicular entrance. In the absence of any detailed access plan, it is unarguable that an improved vehicle route through the existing estate will mean some demolition of existing buildings now in use. I do not doubt that access of this kind could be achieved, and nobody has suggested that there are technical or safety drawbacks that could rule out such an access. However, I find it hard to believe that this form of access would not add materially to the noise problems now experienced in nearby South Street houses.
- 4.14 The Council’s evidence is that it has not been possible to find viable useable sites along Thanet Way. Undeveloped land at the St Augustine’s site was looked at and rejected. I found the Council’s evidence about its reasons for rejecting land south of the nearby John Wilson Estate at Chestfield less than convincing. This last site had been a candidate for new housing in the process that led to the Adopted Local Plan, but it did not feature as an

omission site in Inspector O'Rourke's report. That Plan did include the Chestfield site well within the Whitstable Urban Area Boundary, though the land is open, undeveloped, former agricultural land – albeit privately owned and used by the public for informal access and recreation merely because there is no physical boundary preventing such benign trespass. It seemed clear to me that (understandable) local opposition had been a major factor telling against putting development on the Chestfield site. However, my Inquiry showed that local residents hold equally strong views about the demerits of the Joseph Wilson extension, even more sensitively sited in open countryside with a Special Landscape Area designation.

- 4.15 Given the superior planning merits of the land south of the John Wilson Estate, Chestfield, which I detail in my earlier findings, I conclude that to retain the present proposed allocation would not accord with the Council's Strategic development Objective (b): "to retain and add to the existing allocated employment land across the District, while seeking to protect the environment".

Recommendation

- 4.16 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to delete references to the extension of land to the Joseph Wilson Business Park in this Policy, and that the land south of the John Wilson Business Park, Ridgeway, Chestfield be substituted for it in this Policy, with necessary altered wording on the lines suggested in my paragraphs 3.3.16-3.3.26 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY ED3 – LAND AT HIGHLAND COURT – AND PARAGRAPHS 3.27-3.29

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 3.28

RN322 English Heritage (1778)

- The explanatory text should make clear that the policy does not relate to Highland Court itself

Policy ED3 – Highland Court Allocation

RN036 Highland Investment Co. Ltd represented by Goddard Planning Consultancy (678-690)

RN098 Ms P Gibb represented by David Hicken Associates Ltd (923)

RN113 Miss A Harris-Dean (910)

RN209 PACE (779)

RN228 Kent County Council (1640)

RN268 Trustees of Mount Discretionary Settlement represented by Cluttons (2005)

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patricxbourne (2322, 2323)

RN311 Bridge Parish Council (2281, 2282)

RN401 Byott (1321)

RN406 A. Gomez Ltd. (2620)

- No explanation why the need cannot be met by recycling derelict land or sites within an urban area
- Objection to identification of Highland Court Farm as an employment cluster; allocate it as a larger business park
- Say that "existing buildings" in ED3 and para 3.28 and 3.29 means the old model farm buildings in the north east of the site

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Delete this allocation in AONB, SLA and conservation area. Poorly served by public transport and will not meet employment objectives
- Need for effective lorry signing is installed.
- Supported, provided that the scheme is planned to fit the AONB.
- No planning link between the site's refurbishment & development of open space. Connective wording should be removed
- Include brownfield land only for development at Highland Court Farm
- Concerned that the development of Highland Court Farm would have an adverse impact on Higham Park Estate and Conservation Area. The development should have due regard to the parkland conservation area

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.17 The Council has put forward three relevant Further Amendments. FA3/001 adds a new last sentence to paragraph 3.27 to mention that the Highland Court land lies in an AONB and conservation area. FA3/002 adds a new last sentence to paragraph 3.29, requiring a landscaping strategy and comprehensive vehicle parking arrangements in any development brief. FA3/003 includes those last factors in a new criterion (c) in Policy ED3.
- 4.18 Highland Court already houses a significant amount of employment floorspace in existing buildings; these buildings appear to have grown from an origin in a former model farm near to, but quite separate from the II* listed building of Highland Court (formerly known as Higham Park), which stands in a parkland setting to the north-west. The Highland Court complex now comprises essentially two areas of building; the 3.17 ha of additional Grade 2 agricultural land identified for employment would link the two areas, but would not spread the developed area outside its broad confines into the open countryside beyond.
- 4.19 Clearly, this isolated but significant and well-established employment area will not disappear, and it is a very useful source of work in the wider rural area south of Canterbury, near to a number of small settlements and on a bus route. There is no obvious previously developed land opportunity for equivalent employment in the A2 or B2068 corridors. The Council sees B8 uses as the preponderant desirable activity on site, which seems reasonable, given the present scale and apparent success of the existing Gomez business there. Traffic is also routed away from the listed building at present, and there is good access to the A2 and the wider road network.
- 4.20 The physical context of the local area is highly sensitive, and but for the fact that a complex already exists, countryside and conservation policy considerations would be weighted heavily against more development. However, this particular part of the AONB designation is surprisingly well secluded, with heavy tree planting all around it, and a wider local topography that counteracts its location on a ridge. The site itself is inconspicuous to the general public travelling through the area, existing landscaping around the complex hiding much of it from the immediate area of the listed building. All things considered, I find that the amended Policy and supporting text result from a balancing exercise that respects the location, but increases its usefulness to the District economy. Given assiduous development control by the Council the net result could even enhance the setting of the listed building, and the surroundings of existing buildings at Highland Court. The price paid is a loss of relatively inconspicuous but unspoiled open land. In this instance I find the loss justified.

Recommendation

4.21 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment Nos. FA3/001, FA3/002 and FA3/003, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY ED4 - LAND AT ST AUGUSTINE'S HOSPITAL - AND PARAGRAPHS 3.30-3.31

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 3.30

RN318 Mrs C Swire (2307, 2308)

- Restrictions on development at site 'C' St. Augustine's in para. 6.55 of adopted plan are not included in the deposit draft. These restrictions should be reinstated
- Mixed use development on site C, St. Augustine's is contrary to para 4.13 of the draft plan in terms of accessibility. Development of Site C should be abandoned, due to implications for the SLA and AONB

Policy ED4 – St Augustine's Hospital Chartham

RN255 GOSE (2661)

A3/023 – Amended policy ED4

RD079 GOSE (20182)

RD121 Mrs C Swire (20477)

- Adopted plan was more restrictive towards development of this site. Current plan places no height restrictions and other conditions. Any more buildings will seriously have detrimental effect on the Downs AONB. Ribbon development breaching the skyline
- Remove word “safeguarded”; suggest allocated

Reasoning and Conclusions

4.22 The objectors are not opposing development in principle on this eastern remnant of the former St Augustine's Hospital complex. The Council has put forward Further Amendment FA3/004, adding text to paragraph 3.31. Looking at the amendment, I consider it could be further improved if it read: “Any proposal on the site shall either re-use the existing buildings, or replace them with no net gain in building footprint. Given the site's location within the Special Landscape Area and at the edge of the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, any proposal will be subject to an agreed Development Brief. The aim should be to achieve respect for the intrinsic landscape value of the site and surrounding land through conscious design, minimising the visual impact of all new construction seen from nearby or far viewpoints.”

4.23 A second Further Amendment, FA3/005, adds an uncontroversial new criterion (d) to Policy ED4, requiring a Development Brief for the site. I see no strong planning reason to change the word “safeguarded” to “allocated” in the second line of the Policy.

Recommendation

4.24 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment No. FA3/005 as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 4.21 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

NEW POLICY ED5a – AREA WEST OF CANTERBURY EAST STATION

Objections and Key Issues

RD056 Thanet District Council (20109)

RD116 Kent Messenger Group represented by BTF Lister (20438)

RD149 Network Rail (20726)

- Objects to additional employment land allocations at Canterbury East Station
- Objects to office allocation at KM building St Georges Place as inappropriate. Redevelopment for offices would not be viable unless supplemented by residential development. Allocation is significant burden on land; will inhibit future development & not achieve CCC objective of regeneration of area
- Objects to allocation of land to the south of Canterbury East Station for employment/office purposes. Should be allocated for housing in accordance with the Government's commitment to minimise Greenfield development. The FPD Savills study is flawed.

Reasoning and Conclusions

4.25 The First Deposit Draft allocated this land for housing. The Revised Deposit Draft changed the allocation to employment/office use along a strip of land south of the rail line, leaving existing land uses to the south of this new allocation without any specific allocation. There is little site-specific evidence from either Council or objectors on the matter. I understand why the latter should be disappointed by the prospect of an allocation that is almost certain to bring less development profit than housing. Given the physical character of the surroundings so close to a rail line, and the established industrial/employment land-use character, I am not minded to challenge the Council's conclusions that its action here is part of a thought-through process to provide new office accommodation and protect existing employment use in what it considers appropriate places.

Recommendation

4.26 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

NEW POLICIES: ED2a – EDDINGTON LANE, & ED2b – PROTECTION OF EXISTING TOURING SITES

Objections and Key Issues

Re: A3/036 – New policy ED2a

RD056 Thanet District Council (20108)

- Objects to additional employment land at Eddington Lane, Herne Bay

Re: A3/038 – New paragraph 3.54b

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20695)

- Full comments cannot be made on this change without the publication of the amendment to the UHCS

Re: A3/039 – New policy ED2b

RD079 GOSE (20183)

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (20446)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- In Para 3.54a, after “located along the coast” add “inside the sea defences”, to prevent any assumption they can be located in high risk locations
- Word “resist” should be replaced with more definitive words such as “will not permit”

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.27 In the matter of the additional employment land at the former coal yard at Eddington Lane, I can find no reason to question the Council’s judgement that the action should help to improve local job opportunities.
- 4.28 As to the matter of new touring sites, the suggested rewording of paragraph 3.45a would serve no useful planning purpose. However, the wording of Policy ED2b would be slightly improved if the second sentence began: “The Council will not permit the loss of existing sites unless...”.

Recommendation

- 4.29 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 4.27 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY ED7 – BUSINESS INNOVATION CENTRE AT UNIVERSITY OF KENT CAMPUS – AND PARAGRAPHS 3.42-3.47

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 3.42

RN061 PACE (31)

- PACE supports the idea of a small innovation centre at Beverly Farm, but is concerned about expanding this idea into a business park. Such development would require consultation with neighbouring districts. (Thanet an option?)

Paragraph 3.45

RN207 Reeves and Neylan (751)

- Definition of knowledge/research park unclear, although inference is would be a bias to innovation, research & incubation. This wouldn't assist the development of a wider knowledge-driven economy.

Paragraph 3.47

RN061 PACE (32)

- PACE supports a small innovation centre at Beverly Farm, but is concerned about expanding this idea into a business park. Such development would require consultation with neighbouring districts

Policy ED7 - Business Innovation Centre

RN038 Girlings Solicitors (1847)

RN152 University of Kent at Canterbury (943)

RN184 Kent Maritime Chamber of Commerce (146)

RN185 Lowe (157)

RN207 Reeves and Neylan (750)

RN255 GOSE (2662)

- The Innovation Centre allocation is on open land and in an AHLV and should be retained as such
- Confusion as to where innovation operations will locate once past that stage; there are no knowledge based business parks in the area. Wealth creation would therefore be lost
- No provision has been made to relocate businesses that outgrow the innovation centre at the University of Kent

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- The terms "business innovation centre" & knowledge/research park" are not defined & don't make clear the proposed activity on the safeguarded land at University of Kent
- Amend ED7 to allow for conference centre/hotel as well as business innovation centre

Reasoning and Conclusions

4.30 The essential area of the Beverley Farm allocation exists in the Adopted Local Plan, shown on the Proposals Map. The University no longer seeks to include an hotel/conference centre within the Innovation Centre, and work on a Development Brief was underway at the time of my Inquiry. Other objections are really centred on the question of need for a larger business node than the Draft Plan envisaged. That is a matter which I discuss immediately in the following set of Policy objections. This Policy and its supporting text do not need verbal alteration.

Recommendation

4.31 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY ED6 - NEW ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES/KNOWLEDGE-BASED INDUSTRIES - AND PARAGRAPHS 3.38-3.41, TOGETHER WITH: NEW POLICY ED7a – OFFICE NODES, POLICY ED7b – RESISTANCE TO THE LOSS OF OFFICE ACCOMMODATION, & PARAGRAPHS 3.47 ONWARDS TO THE END OF CHAPTER

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 3.38

RN209 PACE (777)

RN207 Reeves and Neylan (747)

- Site the small knowledge activities in small dispersed clusters around the District
- DTI defines knowledge economy as research and innovation and more effective use of knowledge in all economic activities ; this includes professional services, but Plan separates these from knowledge economy definition

Policy ED6 Inward Investment

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (392, 393)

RN103 McCabe (547)

RN125 Snook (106)

RN131 Clarke Cooper & Co. (110)

RN184 Kent Maritime Chamber of Commerce (145)

RN208 Thanet District Council (769)

- Land resources earmarked in the Plan to encourage high quality knowledge-based economy inadequate and insufficient
- Plan should seek to re-address the employment imbalances between the coastal towns and Canterbury
- Not enough employment land allocated
- Although supported as an objective, this is not a land use planning policy and should not be expressed so
- Make it clear that Policy ED6 should not be interpreted as grounds for additional employment land release
- Not enough employment land has been allocated to achieve the objectives of this policy

Re: A3/067 – Amended policy ED6

RD071 Canterbury District Economic Partnership (20146)

RD079 GOSE (20186)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20274)

RD133 Reeves & Neylan (20490)

- Amended wording puts existing businesses wishing to reinvest & expand in District at a disadvantage. Reword Policy to encourage expansion of existing businesses
- Policy no longer supports reinvestment & in-situ expansion by existing employers. Key theme in economic strategy. This should be incorporated into local plan Policy in ED chapter
- Drafting gives more support to incoming businesses rather than those wishing to expand through deletion of reinvestment
- Objects to words "a positive approach/will seek to encourage"; should be replaced with more definitive words

Paragraphs 3.47 and 3.50

RN208 Thanet District Council (756)

RN207 Reeves and Neylan (752)

RN030 ADM Computing (674)

RN036 Highland Investment Co. Ltd represented by Goddard Planning Consultancy (681)

- Whilst supporting the innovation centre at UKC, object to allocation of extra land for employment in Canterbury District to support innovation centre.
- "Business Park" not defined in relation to knowledge-driven economy & needs clarifying in paras 3.47 & 3.50
- Activities such as retailing, wholesaling & distribution should not occur on Business Park
- Include a high quality business park allocation in Canterbury.
- Put a new high quality business park at Highland Court

Re: A3/045 – New Heading

RD110 PACE (20405)

Re: A3/046 – New paragraph 3.50a

RD110 PACE (20406)

RD118 Kitewood Estates (20467)

- LP makes no references to Structure Plan employment floorspace requirements which are net figures

Re: A3/047 – New paragraph 3.50b

RD110 PACE (20407)

Re: A3/048-A3/052 – New paragraphs 3.50c-3.50g inc.

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20279-20283)

RD110 PACE (20408-20412)

RD139 Quadrant Estates represented by Goddard Planning Consultancy (20535-20537)

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20280)

RD133 Reeves & Neylan (20496-20500)

RD143 South Canterbury Consortium represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20674-20676)

- Savills report only considered extent of demand from existing businesses; did not test wider market. There is broader demand for inward investment in Canterbury as an attractive location
- Savills survey is flawed; edge of town is not adequately defined. Office space take-up is misleading; only achieved because of lack of available high quality office accommodation
- Savills report was flawed; encouraged ideal choice of location & rent leading to edge of town preferences against acknowledged view of hi tech businesses clustering together. Flaw in annual take up figures & to whom the survey was sent

Re: PC3/007; replacement for para 3.50g

APC066 Canterbury South East Liberal Democrats (30081)

APC094 Thanet District Council (30120)

APC061 Thanet District Council (30067)

APC084 Dover District Council (30108)

- Is it intended that there will be little or no physical communication between the Business Innovation Centre, because of the 5 km of road between the sites?
- Proposal will undermine the efforts of PAER to attract investment elsewhere in the sub region
- A single office node will serve to undermine the efforts of the PAER

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Allocation beyond Canterbury's strategic requirements, development not appropriate within Plan period, other potential locations, impact on surrounding area.

Re: A3/053 – New paragraph 3.50h

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20284)

RD110 PACE (20413)

RD133 Reeves & Neylan (20501)

RD143 South Canterbury Consortium represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20679)

- Strict adherence to Policy for allocation of site will not meet needs of business. Certain sites will not be available. Station Road West needed for high speed link. Police Station not available, nor Clarkson House because of certain leases
- Policy will not meet needs of business, as they require relocation to what would be unacceptable locations
- Specific office proposals inappropriate to meet the identified need for employment land. The site at New Dover Road/ A2 Canterbury Bypass would be the most appropriate form of provision for such need

Re: A3/054 – New paragraph 3.50i

RD020 Wilks (20049)

RD024 Wratten (20056)

RD056 Thanet District Council (20110)

RD059 Baker (20125)

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20285)

RD110 PACE (20414)

RD116 Kent Messenger Group represented by BTF Lister (20437)

RD117 KCC Land Use & Transport Policy (20439)

RD118 Kitewood Estates (20468)

RD124 Stansfield (20342, 20346)

RD127 Telereal Development Ltd Represented By RPS (20368)

RD133 Reeves & Neylan (20502)

RD143 South Canterbury Consortium represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20680)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20714)

RD149 Network Rail (20727)

- Objects to office accommodation Whitstable Harbour. Not an active working harbour feature, not a good environment for offices: noise & smell. If replacing former office at West Gate it will reduce car parking. More suitable site is Regent/High Street, which should be mixed use not housing
- Station Road West car part should not be allocated for anything other than car parking, until the potential for West Station high speed link to London is clarified
- Use of Canterbury Road West Car Park for offices will result in insufficient car parking provision once Canterbury is served by fast trains
- Para 3.50i: re John Wilson Business Park Add "No crossing the Ridgeway to take place"
- Objects to additional office allocations
- At least some of land allocated for office accommodation should be reserved for car parking for Canterbury West Station
- Whilst office use may be appropriate on Telephone House site, it should not be an absolute prerequisite of any redevelopment of the site. Other appropriate redevelopments would be contrary to this Policy - Delete ref to BT House / Bingley Centre
- No office allocation at Hawthorn Corner. More sustainable locations nearer Herne Bay. Allocation contrary to criteria set out in paragraph 3.50h
- Strict adherence to Policy for allocation of site will not meet needs of business. Certain sites will not be available. Station Road West needed for high speed link, Police Station not available, Clarkson house because of certain leases
- Objects to office allocation at Kent Messenger building. St George's Place inappropriate. Redevelopment for offices not viable unless supplemented by residential development. Allocations is significant burden on land; will inhibit future development & not achieve CCC objective of regeneration of area

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Object to Hawthorn Corner; greenfield site outside defined urban area; conflicts with RS5 and RS4, not needed in quantitative terms. There are other sites available at Blacksole Farm & Eddington, new slip road is not practicable with design of existing junction
- Object to specific office proposals as these are not considered to be appropriate to meet the identified need for employment land. The site at New Dover Road/ A2 Canterbury Bypass would be the most appropriate form of provision for such need
- Objects to allocation of land to the south of Canterbury East Station for employment/office purposes. Not available within plan period; Should be allocated for housing in accordance with the Governments commitment to minimise Greenfield development. The FPD Savills study is flawed

Re: A3/055 – New paragraph 3.50j

RD110 PACE (20415)

RD117 KCC Land Use & Transport Policy (20440)

RD143 South Canterbury Consortium represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20681)

- Specific office proposals not appropriate to meet the identified need for employment land. The site at New Dover Road/ A2 Canterbury Bypass would be the most appropriate form of provision for such need
- Para 3.50j has no foundation in existing or emerging SP Policy for scale of additional land identified at proposed office nodes beyond existing urban areas on greenfield land. City Centre more sustainable & would aid regeneration

Re: A3/056 – New paragraph 3.50k

RD004 Blean Parish Council (20213)

RD020 Wilks (20048)

RD056 Thanet District Council (20111)

RD066 Parkinson (20137)

RD090 Bekesbourne with Patricxbourne Parish Council (20197)

RD100 Maltby (20269)

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20286)

RD110 PACE (20404, 20416)

RD112 Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee (20429)

RD117 KCC Land Use & Transport Policy (20441)

RD125 Crystal Childcare Ltd (20348)

RD133 Reeves & Neylan (20503)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20661)

RD140 Maylam (20530)

RD143 South Canterbury Consortium represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20682)

- Sites allocated are too small to enable a business park to be established, likely to isolate any knowledge based business relocating; would act as deterrent to 1st occupier
- Breach Farm is too remote and away from major centre of population, with poor access to grade separated junction with A2 & A260
- Para 3.50k: after development principles add "Without taking any new land". No greenfield development at Wraik Hill or Highland Court
- Object to Highland Court; inadequate infrastructure, services roads, main services. Narrow country lanes unsuitable and already carry a dangerous level of traffic around A2 junction greenfield site. Conflict with County and District countryside policies
- No objection to overall strategy, but sites suggested are badly equipped, not enough research has been carried out for the sites
- Supports expansion of Wraik Hill employment area, provided no extra traffic is generated through Blean
- Specific office proposals inappropriate to meet the identified need for employment land. The site at New Dover Road/A2 Canterbury Bypass the most appropriate form of provision
- Offices to be in proposed regeneration zones before out of town office nodes. Concerned scale & form development at Barton Business Park & Brett's HQ at Milton; should be carefully planned as over-development will have a major impact on landscape

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Para 3.50j has no foundation in existing or emerging SP policies for proposed office nodes beyond ex-urban areas on greenfield land. City Centre more sustainable & would aid regeneration. Could agree to Wraik Hill & Breach Farm with floorspace restrictions to agreed max
- Part of the allocated land at Wraik Hill should be designated as an area for childcare provision.
- Do not support office nodes locations: car dependent and would increase travel demand in conflict with amendment A7/010 in particular Barton BP, Highland Court & Breach farm
- Milton Manor - objection to allocation of open land as office node

Re: Appendix 4 - Aa4/002 – Office Nodes

RD066 Parkinson (20141)
RD090 Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council (20198)
RD100 Maltby (20270)
RD112 Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee (20430)
RD125 Crystal Childcare Ltd (20349)
RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20662)

- Part of allocated land at Wraik Hill should be designated as area for childcare provision
- Against car dependent office node locations increasing traffic demand: Barton Business Park, Highland Court and Breach Farm
- Against loss of open land at Barton and Wraik Hill locations; former a prominent, undeveloped and important part of the Stour Valley corridor
- Highland Court highly visible, contra R3, inappropriate for rural location; detrimental to flora and fauna, increasing traffic on country lanes; poor access
- Priority should be offices in proposed regeneration zones; fears for adverse landscape impact in rural locations
- Sites inadequately researched and badly equipped

Re: PC3/008; replacement for para 3.50k

APC010 JWT Wise (30014)
APC080 CPRE (30095)
APC081 LANRA (30097)
APC023 AR Blake (30027)
APC082 Mrs P Robinson (30098)
APC002 Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council (30004)
APC003 Mr & Mrs Kennelly (30005)
APC004 AG Mitchell (30006)
APC005 Mr J Kerr (30007)
APC006 JEE Hanson (30008)
APC007 Old & New Dover Roads Residents Association (30009)
APC008 RG Page (30012)
APC024 TA Frier & Miss D Smith (30028)
APC012 A Williamson Powell (30016)
APC021 Mr & Mrs PF Cooling (30025)
APC017 Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee (30021)
APC011 EM Darrington (30015)
APC020 Mr & Mrs BR Bray (30024)
APC019 Miss J Charlton (30023)
APC022 Mrs S Ingall (30026)
APC013 Mr & Mrs S & J Wilson (30017)
APC018 Mrs J Sutton (30022)
APC041 KH Filmer (30047)
APC025 M Northey (30029)
APC073 MR Stevenson (30088)
APC014 Mrs J Fox (30018)
APC015 M Crux (30019)
APC016 K Young (30020)
APC009 MP Sims (30013)
APC052 Mr & Mrs P Sims (30058)
APC059 G Reilly (30065)
APC058 S Reilly (30064)
APC057 Ms M Reilly (30063)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

APC056	Mrs S Reilly (30062)
APC055	D Buckley (30061)
APC076	C Mills (30091)
APC053	Mr & Mrs MC Deal (30059)
APC050	TR Jones (30056)
APC049	M & P Kielty (30055)
APC047	J Clarke (30053)
APC054	A Jeffers (30060)
APC077	Mrs L Hope (30092)
APC079	E Parkinson (30094)
APC026	J Corfield (30030)
APC074	TJ Lynch (30089)
APC027	Mr & Mrs M Lang (30031)
APC072	NS & JP Jones (30087)
APC060	Mr & Mrs Godden (30066)
APC070	GRD Manley (30085)
APC061	Thanet District Council (30068)
APC067	D Linfoot (30082)
APC066	Canterbury South East Liberal Democrats (30080)
APC063	E Kent Green Party (30072)
APC045	PACE (30096)
APC071	Mr & Mrs T Mansfield (30086)
APC034	PJR Evans (30038)
APC122	Mr & Mrs Sutton (30157)
APC039	HM Russell (30044)
APC038	Ms C de Caires (30042)
APC037	Mr & Mrs J Bailey (30041)
APC042	Ms G Armstrong (30046)
APC035	Ms M Connelly (30039)
APC043	S Sloffham (30048)
APC031	East Kent Green Party (30035)
APC030	Mrs A Garside (30034)
APC115	DA Fawke (30150)
APC036	Mr & Mrs G & P Ward (30040)
APC090	M Esdale (30116)
APC113	M Steed (30149)
APC112	Ms M Smith (30148)
APC111	A Jeffers (30147)
APC110	H Macdonald (30146)
APC109	Ms D Laven (30145)
APC105	NA McDavid (30140)
APC094	Thanet District Council (30121)
APC095	SPOKES (30123)
APC096	R Townsend (30124)
APC099	B Walshaw (30130)
APC100	Robert Brett & Sons (30133)
APC101	Oaten Hill and District Society (30136)
APC102	Ms L Gibson (30137)
APC104	Ms A Wood (30139)
APC108	Ms C Mather (30144)
APC116	Mrs J Munns (30151)
APC118	Ms J Horsley (30153)
APC119	RJ Smith (30154)
APC120	Mr & Mrs Bell (30155)
APC103	Ms D Gillespie (30138)
APC097	Ms P Morgan (30113)
APC085	Mr K Sellwood (30111)
APC040	The Barton Association (320045)
APC084	Dover District Council (30109)
APC102	Ms L Gibson (30137)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

APC092 Ms D Esdaile (30118)
APC091 Ms A-M Marriott (30117)

- Lack of consultation
- Erodes the green gap between Canterbury & Bridge; AHLV, Conservation area, greenfield site
- Lack of public information, pollution, contra character of the area, adverse local landscape impact
- There must be no access from Barton Estate
- Little Barton Farm, increased traffic on A2/A2050. Support proposal if slip roads at A2 junction; suggest woodland is available for public, a separated cycle route & cycle parking provided, future expansion restricted
- Sensitive area, loss of amenity, harmful to habitat, noise, pollution, traffic congestion, pedestrian safety
- Sets a precedent for more development, area is predominantly residential
- Adverse impact on local properties
- Need for a passageway between the residential and proposed business area, farmland with no permitted development. Wrap the community woodland belt all the way around the development, correctly designed and landscaped
- Loss of prime farmland, possibility for future infilling
- Brownfield land should be developed first, no infrastructure
- Will degrade the living environment of South Canterbury
- No need for business park
- A single office node will serve to undermine the efforts of the PAER.
- 40ha commercial development should not be considered until a study is carried out covering all the implications and requirements
- More appropriate locations should be looked for
- Far in excess of demand, unsustainable
- Loss of invaluable heritage for future generations
- Contrary to Policy E8 of RPG9 & Policies E1, E3 & E11 of Kent Structure Plan
- Loss of horse-riding land
- Need for further housing, no need for more business parks
- Loss of attractive approach into Canterbury
- If proposal goes ahead, close North Downs cycle way entirely to cars
- Preserve Pilgrims Way for future generations
- Needs currently outstretch the supply at Milton Manor Farm, suitable environment for office/high tech related development, site well located, well screened, no landscape designation
- Would prefer park to be allocated at Little Barton Farm rather than site behind Park & Ride, however objects in principle
- Where will all the employees live? Could expand into haulage business

Re: PC3/009; deleted office node notations for Breach Farm, Highland Court and Milton Manor from the Proposals Map (Policy ED7a)

APC088 Highland Investment Company (30114)
APC064 Reeves & Neylan (30075)
APC065 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (30078)
APC123 Jennifer Owen and Associates Ltd (30158)
APC126 Kent County Council (30165)
APC007 Old & New Dover Roads Residents Association (30010)
APC124 Highways Agency (30160)
APC100 Robert Brett & Sons (30131)

- Retain Highland Court as an office node, no local demand to support development of a major business park
- Businesses will be prejudiced by the existence of policy ED7a
- Possible concerns regarding the transport impacts on A2
- Objection to deletion of Milton Manor Farm as an office node and the substitution of an extended area of land at Little Barton Farm
- Needs currently outstretch the supply at Milton Manor Farm, suitable environment for office/high tech related development, site well located, well screened, no landscape designation
- Deletion of 3 small sites with one large one means more traffic, local impact, and detriment to the locality

Re: PC3/010; identification on Proposals Map of extended "Office Node" at Little Barton Farm

APC094 Thanet District Council (30122)
APC061 Thanet District Council (30069)
APC084 Dover District Council (30110)

- Proposal will undermine the efforts of PAER to attract investment elsewhere in the sub region
- A single office node will serve to undermine the efforts of the PAER

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Allocation beyond Canterbury's strategic requirements and needs, development not appropriate within Plan period, other potential locations, impact on surrounding area

Re: PC3/011; amendment of Appendix 4 (Aa002) to delete Breach Farm, Highland Court and Milton Manor from the list of "Office Nodes"

APC100 Robert Brett & Sons (30132)

APC007 Old & New Dover Roads Residents Association (30011)

- Needs currently outstretch the supply at Milton Manor Farm, suitable environment for office/high tech related development, site well located, well screened, no landscape designation
- Should be small development; brings problems of traffic, local impact, detriment to character of the locality

Re: PC3/012; Amendment of Appendix 4 (Aa003) to add Breach Far, Barham to the list under Canterbury

APC098 Amirage Properties (30129)

- Unsustainable, no study of employment rated demand in this area, businesses would not be attracted to this area

Re: A3/057 – New Policy ED7a

RD056 Thanet District Council (20112)

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20271)

RD108 South East Estates represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20299)

RD110 PACE (20417)

RD117 KCC Land Use & Transport Policy (20442)

RD133 Reeves & Neylan (20488)

RD143 South Canterbury Consortium represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20683)

RD102 Highways Agency (20262)

- Policy Ed7a add new criterion (iii). Effect of the development on the highway network not to be detrimental in term of congestion or road safety. This would be to safeguard operation of highway network & facilitate provision of offsite developer funded highway improvements where appropriate
- Policy unduly restrictive; will not enable District to have modern Business park during plan period. Similar businesses like to locate near each other - no opportunity e.g. knowledge based businesses
- Wraik Hill should be specifically referred to in Policy ED7a; other sites for employment development are identified by a specific Policy number. Delete final clause of proposed Policy ED7a
- Object to specific office proposals as these are not considered to be appropriate to meet the identified need for employment land. The site at New Dover Road/ A2 Canterbury Bypass would be the most appropriate form of provision for such need
- Will not enable District to have opportunity of developing a material pool of knowledge based businesses
- Against additional office employment and office node allocations
- Delete Policy; no quantitative need for office nodes; existing office function has been exaggerated; existing office use is insignificant; largely greenfield allocations

Re: A3/058 – New heading

RD110 PACE (20418)

Re: A3/059 – New paragraph 3.50l

RD110 PACE (20419)

Re: A3/060 – New paragraph 3.50m

RD110 PACE (20420)

Re: A3/061 – New paragraph 3.50n

RD110 PACE (20421)

Re: A3/062 – New policy ED7b

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20272)

RD110 PACE (20422)

RD128 Unite represented by Turley Associates (20352)

RD133 Reeves & Neylan (20489)

RD079 GOSE (20184)

- Objects to word "safeguard" in Policy; should be replaced with more definitive words such as "allocated"

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- ED7b will operate unduly against existing professional services sector in unsuitable town centre premises. They need maximum value to relocate and expand. Existing office accommodation not easily upgraded to meet modern standards. Retain existing office, if fit for purpose
- Policy will increase unlet office accommodation
- ED7b inflexible in terms of exceptions, and does not reflect the range of office space available, making some units more appropriate than others for protection. Amend by referring to a more flexible approach for older buildings and 100% affordable housing

Re: A3/063 – New heading

RD110 PACE (20423)

Re: A3/064 – New paragraph 3.50p

RD110 PACE (20424)

Re: A3/065 – New paragraph 3.50p

RD110 PACE (20425)

Re: A3/066 – New Heading

RD103 Canterbury District Chamber of Commerce (20273)

- By deleting reinvestment and introduction of new heading, CCC is giving more support to incoming businesses rather than those wishing to expand

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.32 The Revised Deposit Draft had already produced a significant amount of altered and repositioned text in this Plan Chapter. By the end of my Inquiry, the Council had also put forward a number of Proposed Changes to the final draft text which reflect further significantly revised thinking on its part.
- 4.33 Proposed Change PC3/002 amends the new heading preceding paragraph 3.41, deleting “inward”. PC3/003 reinstates mention of “re-investment and in-situ expansion by existing employers” to Policy ED6.
- 4.34 A number of Proposed Changes – PC3/007, PC3/008, PC3/009, PC3/010 and PC3/011 – bring forward the new concept of a 20 hectare site at Little Barton Farm as one of two new District Office Nodes, alongside Wraik Hill, Whitstable. At the same time, Milton Manor, Highland Court and Breach Farm lose the status of office nodes.
- 4.35 During my Inquiry, the County Council’s proposed pre-EIP Changes (June 2004) to the emerging Kent and Medway Structure Plan became available. Identified in Draft Policy FP1 – Employment Land Provision was a new provision of “up to 20 hectares for office accommodation and business development at the City” (i.e. Canterbury). This stance is explained in the officer-produced “Joint Statement on Economic Need” (CD3.15). The City and County Council view is that, though a large proportion of Canterbury employees work within what is termed broadly the “knowledge economy”, the “District has yet to develop a strong knowledge-based business sector that provides high earnings and productivity, and leads to strong business formation in the area”. The Joint Statement’s final paragraph contains a view that “it is appropriate to increase the size of the business and technology sectors in Canterbury District”, and that “this diversification, on the scale proposed, will complement and not supplant the existing economic roles of the District”.
- 4.36 Throughout the Inquiry, it has been the Council’s stance that the Structure Plan guidelines on employment floorspace for the period to 2011 are no more than guidelines, and certainly not ceilings. The Explanatory Memorandum itself says that they are not precise quantities, and that minor variations from them may be warranted. At the end of my Inquiry the only employment allocation in the emerging Local Plan seriously opposed by

the County Council was that within the AONB at Highland Court, which I discussed above.

- 4.37 City Council evidence shows, in what appears to me a factually correct manner, the effects of its end-of-Inquiry position on the employment land supply, if its final proposed employment allocations were carried into an adopted Local Plan. It was put in to the Inquiry on 5 October 2004 in Council Appearance Statement CCC/PR/82, expanded by a Table produced at the proceedings. That position is calculated on the basis of:
- a) only two Office Nodes in the District, at Barton Farm, Canterbury, and Wraik Hill, Whitstable; plus
 - b) calculation of the area of existing employment land lost to new housing as a result of the Council's proposed housing allocations; plus
 - c) the Council's final calculation of all other employment allocations.
- 4.38 The result is that the initial calculation of 47% oversupply of employment land in the emerging Local Plan over the Structure Plan Guidelines at the start of my Inquiry (CD 3.1 – Economy Core Proof), is reduced to 28% in the final figure over those same Guidelines. One significant way of looking at the 20 ha Barton Farm site is that its removal would bring about a shortfall of 3% in the employment land supply to 2011.
- 4.39 I have no reason to doubt the dependability of that calculation. Of the elements within it, the Wraik Hill location is not the subject of significant opposition from objectors. Element (b) is significant, even though I have not found it possible to endorse all the new housing allocations put forward by the Council. I have not opposed those proposed allocations in principle; rather, I have concluded that a number of them cannot be relied on to come about in this Plan period, although they may be achieved over a somewhat longer period. Barton Farm and the remainder of the employment allocations I discuss below.
- 4.40 It is thus true to say that the County Council as Structure Plan Authority does not object to the overall scale of employment allocations proposed at the Inquiry, despite specific opposition to a particular site.
- 4.41 I turn to the matter of the Office Nodes. Other than Wraik Hill and the original 7.5 ha Barton Farm site, the remaining three identified in the Revised Deposit Draft, and officially supported by the Council at the start of my Inquiry, always gave me the impression of being "penny packets" in rural surroundings, chosen for geographical variety rather than likely market appeal. Consequently, the Council's Proposed Changes to remove Breach Farm, Highland Court and Milton Manor seems to me no more than common sense planning.
- 4.42 The Breach Farm site is a former Pfizer site in an isolated position. It has proved hard to find a follow-on employment activity here, and there are some who hope that the site may be given planning permission for housing eventually. Given its isolated rural position, this is a site with virtually no positive planning credentials as a housing site. The Council's summation of the most desirable outcome – employment on an unexpanded site – in Proposed Change PC3/004 seems to me clearly correct.
- 4.43 I gave my opinion earlier in this chapter that the Highland Court site, on balance, merited some relatively inconspicuous expansion on to green land lying between two existing

employment areas. There seemed little logic, but considerable harm in a wider take-up of c.4.5 ha of agricultural land around this isolated site in an AONB, for office-type uses. I fully support the Proposed Changes withdrawing this allocation.

- 4.44 The Milton Manor node site contained a large amount of attractive rural land, north-east of the area occupied by the premises of Robert Brett & Sons Ltd. Its location between Thanington and Chartham never seemed to me an obvious site for offices, so I also support the Proposed Changes withdrawing this allocation.
- 4.45 The enlarged Barton Farm allocation is perceived by the Council as viable, given its ability to re-accommodate: (i) existing office users in Canterbury unable to grow or rationalise their property in a tight knit, small historic city, (ii) “grow-on” space for business from the University Business Innovation Centre, and (iii) other related “high-tech” business development attracted to the city, perhaps linked to the development of businesses from Canterbury’s educational establishments. These are forms of development that fall within Use Classes A2 (financial and professional services), B1(a) (offices), and B1(b) (research and development, studios, laboratories and high tech).
- 4.46 Barton Farm’s recognition as a key location for specialised employment came about late. Thus, though the procedures for advertising, consulting the public, and making the relevant Proposed Changes followed to the letter the procedures laid down in the Departmental “Green Book” (A Guide to Procedures, DETR, 1999), I find it easy to see why many counter-objectors were concerned and cynical as to the Council’s motives. However, since the counter-objectors were in fact given reasonable opportunities and time to gather their thoughts, write objections and appear at my Inquiry, well briefed with background information about the Council’s changed thinking, I see nothing wrong with the Council’s actions. It is much better that the Office Nodes matter is before me in its most developed form, than that I should be writing a report without being privy to the Council’s fully considered final views.
- 4.47 I accept the Council’s stance that the change of mind for this significant new allocation sprang from at least two directions. The first was the objections from the County Council and others about the undesirable nature of scattered rural locations, taking up green field sites which did not have very good public transport links. The second was a series of objections, associated with more personal approaches to the Council from local firms and business organisations, backed by those taking forward the 7 ha Kent University Enterprise Hub, from its project stage to start-up. The stance which the Council and the latter faction now take favours consolidating provision for Canterbury-related enterprises on a green field site. That site is immediately south-east of the substantial but utilitarian Barton Business Park which, despite its name, is no more than a conventional industrial estate.
- 4.48 As to the opportunities elsewhere in Canterbury to site an allocation of this scope, able to grow over a period of years, I find the Council’s analysis of deficiencies of the City Centre and the various Regeneration Zones to be realistic and convincing as regards available space, development potential, and market realities (CD3.14, paragraphs 3.9-3.11). I agree with the Council that the easiest possible accessibility to the A2 trunk road – the key connector to the strongpoints of the regional economy – is necessary for success. CD3.14’s analysis of possible alternative sites around the city edge shows no easy alternative without substantial planning drawbacks. This close analysis has not been able to identify a feasible site close to the University Enterprise Hub, or with better connections to the labour markets of Whitstable and Herne Bay.

- 4.49 The site chosen develops the concept of the former Barton Park node in the Revised Deposit Draft, extending the allocated business use area southwards, and providing for a significant landscaped screen along the New Dover Road frontage. While the designation on the Proposals Map would leave a permanent green gap between the existing urban fringe and the western edge of the allocation, possibilities for extension of a successful area are available on other open land to the south and east. I regard this as no more than sensible longer-term planning to accommodate organic growth, if the initial concept proves successful. However, I can also see, though I do not agree, that this stance will suggest to those opposed to the whole idea that development could or will sprawl significantly in coming years. It will be vital to maximise the quality of the structural landscaping, and ensure the most sensitive master-planning of built development, in order to minimise impact on the green surroundings of the City hereabouts.
- 4.50 The location chosen will obviously result in far more traffic activity than hitherto. Even so, the opportunities are there for getting a high proportion of the resultant trips partially or wholly made using public transport. A rigorous Transport Assessment would be a prerequisite, and the evidence makes me confident that the Council can ensure that all the ramifications of changed road use and necessary road works will be identified, so that change can be brought about in phase with development on the site. The New Dover Road park and ride area is close by; the other park and ride facilities could be made to provide enhanced public transport connections to this site. Travel Plans, influencing the travel choices of workers in each new enterprise on site, could be brought about through the planning application system, and monitored and updated over time.
- 4.51 The establishment of development principles through mechanisms like development briefs is mentioned in the text of Proposed Change PC3/008. Such action would be able to minimise the intrusive effects of development on local residents, to maintain and enhance access through the site for pedestrians and cyclists, and to keep all undeveloped parts of the site green and un-blighted until needed for development.
- 4.52 Nobody, not I nor the Council, nor those favouring the Barton Farm allocation, can be sure that this office node on the edge of the City will have the effect the Council hopes for. The Council took recent advice from Messrs FDP Savills, and the latter gave a view in 2002 that the unsatisfied demand for office space in the District was not likely to possess the scale and value to support a major, modern, low-density, out of town business park. The Council has pondered that advice, and come to a different view. It is confident that there is a valuable Canterbury "brand" that is inherently attractive to existing and potential enterprises in the outside world. It wishes to make the ambitions behind the University Enterprise Hub credible by providing a permanent home for newly generated enterprise. It also desires to provide a new home for existing City businesses unable to expand, and thereby tempted to move to another part of Kent with unfettered development land.
- 4.53 The new node could provide a site now lacking in the District: part of the City, yet able to house a large number of modern businesses spaciouly but close to each other; a home to innovative, productive enterprises benefiting from the prestigious Canterbury image and capable of sparking further activities and attracting successor activities. I do not think it necessary that the Council should pretend to know precisely what the make-up of future occupiers of an office node here might look like. I find that the Council's final stance on this matter has been reached on the basis of rigorous thinking and is worth support. The Council is charged with looking to Canterbury's long-term interests, and like any large

business it has to plan and provide a strategy for survival, adaptation and sustainable growth before foreseeable problems become acute and decline sets in.

- 4.54 In my opinion, the Barton Farm allocation is not the first step towards sprawl around Canterbury, but the meeting of one defined need. I see no good planning reason why the Council has to show evidence of actual economic decline to justify aspiring towards, and providing, a location for high quality development that will attract high quality enterprises. It does lack such a site close to the City at present. The historic City is small, tightly knit and utterly unsuited to major physical change of this kind. The existing Business Parks around Canterbury, Whitstable and Herne Bay, and certainly the existing Barton Business Park, are essentially older-type conventional industrial estates of utilitarian character and design, none in the first flush of youth. None is a suitable candidate for an add-on enclave of the kind proposed at Little Barton Farm.
- 4.55 If either Barton Farm or Wraik Hill is to attain the high quality of development aspired for, I consider that it would be wise to state clearly in the Plan that only new buildings that fall within Use Classes A2 (financial and professional services), B1(a) (offices), and B1(b) (research and development, studios, laboratories and high tech) will be given planning permission there. I consider it would be prudent to expand on the reasons for that restriction, preferably in Policy ED7a. The sentiment I would like to see conveyed is that the allocations have been made on good quality open land for a specific purpose, and the Council will not give planning permission for other development there, if development of the kind aspired to is slow to appear, merely to get some form of activity started. The implication for Barton Farm, with its possibilities for future enlargement beyond a 20 ha confine, would be that if the policy failed to meet the Council's aspirations, the allocation would be removed and the site would revert to its former status in some future Local Development Framework.
- 4.56 I turn to the objections that the magnitude or location of Canterbury's final list of employment allocations offends overtly against the letter or spirit of RPG9, the Regional Planning Guidance for the South-East. It is the argument of some objectors that seeking to encourage substantial development in the District, to develop and grow knowledge-based and other employment enterprises, runs against RPG9's emphasis on development in the Thames Gateway and the PAERs in the former coal fields and coastal towns of East Kent.
- 4.57 The Council's evidence is that it wishes to diversify the District economy, and move away from what it sees as an over-dependence on employment biased towards the public sector, retail and leisure, with the attendant problems of low wages and seasonality. Its evidence shows a number of indices in which the District economy lags behind regional and county averages. It is not disputed that other Kent Districts fare worse in many respects, notably Thanet and Dover. Objectors have queried the seriousness of the Council's demonstrations of relative under-performance, with the inference that matters are acceptable, others areas fare worse, and that a drive to upgrade the District's economy is an unfair poaching of opportunities that poorer Districts should profit from – in other words, why does Canterbury need to improve a reasonable present position, and take green land to do it?
- 4.58 I see it as inevitable that Districts in Kent will compete for investment. Canterbury can legitimately defend its interests, rather than merely observe an overwhelming proportion of new investment go to West Kent. Canterbury District will not cease to be a nationally peripheral location, in a geographical sense, but its present activities must have suitable

sites to diversify and change, and there must be sites where activities of the future, inherently unguessable in detail and exact kind at present, will be induced to locate. An attractive and diverse site portfolio appears to me to be essential. It may seem harsh, but I think that recommending against the Barton Farm office node would not mean that less favoured East Kent authorities would be the beneficiaries; it is more likely that West Kent/Ashford would get even more investment by default, Canterbury District being judged as a location without a single dedicated site capable of attracting new or relocated knowledge-based enterprises on any scale. Dover and Thanet Districts would receive tangible benefits from proximity to a stronger Canterbury economy, and the existence of the latter would tend to make the other two Districts somewhat less marginal and thereby more attractive than hitherto to new investment. I simply do not see those two Districts as natural recipients of the kind of Canterbury-related development aimed at on the Barton Farm site. Nothing in the development plan or regional planning guidance recommends that ring-fencing in Dover or Thanet’s favour should obtain, or even be considered as a planning factor of real significance here. Moreover, I see no good reason to view the development of the economy in Kent as a zero sum game with a finite “pot”.

- 4.59 Concerning the sites considered suitable for office locations in new paragraph 3.50i, none of the objections is of sufficient substance to convince me that the locations are unsuitable for this purpose.
- 4.60 Policy ED7a contains certain defined hurdles that a potential occupier of the two office nodes would have to overcome. This sequential test appears to me to accord well with national policy guidance, and the requirements should not prove so onerous as to act as real disincentives to a serious potential occupier. Policy ED7b does seem to me weakly worded at present. I see no reason why the second line of the Policy should not be reworded as: “...urban areas, planning permission will not be granted for development involving the loss of such accommodation, unless...”.
- 4.61 Policy ED6 expresses sentiments that are quite appropriate, taking account of the needs of local employers as well as desired incomers. However, I share the GOSE opinion that its general welcoming tone falls short of what is required in a specific policy. I consider that the Council could well add it to paragraph 3.41 as more supporting text. Alternatively, it could be recast it to be more development control oriented, by saying that planning permission for the various activities will be granted, but adding a minimum number of criteria. Those criteria could focus on the general acceptability of a development in its physical context, and the Council is perfectly capable of formulating them itself, without specific prompting from me.

Recommendation

- 4.62 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes Nos. PC3/002, /003, /007, /008, /009, /010, and /011, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraphs 4.53, 4.48 and 4.59 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND SOUTH OF THE A257 LITTLEBOURNE ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN192 PJ & JE Holdstock (184)

- Allocate site for a range of uses such as: hotel, and/or fitness centre; sports/leisure/recreational facilities; roadside services facilities, possibly in conjunction with a park and ride site

Reasoning and Conclusions

4.63 This is an almost rectangular parcel of agricultural land (13.81 ha) beyond the Canterbury Urban Area Boundary, subject to open countryside policies. It has a long northern frontage to the A257, on the other side of which is a scattered pattern of housing along the road edge. The site and its surroundings are unquestionably rural in appearance and function, despite the closeness of the City to the west.

4.64 The objectors' proposals are put only in the barest outline. As the Council says in CD1.16, the site is unrelated in form or function to the wider urban area, it is not well served by public transport, and it is unrelated to other employment uses. I consider the proposals have no significant obvious planning merits.

Recommendation

4.65 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE: LAND NORTH OF STURRY ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN150 Mr A J Pierce represented by BSF Planning Consultants (956, 957, 958, 959, 960)

- Land should be allocated for industrial, commercial and retail purposes under ED1
- Objects to inclusion in Green Gap, under R7, of site east of Sturry Road Sewage Works
- Objection to inclusion of land within the area at risk from fluvial flooding, under C28 and C29
- Objects to inclusion in AHLV, under R6, of site east of Sturry Road Sewage Works

Reasoning and Conclusions

4.66 This is a broad L-shaped piece of land (just over 2 ha in area), used for keeping horses. In an edge-of-town area of scrappy visual character, this appears to me to be land of unquestionably rural character. It is sited to the east of, and immediately outside, the Urban Area Boundary in the Adopted and emerging Local Plans. In the emerging Local Plan, it is designated within the Area of High Landscape Value. It is also a significant part of a Green Gap, the pinch point designation intended to keep the separate identities of Canterbury and Sturry by preventing development that would lead to coalescence. Although the land east of the objection site contains a number of houses, greenhouses and polytunnels, I find that the predominant characteristic of the designated Green Gap on the north side of Sturry Road is openness, a quality which is highly vulnerable to any greater degree of physical development. The long, open site frontage here comprises about one fifth of the entire gap on the north side of Sturry Road. The value of physical separation between the City and Sturry seems to me self-evident. The case against development is unarguably increased by the location of the omission site within a river floodplain, in which Revised Deposit Draft Policy C28 states that no development will be permitted

unless an exceptional justification can be demonstrated. There could be some building on this site, but it would need to be constructed in a non-standard way.

4.67 A main part of the objector's case is that the land would be of great value in accommodating displaced general employment uses from the draft housing allocations on previously developed land in the City, and from the four Regeneration Zones as these change their present character. The nearby Kingsmead Zone is considered particularly relevant to this site. However, the Council is allocating employment land measurably in excess of the Structure Plan floorspace guidelines, and other recommendations in my report do not remove that surplus. I conclude that the site is rightly located outside a well defined Urban Area Boundary, and that is an essential part of a worthwhile Green Gap designation.

Recommendation

4.68 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND ADJOINING THE JOSEPH WILSON ESTATE, SOUTH STREET, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN200 The DC Bartlett Partnership (1543)

- Add a further area of extension to the Estate on 3B agricultural land, and remove it from the Special Landscape Area designation

Reasoning and Conclusions

4.69 This blade-shaped area of open agricultural land lies immediately south of the land allocated as an employment site in the Revised Deposit Draft. That allocation extends the Joseph Wilson Estate southwards, and I have recommended against the extension earlier in this chapter in paragraphs 4.9-4.15. If my recommendation is accepted this omission site would be seen as a totally isolated area, on part of a ridge that is highly visible over long distances to the south. That would obviously be unacceptable. The Council itself distinguishes between its own allocation, which it holds to be of greatly less impact viewed from the south, and this land, which it regards as a site that could not be screened. Apart from the overwhelming visual deficiencies of this site in open countryside, I also no strong employment need argument that could be deployed in support of the proposal.

Recommendation

4.70 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE: LAND NORTH OF ASHFORD ROAD, CHARTHAM

Objections and Key Issues

RN191 Newmafruit Farms Ltd (183)

- allocate as commercial/business on a site well related to the residential expansion of Chartham

Reasoning and Conclusions

4.71 This is orchard land north of the A28. Though there is an irregular pattern of houses and employment premises south and east of the site, this is indisputably a large, visually exposed site in open countryside. It is partly within the River Stour floodplain and thus additionally constrained, with inherent development problems. The local area is not far from either Canterbury City or the main settlement at Chartham, both of which are already sources of employment. Nor is there any overall shortage of existing or allocated employment sites in the District as a whole.

Recommendation

4.72 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITES: (1) LAND OFF THE OLD DOVER ROAD, CANTERBURY, & (2) LAND SOUTH OF PONDS COTTAGES, DOVER ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN154 South Canterbury Consortium represented by BSF Planning Consultants (938, 939)

RN268 Trustees of Mount Discretionary Settlement represented by Cluttons (2006)

- Allocate c. 66 ha site as an excellent location for a new combined knowledge-based business park: well related to educational allocations, the urban area and with good transport and strategic road links
- Remove the land from the AHLV designation

RN353 Accor Hotels (2468, 2471)

- Dedicate the site by the proposed slip road from the A2 for roadside services, including an hotel, and remove it from the Area of High Landscape Value

Reasoning and Conclusions

4.73 Both of these sites are indisputably in open countryside, extending well beyond the limits of linear development running along the southern side of the Old Dover Road, and outside the Urban Area Boundary. Any development on Site (1) would significantly expand the built form of the City to the line of the A2 trunk road. If developed, I believe that the precedent set would create a number of unrealistic development expectations in its wake. There would be a ready-made planning argument for any developer to plead in pursuit of more building towards the line of the A2, filling open land between the western edge of this site, as far north as the Wincheap area.

4.74 The development sought at Site (1) is of the same kind as the Council now intends should occupy an extension of the Barton Farm allocation in the Revised Deposit Draft. I have, earlier in this Chapter, supported the Barton Farm concept, which has far less damaging consequences for edge-of-City land than the present site. I therefore see no real planning case of any merit to be made for an allocation here.

4.75 The proposal for roadside services, including an hotel, at Site (2) would fill in the much smaller (1.173 ha) triangular site at the south-east tip of Site (1). This site adjoins an area identified for improvement of the A2 slip road. Though the Council gave planning permission for an hotel on this site in the late 1980's, a later application for renewal was refused in 1996. The present objections are not supported by a convincing body of evidence to show real need for either the hotel or the roadside services in this rural area. Moreover, the Council's point that the mechanisms for slip road improvements are not yet established is not refuted or argued against.

Recommendation

4.76 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND SOUTH OF A2 HARBLEDOWN JUNCTION & CHINA FARM, HARBLEDOWN, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN126 TG Redsell Ltd represented by BTF Lister Ltd (114, 115)

- Allocate the land for new commercial development: knowledge-based and high value added users (e.g. incubator units and high spec office developments)
- Achieve objectives behind policy C5 – improvement of A2(T) junction and Wincheap traffic relief – through the allocation of the site for a business park

Reasoning and Conclusions

4.77 This is a very large wedge-shaped site of 85.81 ha, south of the A2 trunk road and well outside the Urban Area Boundary of Canterbury City in open countryside. It is a prominent, open site in agricultural use.

4.78 The development sought is of the same kind as the Council now intends should occupy an extension of the Barton Farm allocation in the Revised Deposit Draft. I have, earlier in this Chapter, supported the Barton Farm concept, which has far less damaging consequences for edge-of-City land than the present site, where the adverse planning consequences of large-scale physical development are difficult to over-state. I therefore find no real planning case of any merit for an allocation here.

Recommendation

4.79 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT WRAIK HILL, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN147 SE Estates Ltd represented by BSF Planning Consultants (2019, 2020)

- Object to the non-allocation of land at Wraik Hill for residential development

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN119 George Wilson Developments Ltd (936)

- Allocate office village on 6.5 acres at Wraik Hill, close to the Chaucer Business Park, for 75,000-100,000 sq ft

Reasoning and Conclusions

4.80 The George Williams objection has been met in the Revised Deposit Draft by the allocation of the Wraik Hill office node, which also covers the whole site sought for housing by SE Estates Ltd. I have found no planning difficulty in agreeing with the Council about the merits of the Wraik Hill office node, which lies just south of the Whitstable Urban Area Boundary, well positioned on a crucial main road corridor within the District. The SE Estates Ltd objection has not been pursued in any detail since the publication of the Revised Deposit Draft, so I am presuming that this is no more than a technical objection left on the record.

Recommendation

4.81 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE: LAND AT HAWTHORNE CORNER, HERNE BAY

Objections and Key Issues

RN320 JTS Partnership (1991-1996, 2000, 2002)

- Allocate this previously developed land for employment and tourism development

Reasoning and Conclusions

4.82 The Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan complies with the desires of the objector by inserting a new Paragraph 3.50i, which confirms the designation on the Proposals Map of Hawthorne Corner, as a new employment allocation on 3 ha, stating this would be for office use and associated storage for FDS. The site was occupied by the local company FDS, but buildings on site were abandoned after a fire and consequent disrepair, with the company occupying other accommodation in the District. The allocation is regarded by the Council as commonsense, after grants of (as yet unimplemented) planning permission in 1998 and 2000 for a replacement building with offices, storage, production, and ancillary residential space. I find no flaw in the Council's thinking on the matter.

4.83 The objectors have not made any detailed or convincing case for the siting of an hotel here, some distance from the centre of Herne Bay. There is already an hotel allocation on a site at Eddington, closer to the town centre. The Council explains factually in CD1.16, pages 74-75, the reasons why no hotel all was included in the Adopted Local Plan, despite what transpired at Inspector O'Rourke's Inquiry. I have no evidence before me to suggest that market realities could sustain more new hotel accommodation in the Herne Bay area. Indeed, the Council has stated in evidence that a private sector study in 2003, prepared for the County Council and East Kent District Councils, concluded that likely future demand and lack of developer interest suggested no case for pursuing hotel accommodation at Herne Bay.

Recommendation

4.84 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. OBJECTIONS TO THE CHAPTER ON IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN OUR CITY AND TOWN CENTRES

POLICY TC1 - TOWN CENTRE DEVELOPMENT, NEW POLICY TC1a - PROPOSALS OUTSIDE TOWN CENTRE BOUNDARIES & AND PREAMBLE IN PARAGRAPHS 4.1-4.12

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 4.4 – Our Objectives

RN199 East Kent District Green Party (1520)

- At odds with recent decisions like Canterbury College

Paragraph 4.10 – Town Centre Designations

RN128 Dean and Chapter of Canterbury (118)

- Council fails to recognise importance of existing city centre car parks essential to retailers and customers

Policy TC1 Vitality and Viability of Town Centres

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1877)

RN199 East Kent District Green Party (1521)

RN208 Thanet District Council (764)

RN227 B&Q Plc Represented By RPS (1668)

RN345 Oaten Hill & District Society (2441)

- Redraft so that proposals be assessed rethe test of sequential approach, need and impact on the town centre
- With the approach in para 4.56 of not having new retail allocations, illogical to have a policy stating what would happen should retail proposals occur
- The wording unclear. The policy should be split into 'in centre' and 'outside centre'
- Town centre boundary should be redrawn more tightly to avoid town centre uses spread into non-town centre areas
- Allows out of town development

Re: A4/002 – New policy TC1a

RD102 Highways Agency (20263)

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20555)

- Add new criterion (f): There is no detrimental effect on highway network in terms of road safety or congestion. Safeguards operation of highway network & provision of offsite developer-funded highway improvements where appropriate
- No reference to contributions being made if necessary towards any additional community facilities e.g. such places which arise directly from development. Add at end “including necessary contributions towards community facilities after development brief”

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.1 I regard the preamble to the two policies as uncontroversial. The split into two policies, covering development inside and outside the town centre boundaries, makes better sense than the First Deposit Draft version, and I consider it covers all the aspects necessary for successful implementation. To satisfy the Highways Agency, the Council has put forward Proposed Change PC4/001, adding a sensible new criterion (f) to new Policy TC1a: that there is no detrimental effect on the highway network in terms of road safety or congestion.

Recommendation

5.2 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change PC4/001, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY TC2 - COMMERCIAL FRONTAGES IN OR ADJACENT TO TOWN CENTRES, POLICY TC2a - MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, AND PARAGRAPHS 4.13-4.14

Objections and Key Issues

Policy TC2 Mixed Use Developments

RN025 Ms V Cutler (651)

RN118 Dept of Health represented by Inventures (495)

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2163)

RN324 Stagecoach (2405)

- Plan needs to be reconsidered in the light of the activity of insurers: e.g. they will not insure businesses with DSS tenants above the business. This conflicts with policy TC2
- Mixed-use development – needs small businesses to be retained for liveliness and public safety. Redevelopment should not end up like deserted area adjacent to Canterbury West station
- Proposed policy would prevent development of the town centre/edge of centre NHS health care facilities. Add to policy
- Objects to mixed-use allocation at Stagecoach, High Street, Herne Bay as the premises are needed for operations

Re: A4/003 New Policy TC2a – Site Specific Mixed Use Allocations

RD056 Thanet District Council (20113)

RD113 London & Eastern Investments Ltd represented by LGA Design Group (20433, 20434)

RD118 Kitewood Estates (20469)

RD124 Stansfield (20345)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20372)

RD127 Telereal Development Ltd Represented By RPS (20380)

RD128 Unite represented by Turley Associates (20353)

RD129 Second Site Property Holdings (20478)

RD136 Oaten Hill & District Society (20527)

RD144 The Metric Group represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20745)

- Mixed use Policy could be misused to the detriment of employment opportunities. Amend Policy to strengthen the requirement to bring uses other than residential forward as priority and treat any residential units brought forward as windfall
- TC2a does not specify criteria for selecting a mixed use site, nor what mix will be sought - clarification needed for certainty, detailing where intensification by housing/ retail/office would be appropriate, include TC provision and proximity to public transport nodes
- Object to sites facing St Dunstan's Street – Hallett's Garage and former Tyre Garage on Roper Rd. Housing provision should be reduced so that adequate provision can be made for off-street parking and deliveries in response to traffic problem
- Concern at list of possible uses for some of the sites namely to sites c) to h) , k) & o) Several could be suitable for education for Canterbury or Christ Church College, or for modern office accommodation
- Object to Gas Works, Belmont Road, & Sea Street mixed use allocations – should be housing which is in line with government guidance. Should not be requirement for Belmont to have development brief as at advanced stage in planning application & negotiations with planning officers

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Newingate House Policy TC2a item d): support offices, residential and educational uses, but A3 use should be included on ground & basement floors
- Invicta House Policy TC2a item (k): support commercial & residential uses but object on basis that existing retail, leisure & educational uses be retained in the new Policy as well
- Too commercial element of mixed use allocation at Talmead
- While Telephone House is suitable for a mix of uses, development for one predominant use could result in significant planning benefits. The site is ideally suited to high density housing. TC2a and map should be amended not to require mixed uses if single use is acceptable
- Object to mixed use allocation at Metric site. All of site should be allocated for residential, supporting the aspiration of a link road

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.3 The supporting text and the wording of Policy TC2 do not need any rewording, as the objectors to this area-wide Policy are concerned with specifics that should not undermine its sensible principles, which are aimed at retaining and increasing urban vitality.
- 5.4 As to TC2a, the Policy sets down the specific sites that the Council envisages coming forward in the Local Plan period, but it is not setting out the exact uses that would be permitted. The Council has put forward two Further Amendments in this section to emphasise this point. FA4/001 amends the last sentence of the first paragraph of Policy TC2a to say that only “an indication of the types of uses that would be appropriate as part of the development” is set out beside the named sites. FA4/002 adds text in paragraph 4.13, expanding on this new emphasis. I endorse this clarification, which seems to me to overcome the main force of the objections made to the new policy.
- 5.5 Before the Plan is adopted, the Council will presumably bring up to date the list of sites, to reflect the current planning position. In this report I have not been able to agree all the sites listed as being definite enough to merit a firm allocation. I instance Canterbury sites (i), (j), (k), (l), (o), (p); and Herne Bay site (d). Details of my misgivings are to be found in my Chapter Three, where I have considered site-specific objections. However, in my paragraph 3.4.20 I have suggested a mechanism for retaining mention of such sites without them enjoying the status of a formal allocation. It may be possible for those sites to be mentioned under this policy, if suitable wording can be found.

Recommendation

- 5.6 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment Nos. FA4/001 and FA4/002, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and some altered wording to meet the points I raise in my paragraph 5.5 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY TC3 - RETAIL CORE AREAS OF TOWN CENTRES – AND PARAGRAPH 4.15

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 4.15 – Retail Core Areas

RN295 Going Places Leisure Travel Ltd Represented By RPS (2262)

- Flexibility needed in retail area for vitality and viability of town centres. Talk re prevention of dead frontages, not of resisting loss entirely

Re: A4/004 Amendment to paragraph 4.15

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RD056 Thanet District Council (20114)

- Object to lack of clarification of scale of additional need & potential additional retail floorspace implied for non-bulky & bulky goods now identified in updated retail study, & the lack of analysis of impact on town centres & retail expenditure in adjoining districts like Thanet

Policy TC3 Retail Core Areas

RN118 Dept of Health represented by Inventures (497)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1868)

RN255 GOSE (2634)

RN295 Going Places Leisure Travel Ltd Represented By RPS (22601, 2261)

- Objection to the need for 'overriding justification' for changes of use in retail core areas. The correct approach would be to determine if the change of use would harm vitality and viability of the retail core
- Policy, as worded, would be likely to prevent the development of town centre/edge of centre NHS health care facilities
- Retail core area policy too restrictive with regard to change of ground floor retail uses. Sustaining vitality depends on the flexibility of floorspace use
- Too restrictive. Other uses are appropriate in town centres, including retail core areas

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.7 This is a crisp and strongly expressed policy. It puts the onus on an applicant seeking permission for change of use to provide the “overriding justification”, so that the expansion of existing non-retail uses is not encouraged. That seems to me to be tough but fair. The substantial number of existing non-retail premises in the retail core areas is not being threatened in any way, so non-retail uses have a very reasonable chance of being able to seek out vacant premises not requiring any planning permission.

Recommendation

5.8 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY TC4 - LOCAL CENTRES – AND PARAGRAPHS 4.16-4.18

Objections and Key Issues

Re: A4/005 Amended policy TC4 – Local Centres

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20551)

- Word “demand” is not correct, as could be perceived rather than actual demand. Replace with “need” in criterion e)

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.9 The Council's preferred word “demand”, meaning actual demand by the public, seems to me much more capable of demonstration in real life than “need”, a much more subjective and endlessly debatable term.

Recommendation

5.10 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

POLICY TC5 – NEW TOURISM DEVELOPMENT – AND PARAGRAPHS 4.19-4.24

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 4.22 – Tourism, Culture and Heritage

RN158 SE England Tourist Board represented by Kember Loudon Williams (2033)

- Add self catering accommodation after reference to guesthouses

Policy TC5 – New Tourism Developments

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates ((394)

RN067 The Whitstable Society (988)

RN158 SE England Tourist Board represented by Kember Loudon Williams (2030-2035 inclusive)

RN345 Oaten Hill & District Society (2447)

- Reference in policy regarding access to transport is not realistic for rural facilities. Should read: “the proposed development would not create or exacerbate traffic problems in the area”.
- After tourism development, add: "of a high quality" to reflect para. 4.22
- Amend to provide a strong promotional stance in respect of enabling the provision and upgrading of tourism development in the plan area
- Policy should be flexible enough to respond to changing trends in tourism in Plan period
- Policy should refer to new tourist attractions, in addition to new accommodation, to reflect support in PPG21
- Delete reference to appropriate locations, as development should properly fall to be tested against the 7 criteria
- New attractions like casinos should be included in the policy
- Make all references to promoting tourism, where they affect Whitstable, subject to appropriate infrastructural and capacity improvements

Re: A4/009 Amended policy TC5

RD111 SE England Tourist Board represented by Kember Loudon Williams (20427)

- Criterion (a) has not been amended as per previous objection

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.11 While the Council has constructed a policy to include the essential criteria necessary to making good planning decisions, the objections sought would generally add non-vital emphases reflecting the objector's particular concerns, sometimes touched on elsewhere in the Plan. The two amendments made in the text between the First and Revised Deposit Drafts in response to objections seem to me quite sufficient. I find that the Plan does make a number of policy references to potential development in Whitstable in policies TC23, TC24 and TC25. I see little evidence that the Council's attitude to the town in the Plan's text is tourism-centred, and I find no planning case for any verbal alteration to meet the Whitstable Society's objection.

Recommendation

5.12 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY TC6 - LOSS OF VISITOR STAYING ACCOMMODATION - & PARAGRAPH 4.25

Objections and Key Issues

Policy TC6 – Visitor Staying Accommodation

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1867)

RN158 SE England Tourist Board represented by Kember Loudon Williams (2037-2039)

- Self catering and longer stay has a valuable role; the specific reference to short stay should be omitted
- Proper policy support should be put in place to protect tourism accommodation stock converting to residential
- Refer to need to protect existing tourist accommodation across the district, not just in town centres. Alternatively, out of town accommodation could be addressed in a separate policy
- Need robust test for assessing proposals for a loss of accommodation Criterion (a) should required applicants to demonstrate that the building cannot be adapted to minimum standards
- If accommodation is not essential to the character of the conservation area this does not diminish its value to the economy or tourism. Criterion (b) should therefore be omitted
- Criterion c) does not clarify the definition of environmental problems. Amend to: unacceptable impact on traffic levels, visual or residential amenities
- Criterion (d) does not clarify how the 'need' should be tested. Add to policy that clear evidence is required to demonstrate that the accommodation is not viable for use
- Policy should be deleted. It is too negative and will discourage new investment

Re: A4/011 Amended Policy TC6

RD079 GOSE (20185)

RD111 SE England Tourist Board represented by Kember Loudon Williams (2040-2042, 2036, 20428)

- Replace “resist” with more definitive words such as: “will not permit”
- Redevelopment of tourist facilities should be subject to robust test; add the following to policy or text.
 - a. evidence that the property has been marketed for a consistent period of 2 years at a competitive price, and that this has been undertaken through mainstream tourism publications both regionally and nationally and through appropriate agencies;
 - b. evidence of a clear and demonstrable lack of demand for the facility and that such a lack of demand is based on evidence of the preceding 3 years occupancy rates and returns;
 - c. evidence that the physical structure of the building cannot be enhanced or investment undertaken to make it suitable for continued tourism use

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.13 The Council has made significant amendments to the policy and supporting text, in response to objections at the First and Revised Deposit Draft stages. It has put forward Proposed Change PC4/002 to amend further paragraph 4.25, expanding on evidence that would be required of an applicant for development involving loss of tourist accommodation. The thrust of the policy now appears to me to be realistic and hard-headed, and it covers all the matters important for effective development control.

5.14 However, I see no good reason why a further rewording on the lines of the GOSE objection should not be made, to increase the force of the policy. The opening line would then read: “Planning permission will not be given for development involving the loss...”.

Recommendation

5.15 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC4/002, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 5.14 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY TC7 - CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT- AND PARAGRAPHS 4.26-4.29

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 4.28 – Local Cultural Strategies

RN229 Property Review & Development (2576)

- Include reference to existing service providers, such as KCC Arts and Libraries Service, who should clearly be involved in the development of such Strategies

Policy TC7 Edge of Town Centres

RN199 East Kent District Green Party (1522)

RN255 GOSE (2642)

- This encourages development which is accessible by means other than the car at odds with policy TC1
- Avoid the word “encourage”

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.16 I see no good planning reason to make any reference to particular service providers in this policy. The word “encourage” is here usefully linked to the development control intention, and can remain. I see no problem about lack of linkage to policy TC1, now that it has been amended, and policy TC1a added.

Recommendation

5.17 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY TC8 - LATE NIGHT ACTIVITY - AND PARAGRAPHS 4.30-4.33

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 4.30 – Public Safety and Crime Prevention

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2510)

- Villages need a policeman, or at least personal contact. Criminals are getting away with their actions

Paragraph 4.31 - Public Safety and Crime Prevention

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2511)

- Needs following up

Paragraph 4.33 - Public Safety and Crime Prevention

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2512)

- Children excluded from school need supervision and to be occupied not left to wander and get up to mischief

Policy TC8 – Night Time Activity

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1866)

- Policy badly worded, is too negative and conflicts with cultural objectives

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.18 The Parish Council objections are more in the nature of concerned comment than a suggested redrafting. The Council has reworded and slightly expanded the policy in a more precise way, helpful to good development control.

Recommendation

5.19 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY TC9 - ACCESS OTHER THAN BY THE PRIVATE CAR - AND PARAGRAPHS 4.34-4.36

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 4.34 – Access and Permeability

RN255 GOSE (2645)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2513)

- Cycle routes are important, one is needed in Littlebourne
- Imprecise wording

Policy TC9 – Access and Permeability

RN085 Marks & Spencer Plc represented by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (1833)

- Policy implies that a travel plan would have to be submitted. Amend policy so that it refers to 'major' new development in the opening and “where submitted” in its concluding sentence

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.20 I consider that the policy wording would be improved and meet the essence of the GOSE and Marks & Spencer objections, if the opening sentence started: “Planning proposals within the City and town centres will be assessed for their scale and impact and, where appropriate, planning permission will be dependent on the incorporation of measures to provide access to...”.

Recommendation

5.21 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 5.20 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objection.

POLICY TC10 - REGENERATION ZONE: CANTERBURY WEST STATION - AND PARAGRAPHS 4.37-4.46

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 4.37 – Canterbury City

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1865)

- dogmatic approach to Zones will discourage proposals; CPO powers rarely appropriate; reword more flexibly

Paragraph 4.40 – Regenerations Zones

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1501)

RN349 Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee (2461)

RN224 Sport England (1686)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN208 Thanet District Council (766)

- Hersden Regeneration Zone should be clearly defined and there should be a mixed use development on the Former Colliery Land.
- Acknowledge the contribution that sport can make to regeneration
- Clarify the scale of any business and retail element within identified regeneration zones
- Schemes must be designed to high standard. This priority should be emphasised

Paragraph 4.41 - Regenerations Zones

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1502)

- Hersden Regeneration Zone should be focussed entirely on the remainder of the former colliery land at Hersden.

Paragraph 4.42 - Regenerations Zones

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1503)

- Essential requirements of the Council for the Hersden Regeneration Zone should be broadly identified now.

Re: A4/013 New Paragraph 4.42a - Section 106 Agreements

RD095 House Builders Federation (20236)

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20373)

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20552)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20631)

- Objects to suspense account approach as partial solution in cases where development & associated facilities will bring forward major environmental improvements & community benefits
- Proposal to set up funds into which developer contributions are put is contrary to C1/97 - conflicts with the 5 tests of reasonableness. Ultra vires
- Re funding: add community & cultural facilities; reword to clarify purpose of suspense account

Paragraph 4.44 - Regenerations Zones

RN012 Smith (308, 309)

- Text should include reference to the land next to the tunnel on station road west. This land is used to dump rubbish, is dangerous to pedestrians and should be improved.
- Text should include the improvement of the tunnel under the railway into Hackington Place (outside the RZ)

Policy TC10 – Canterbury West Regeneration Zone

RN025 Cutler (650)

RN186 Strutt & Parker (175)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (248)

RN224 Sport England (2666)

RN225 Telereal Developments Ltd Represented By RPS (1202)

RN285 Strategic Rail Authority (828)

- Concerned about the existing development around Canterbury West station. Hotel possibly OK but must have safeguards as to noise and traffic and a building of suitable scale
- Extend Canterbury West Station Regeneration Zone to include land at Kirby's Lane/Station Road West
- Enhance the access routes between the station and the City Centre
- Proposals for the Regeneration Zone must not prejudice the strategic objectives of the rail network
- Existing uses in these Regeneration Zones should remain
- Sport can play a part in this regeneration
- Don't say that proposals produced before completion of frameworks are premature

Re: A4/015 Amended Policy TC10

RD059 Baker (20124)

RD086 Sport England (20308)

RD095 House Builders Federation (20237)

RD124 Stansfield (20343, 20344)

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20553)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20632)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20713)

- Last sentence of Policy contrary to C1/97 & C6/98 e.g. 5 tests of reasonableness
- Add an additional provision for a development framework which should be subject to a public consultation

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- The Policy should make reference to fast rail links, heritage and amenity
- Amendment inconsistent with fast rail link proposals (A7/074). Policy incompatible with proper development of Canterbury West Station for reasons including deletion of historic importance of the station, insufficient parking and excessive housing
- Site poorly suited to housing & should be promoted for employment use
- Mention provision of recreation either on this site or off-site; site has a notional capacity of 40 housing units
- Make reference to contributions being made, if necessary, towards any additional community facilities e.g. such places which arise directly from development. Add "community facilities" after "affordable housing"
- Restore the part of Policy TC10 relating to element of public car parking in Cant West RZ. Essential in light of Strategic Rail Authority's proposals for fast train services
- Proposals for this area should await the decisions on the high speed rail link, and relate to that enhanced transport facility

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.22 The Council's essential concept of Regeneration Zones in gateway areas outside the inner city is not seriously questioned, but the details are naturally the subject of objections, some of which are more in the nature of comments, suggestions or specific queries. The Council has extended the area to include an area of Kirby's Lane and Station Road West. This Plan does not pretend to identify any real matters of detail, apart from the Plan allocations shown within a particular Regeneration Zone on the Proposals Map; detailed guidance – mix of uses, design, access, landscaping and sustainability – will be achieved through yet to be devised Planning Frameworks. At site level, development briefs and CPOs will be used.
- 5.23 The new paragraph 4.42a on financial contributions made though planning obligations has attracted objections, but I do not find that this necessarily broad text raises any fundamental conflict with the five tests concerning reasonableness set down in para.B2 of Annex B to Circular 1/97.
- 5.24 A major unknown element at the time of the Inquiry was the precise impact on domestic rail services following completion of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link. Any detailed design and layout of the kind of new office-type development broadly allocated in the existing parking area around the Canterbury West station will not be possible until 2007, probably later. However, even if the future brings about a radical change in the importance of the rail station, with a need for more parking and better access, the Plan's text has the inbuilt flexibility to cope with altered circumstances. Nevertheless, it would be appropriate and helpful to Plan users for the supporting text leading up to Policy TC10 to mention the uncertainties in the earlier part of the Plan period, stemming from lack of precise knowledge about the consequences of CTRL completion. Otherwise I see no need to amend the Plan in respect of the employment or housing allocations within this Regeneration Zone where they are mentioned elsewhere in the Plan text.

Recommendation

- 5.25 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 5.24 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

POLICY TC11 - REGENERATION ZONE: KINGSMEAD AND RIVERSIDE AREA - AND PARAGRAPHS 4.47-4.48

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 4.47 – Kingsmead and Riverside

RN228 Kent County Council (1652)
● Clarify the transport function of the riverside corridor

Re: A4/016 Amended paragraph 4.48

RD110 PACE (20426)
● Previous objection reiterated

Policy TC11 – Kingsmead and Riverside Regeneration Zone

RN061 PACE (37)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1870)

RN160 Brade (1897)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (247)

RN209 PACE (781, 782)

RN224 Sport England (2667)

RN225 Telereal Developments Ltd Represented By RPS (1203)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2588)

RN237 St. Peters Association (2047)

- Regeneration in the Kingsmead and Riverside area should concentrate on employment, rather than residential. The existing uses in this are an important resource for the city
- Housing here contrary to PPG25 in an area at risk of flooding. There is other land on the site that should remain as it is
- Proposed footpath along River Stour below Dalgety Mill shouldn't be instigated. Will be detrimental to wildlife and isn't recognising indication in paragraph 6.125 that otters are protected. Policy NE2 is not being applied
- Provision should be made for a multi-use stadium in the Kingsmead Area.
- Regeneration of the Kingsmead area should not lead to a reduction in green areas, report states underprovision
- Unhappy that 'Bus Company Island' & neighbouring Kingsmead School playing field are included in regeneration zone. Are inner city green areas & should be retained as such
- Conflict between para. 6.124 and this policy. Path should not be extended beyond Dalgety Mill. This is a pristine stretch of river and access would be detrimental to wildlife e.g. otters
- Don't say that proposals produced before completed frameworks are premature
- Sport can play a part in this regeneration

Re: A4/018 Amended Policy TC11

RD126 Pelham Homes Ltd represented by Jennifer Owen & Associates (20374)

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20554)

- Make clear the proportion of the various proposed uses within the overall development
- Refer to need for contributions towards additional community facilities arising directly from development. Add text at end re including necessary contributions towards community facilities after development brief

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.26 A Draft Development Brief for Kingsmead was produced during the Inquiry in May 2004 (CD9.9), but had not been adopted before the end of my Inquiry. The Draft says that an approved brief would be adopted as supplementary planning guidance. Given its probable adoption by the time my report is received by the Council, this Brief may induce the Council to some further updating of the Plan text. However, the Plan is not the place for a detailed exposition of planning proposals in the Regeneration Zones, even if all the Development Briefs were available before Plan adoption, and I consider that the existing text, together with the allocations on the Proposals Map are sufficient.

5.27 None of the individual matters raised in the objections appears to me so fundamental that it should be specifically put into the Plan text, either as something to be avoided or specifically aimed at. I have in mind two matters in particular. The first is any kind of dogmatic statement that employment development should be the paramount aim, with an emphasis on offices. The second is specific proscriptions on what should happen in undeveloped areas. The fact that the Council is the principal landowner in the Zone strengthens my feelings on that point. The matter of contributions is better dealt with through Policy IMP2 in the Plan's Chapter Eight.

5.28 What is written in the Draft Brief about the balance of open, as opposed to developed land, and the whole range of concerns about the nature conservation and ecology, seem to me to underline an enlightened approach to regeneration in this urbanised location. Having walked around the area, I am unable to share the PACE view that a proposed cycle and footpath along the south bank of the Stour need be intrinsically damaging to the local wildlife and habitats – the way that it is done is the key factor.

Recommendation

5.29 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY TC12 - REGENERATION ZONE: ST GEORGE'S TO CANTERBURY EAST – AND PARAGRAPHS 4.49-4.51

Objections and Key Issues

Policy TC12 – St George's to Canterbury East Regeneration Zone

- RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (249)
- RN224 Sport England (2668)
- RN225 Telereal Developments Ltd Represented By RPS (1204)
- RN255 GOSE (2646)
- RN285 Strategic Rail Authority (829)
- RN345 Oaten Hill & District Society (2441)

- Proposals for Regeneration Zone must not prejudice the strategic objectives of the rail network
- This area should be retained for employment uses and is not suited for additional housing.
- Don't say proposals produced before completed frameworks are premature
- Say sport can play a part in this regeneration

Re: A4/021 Amended Policy TC12

- RD079 GOSE (20175)
- RD086 Sport England (20310)
- RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20633)
- RD149 Network Rail (20728)
- Delete references to housing in Policy TC12
- The word "appropriate" makes the Policy unclear
- Policy must mention provision of recreation either on this site or off-site, even though the site has a notional capacity of 24 housing units

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.30 The Council has already expanded the text of the policy, in response to representations made to the First Deposit Draft, and it appears to me generally adequate for its purpose and uncontentious. The exception is the GOSE objection, which has substance. I consider that the last sentence of the Policy would end better if reworded to say: "...the Development Brief and, dependent on the scale and location of a particular development, to enhance the entrances to the City, improve pedestrian links and ease traffic congestion".

Recommendation

5.31 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 5.30 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

POLICY TC13 - REGENERATION ZONE: WINCHEAP AREA – AND PARAGRAPHS 4.52-4.53a

Objections and Key Issues

Re: A4/022 –New paragraph 4.53a

RD025 McCalla (20059)

RD026 Upward (20060)

RD027 Upward (20061)

RD028 Hawkins (20062)

RD029 Stobbs (20063)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20634)

- Objects to inclusion of floodplain in Wincheap Regeneration Zone - should be a nature reserve
- Delete references to housing, as site falls within floodplain
- Do not include water meadows in Wincheap Regeneration Zone. Important wildlife habitat/part of river valley

Policy TC13 – Wincheap Regeneration Zone

RN179 Kent Wildlife Trust (188)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (250)

RN224 Sport England (2669)

RN225 Telereal Developments Ltd Represented By RPS (1205, 1206)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2587)

RN262 Lenleys (2227)

RN285 Strategic Rail Authority (830)

RN315 Blean Parish Council (2303)

- Don't say proposals produced before completed frameworks are premature; requirement for provision of gyratory in relation to residential development of Telephone House should not be responsibility of this development alone
- Land north-west of the Wincheap industrial estate to the Canterbury/Ashford railway and adjacent to the A2 should be re-designated for North Canterbury Park & Ride, Parkway St. and Coach Park and included in Wincheap Regeneration Zone
- Wincheap now very unattractive, but has potential to be turned into a good retail park. There is no evidence, however, that the warehousing and non retailing businesses are to be re-sited
- Refer in preamble to policy to the Site of Nature Conservation Interest, and need to make provision for it in redevelopment of the Wincheap area
- Amend boundary to take account of the floodplain; open space beside the river to be retained; the nature conservation interest and footpath along the river

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Proposals for Zone must not prejudice the strategic objectives of the rail network
- Any substantial increase in housing levels in this area is likely to put strains on existing local schools through the increased demand for places; a new site may be needed if the housing level is high
- This is a location for industry and warehousing, and an area at risk of flooding. It is not suitable for additional housing
- Sport can play a part in this regeneration

Re: A4/023 – Amended policy TC13

RD127 Telereal Development Ltd Represented By RPS (20381, 20384)

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20556)

- Inappropriate in TC13 to require all developments to provide a mix of uses. It should 'encourage' but not 'require' as it could prevent wholly acceptable schemes. Requiring compliance with a brief will also delay redevelopment
- The requirement to contribute to traffic management schemes should be clarified. Contributions would not be appropriate to schemes which result in a net reduction in traffic numbers
- Amendments should make refer to contributions towards other necessary infrastructure. Last sentence add “and other necessary infrastructure”

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.32 The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC4/003 adding text to new Paragraph 4.53a about open space on the Great Stour, and making it clear that not all the Zone is seen as development land. I have no reason to think that the Council is mistaken in seeing no need to extend the Zone, in the way that Blean PC wishes. The Council's strong wording in the Policy, about requiring mixed uses in new development, are clearly explained in the supporting text. Other objections are really seeking a level of detail or change that will be better and more fully addressed through the master-planning stages, where public input will be sought. The matter of contributions is better dealt with through Policy IMP2 in the Plan's Chapter Eight.

Recommendation

5.33 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC4/003, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

NEW POLICY TC13a – DEVELOPMENT TO MEET IDENTIFIED LOCAL NEED AND OBJECTIVES

Objections and Key Issues

Re: A4/025

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20557)

- Support in principle. Should be reference to contributions being made towards any additional community facilities e.g. such places arising directly from development. Add to end: “including appropriate additional community facilities”

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.34 I see no reason question the Council's response: that this matter will be addressed through local partnerships and the Community Plan, if such a need is identified.

Recommendation

5.35 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

POLICIES TC14, TC15 & TC16 - LARGE FOOD/NON-FOOD SHOPPING AND RETAIL WAREHOUSING - AND PARAGRAPHS 4.54-4.57

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 4.54 – Retail Development

RN315 Blean Parish Council (2299)

RN228 Kent County Council (1631)

- Retail at Wincheap and Sturry contribute to congestion. Further retail should be considered carefully, instead of the present mixture of retail sites in an 'ad hoc' combination across the district
- The proposed policies for retail development at Whitstable and Herne Bay should reflect PPG6 and be amended to be consistent with policies for Canterbury

Paragraph 4.56 - Retail Development

RN299 Chartwell Land Plc represented by Drivers Jonas (2253)

RN227 B&Q Plc Represented By RPS (1669)

RN208 Thanet District Council (765, 771)

- Criteria for retail development should be augmented to include impact on viability and vitality on other town centres in East Kent, in particular with Thanet & include a need test for further retail development
- The Council should not place undue weight upon the Colliers retail assessment, and flexibility should be incorporated into the Plan
- The Plan should indicate that quantitative need is only one element of the need test in PPG6 for retail floorspace. Make reference to other potential indicators of need that may justify more provision
- Welcomes approach of not having new retail allocations but feels it is illogical to then have policies stating what would happen should retail proposals occur. Should have a restriction on extra retail

Re: A4/041 – New paragraph 4.57a

RD037 Peacock & Smith (20193)

- Para 4.57a 1st sentence should be amended to ensure consistency with PPG6, case law & ministerial statements regarding demonstrating need in out of town, not town, centre. Add to 1st sentence: “in out of centre locations”

Policy TC14 – Large Retail Development within City Centre

RN085 Marks & Spencer Plc represented by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (1834)

RN208 Thanet District Council (762)

RN227 B&Q Plc Represented By RPS (1670)

RN262 Lenleys (2228)

- Need should be incorporated into the assessment, retail nodes should be deleted
- Welcomes approach set out in para 4.56 of not having new retail allocations; illogical to then have a policy stating what would happen should retail proposals occur
- The retail nodes on Sturry Road are not very extensive. The area should be extended into Marshwood Close, Vauxhall Road, Westminster Road and Broad Oak
- Policy does not make provision for out of centre development, if no sequentially preferable are suitable or available

Re: A4/030 – Reworded Policy TC14

RD037 Peacock & Smith (20194)

RD063 B&Q Plc Represented By RPS (20132)

RD102 Highways Agency (20264)

RD134 English Heritage (20508)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Re-worded Policy TC14 suggests proposals might be acceptable where environmental objectives are not met. Delete the second "or" and replace with "and"
- Policy TC14: add new criterion e) The proposed development does not have a detrimental effect on the highway network in terms of congestion and road safety. Safeguards operation of highway network & facilitates offsite, developer-funded improvements
- Final paragraph of Policy TC14 is unnecessary as other Policy deal with this
- Objects to Policy TC14 applying to all proposals over 1000sqm regardless of location + need to demonstrate a quantitative & qualitative need. Suggests alternative wording

Policy TC15 – Large Retail Development at Edge of Centre

RN084 WM Morrison Supermarkets plc (1929, 1930)

RN084 Marks & Spencer plc (1835-1838)

RN208 Thanet District Council (763)

RN227 B&Q Plc Represented By RPS (1671)

- Object to policy. Criterion (e) is unclear and may not be applicable to edge of centre developments. This should be deleted from the policy
- The policy should include the demonstration of need
- Welcomes approach set out in para 4.56 of not having new retail allocations but illogical to then have a policy stating what would happen should retail proposals occur
- Object to policy. Criterion (f) should be amended to read that ' the type of goods sold does not significantly harm the vitality and viability of the city centre'

Policy TC16 – Large Retail Development outside the City Centre

NN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (395)

RN084 WM Morrison Supermarkets plc (1931)

RN084 Marks & Spencer plc (1840-1845)

RN208 Thanet District Council (770)

RN227 B&Q Plc Represented By RPS (1672)

- Need should be incorporated into the retail assessment. A single policy should be used for TC14-16
- Object to policy. Criterion (e) should be amended to read 'The type of goods sold does not significantly harm the vitality and viability of the city centre'
- Welcomes approach set out in para 4.56 of not having new retail allocations; illogical to then have a policy stating what would happen should retail proposals occur

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.36 The Council has radically revised this section, making it accord with national policy guidance in PPG6 and the adopted Structure Plan, devising a new single policy TC14 to replace the three in the First Deposit Draft, and expanding the supporting text to explain better the local context in which the new single the policy is framed. In response to a Highways Agency objection, the Council has put forward Proposed Change PC4/004, adding a new criterion (e) to TC14, to take account of any adverse effects on the highway network. I consider the new text in the Revised Deposit Draft is both clear and helpful, and that no other alteration suggested by objectors is needed.

Recommendation

5.37 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No.PC4/004, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY TC17 – LOCAL CENTRES WITHIN CANTERBURY CITY

Objections and Key Issues

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1869)

- TC17(e) is unnecessary and should be deleted

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.38 I consider that criterion (e) is highly useful for effective development control when a planning application is under consideration.

Recommendation

5.39 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

POLICY TC18 - CITY QUARTERS - AND PARAGRAPHS 4.59-4.66

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 4.59 – Quarters

RN229 Property Review & Development (2582)

- Involve all parties in proposals, where education and other social and community facilities provided by KCC play a key role in maintaining the vitality and character of these areas

Policy TC18 - Quarters

RN255 GOSE (2635)

RN322 English Heritage (1781)

- Alter “will be resisted”
- While the policy refers to the need to respect other policies in the Plan, an open-ended commitment to 'more of the same' may need to be reconsidered

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.40 I find the aim of the Policy essentially laudable and support it, while recognising that the whole matter is intensely subjective. Thus my support is accompanied by a hope that the Council's judgements will be infallibly wise. To meet the GOSE point, which I sympathise with, I consider the sentiments in the Policy would be further strengthened if reworded as: “Planning permission will be given for proposals that strengthen the individual characteristics and distinctiveness of the City, unless they would cause specific environmental problems, or conflict with other policies in the Local Plan. Similarly, proposals that demonstrably weaken the characteristics and distinctiveness of these areas will be refused planning permission”. There is no need or requirement to expand the text to mention matters that appear to cause the County Council concern, as I see no harm to its interests or powers arising from the text.

Recommendation

5.41 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 5.40 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICIES TC19, TC20 & TC21 - HERNE BAY - AND PARAGRAPHS 4.67-4.70

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 4.70 – Herne Bay

RN086 Thomas (441)

- There is a need for a more ambitious strategy to upgrade the quite inadequate level of retail provision within Herne Bay and attract major retailers

Policy TC19 – Herne Bay Leisure and Tourism

RN320 JTS Partnership (1995)

- Policy TC19 should include a reference to the proposals map inset 3, as well as inset 4

Policy TC20 – Hotel allocation Herne Bay Golf Club

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (396, 397)

RN274 Davis (1738)

- Object to allocation at Herne Bay Golf Club for a hotel. Blacksole Farm Business Park would be a better hotel location.
- A park and Ride at Herne Bay Golf Club is unnecessary

Policy TC21 – Mixed use allocation Serco Nursery Eddington

RN274 Davis (1739)

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2393)

- The Serco nursery site should be safeguarded for woodland and extension of the cemetery
- The adjacent woodland at the Serco Nursery site should be reserved for community use or as an extension to the cemetery. If the Council decides to allocate for housing it should be affordable housing

Re: A4/034 – Amended policy TC21

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20636)

- Delete reference to residential site; should be retained in employment use

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.42 Herne Bay undoubtedly has tangible problems: an observable lack of economic vitality, and an obvious perception by many retailers that it is not a good location for branches of national multiple stores. The Council's evidence is that it intends to produce a Regeneration Action Plan for Herne Bay, and will continue to employ a Town Centre manager, but it correctly stresses that the nearby presence of Canterbury will always influence retailers' intentions, even if sustained effective action is undertaken. All this suggests that the best opportunities lie in action to improve tourism, business, culture and leisure facilities.

5.43 These three policies address aspects of that problem in what seem to me uncontroversial ways. The Council's evidence refers to the existence of a recent planning permission for a 50-bed hotel at the Herne Bay Golf Club, while the Blacksole Farm site enjoys a 2003 planning permission for a business park with extensive landscaping. It is within this latter area assigned for landscaping that Kitewood Estates aspire to build an hotel. The economics of hotel building are very often difficult to grasp. The Council has mentioned consultants' conclusion, in a 2003 survey for the County Council and East Kent District Councils, that there is no case for pursuing hotel development at Herne Bay, although it also refers to anecdotal indications of demand for business related accommodation. I see no convincing reason to alter the wording of Policy TC20 about the hotel – which may

reasonably hope to capitalise on a golf club location as an attractor for functions and conference business – or to remove the reference to a Park and Ride facility there.

- 5.44 As to objections to development on the Serco site, there is planning permission for mixed development on part of the site, which is previously developed land, and reported expectations of more development if and when Serco leaves the site in the next few years. I find that the development of this previously developed land, made vacant in the construction of part of the A299, is no longer a controversial planning matter.

Recommendation

- 5.45 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICIES TC23, TC24 & TC25 – WHITSTABLE – AND PARAGRAPHS 4.76-4.79

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 4.76 - Whitstable

RN067 Whitstable Society (690)

- Character of Whitstable should be preserved & enhanced but it won't necessarily always be associated with oyster fishing and may share in knowledge industries located in Canterbury area. Redraft paragraph.

Policy TC24 – The Norsebridge mixed development proposals

RN010 Wilks (366)

- Land known as the Oval at Reeves Beach should be kept as open space and protected as such.

Re: A4/035 – Amended Policy TC24

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20635)

- These sites should be retained in employment use, and res4 uses deleted or significantly reduced

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.46 It is my personal hope that Whitstable will always be associated with the oyster trade, but the planning background set down in paragraphs 4.76-4.79 seems to set down much more than an historical sketch, and is welcoming to new enterprises in mixed-use development at named areas. I see no great need for textual change, and the mixed use approach seems eminently sensible, but the Council might think it appropriate to make brief reference to the significant Wraik Hill office node allocation at the town's edge. The Council also confirms that The Oval area is to be understood as covered by Policy TC24, and that a re-developed site should provide public open space and access to the seafront.

Recommendation

- 5.47 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 5.46 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY TC26 - THE HERNE BAY AND WHITSTABLE GREEN GAP - AND PARAGRAPH 4.80

Objections and Key Issues

Re: A4/037 – New paragraph 4.80a

RD020 Wilks (20051)

RD080 Whitley (20444)

- Para 4.80a Delete from "...open use of the land to buildings ancillary to the use of the land" , This will start with a pavilion and lead to numerous buildings, leaving a small amount of open space.
- Omit reference to proposal for sports/football academy. Green gap may be suitable for playing fields, integrity threatened by construction of such or academy. Erode open character & function of green gap

Policy TC26 – Herne Bay and Whitstable Green Gap

RN033 Maydowns Road Residents Association (89)

RN067 Whitstable Society (689)

RN160 Brade (1894, 1895, 1896)

RN216 Symons (811)

RN217 Skilton (816)

- Allows scope for spurious diverse leisure uses, requiring permanent buildings. Plan should state that leisure uses will be limited to those not needing permanent development & development should be limited to temporary structures such as marquees etc
- Playing fields could be an appropriate use, but not a major educational establishment
- Policy is too sketchy: a need to identify sites especially for the youth and children of the district. Canterbury City Youth Football Club have a location need here, and land east of Estuary Close is appropriate

Re: A4/038 – Amended Policy TC26

RD020 Wilks (20052)

RD080 Whitley (20443)

RD099 Maydowns Road Residents Association (20259)

- Amendment considerably weakens Council's support for green gap by inserting "material". Words are ambiguous
- Criterion (a): delete "material" and do not reinstate "significant". Part b) reinstate "and"

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.48 I support the Green Gap principle and comment on it more generally under Policy R7 in my Chapter Six. I find a Green Gap to be imperative in this very vulnerable area, separating two seaside towns that have been allowed to sprawl very close to each other. I can also see the strength of an argument that active leisure and recreation may be a better preservation mechanism for retaining openness in the long term than a more passive status such as un-farmed open land (even taking account of the motor travel and parking implications of such a use). Consequently, I have looked at the text to see how it might be vulnerable to interpretation by an advocate of more active development than the Council envisages. It is a fact of life that unless the Council specifies "no development at all", there will be argument as to what constitutes "significant" or "material" development. I think that the last paragraph and the three criteria in the Policy are complementary; they contain enough elaboration of the Council's concept to enable it to rebuff proposals for more than truly ancillary and inconspicuous building in the Gap. That will not, of course, prevent those advocating excessive proposals from defending the indefensible, but I believe the Policy should prove adequate to allow the Council to prevail in any planning appeal if it refuses an unsuitable application.

Recommendation

5.49 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

PARAGRAPHS 4.81-4.83 & NEW POLICY TC26A - OUT OF TOWN RETAIL DEVELOPMENT IN HERNE BAY AND WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

Re: A4/039

RD063 B&Q Plc Represented By RPS (20133)
RD102 Highways Agency (20265)
RD134 English Heritage (20509)

- Add new criterion (e): “the proposed development does not have a detrimental effect on the highway network in terms of congestion and road safety”
- Final paragraph of TC26a is unnecessary, as other policies deals with this
- As worded, final para. of TC26a suggests proposals might be acceptable where environmental objectives are not met. Delete the second “or”; replace with “and”

Reasoning and Conclusions

5.50 This Policy follows the model devised for TC14 in the Revised Deposit Draft, making it accord with national policy guidance in PPG6 (subsequently overtaken by PPS6 of 2005) and the adopted Structure Plan. As in TC14, the Council has acceded to the Highways Agency objection, and put forward Proposed Change PC4/005, adding a new criterion (e) to Policy TC26a to take account of any adverse effects on the highway network.

5.51 I consider that the final paragraph sends out a useful and legitimate planning message to a potential developer. In the context of the whole Plan text, I find no implication in the wording that environmental objectives could be shirked.

Recommendation

5.52 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC4/005 as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

CHAPTER SIX

6. OBJECTIONS TO THE CHAPTER ON PROMOTING OUR COUNTRYSIDE

POLICY R1 - CONVERSION OF BUILDINGS IN THE OPEN COUNTRYSIDE - AND PREAMBLE IN PARAGRAPHS 5.1-5.12

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 5.1 Our Objectives

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2338)

- Emphasis on tourism is wrong

Paragraph 5.4 – Local Needs Housing in the Countryside

RN103 McCabe (548, 549)

- Affordable housing should only be through a housing trust with a survey through KRCC

Paragraph 5.8 - Residential Extensions in the Countryside

RN199 East Kent District Green Party (1523)

- What logic is it to ensure extensions should be subservient to the scale of the original building?

Policy R1 – Conversion of agricultural or rural buildings

RN120 English Nature (469)

RN226 BT Group Plc Represented By RPS (1681)

RN270 The Church Commissioners for England represented by Cluttons (1985)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2515)

- Add "any conditions should be enforced"
- Farm buildings often serve as bat roosts: include reference to retention of roosts
- Unclear if all the criteria in policy R1 must be satisfied, or just one category
- Policy makes no allowance for enhancement by conversion or replacement of a building which does not meet the R1(a) definition
- Clarification needed between the conversion of buildings in the open countryside and those near to existing settlements
- Criterion (a) is too excessive and not supported by PPG7. Amend Policy and delete criterion (a)

Re: A5/005 – Reworded Policy R1

RD097 English Nature (20244)

RD092 BT Group Plc Represented By RPS (20223)

- Important that R1 reflects guidance in PPG7 & allows consideration of viable alternatives to prevent buildings becoming vacant & falling into dereliction. Policy would restrict development
- Make specific reference to bats as set out in original objection

Reasoning and Conclusions

6.1 The Council has made a number of textual alterations to the words in Policy R1, in response to the First Deposit Draft objections, and the redrafted policy wording and supporting text accords very well with what is said in paras. 17-18 of PPS7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, which appeared in 2004. The text strikes a good balance between avoiding harm to the local rural context and not standing in the way of benign, sustainable development. I find that the English Nature objection about bat habitats has been satisfactorily dealt with by textual change in new paragraph 5.12b and a re-worded Policy NE1.

Recommendation

6.2 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY R2 – NEW AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT – AND PARAGRAPHS 5.13-5.16

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 5.13 – A Working Countryside

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2349)

- It is felt that the government does not really care about agricultural prosperity (but does towards supermarkets)

Policy R2 – New Agricultural Buildings

RN103 McCabe (550)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2516)

- Add "any conditions should be enforced."
- Add (d): "the new building should have a proven economic need"

Re: A5/008 – Amended Policy R2

RD134 English Heritage (20510)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20710)

- (d) re impact on the setting of heritage, add: "and their settings where appropriate"
- (a) - this goes beyond the GDPO provisions

Reasoning and Conclusions

6.3 The Council has put forward Further Amendment FA5/004, which deletes an erroneous "or" separating criteria (a) and (b) in Policy R2. The Revised Deposit Draft text strikes a good balance overall between accommodating demonstrable agricultural needs and avoiding harm to existing buildings of character and the rural surroundings. Nevertheless, I consider that criterion (b) would be strengthened and made more clear if rephrased to read:

"(b) the proposal avoids harm to its physical setting by its siting, scale, design, materials and external colours;"

Recommendation

6.4 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment No. FA5/004 as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 6.3 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY R3 - AGRICULTURAL DIVERSIFICATION - AND PARAGRAPHS 5.17-5.19

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 5.17 – Agricultural Diversification and Rural Enterprise

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2350)

- It is felt that the government does not really care about agricultural prosperity (but does towards supermarkets)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Paragraph 5.19 – Protecting the Best Agricultural land

RN010 Wilks (333)

- New policy should state: Grades 1 & 2 agricultural land will not be permitted for any development except changes to organic farming

Re: A5/011 – New paragraph 5.18a Rural Diversification

RD088 South Canterbury Trust represented by J & J Design (20306)

- Object to omission of tourism and community re-uses to paragraph 5.18a. Include these as acceptable uses for conversion of redundant buildings

Re: A5/013 – New paragraph 5.18c Rural Diversification

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (2044)

- Para 5.18c after “agricultural” add “or fish (farming) purposes”

Policy R3 – Rural Diversification

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2517)

- Agree with policy but add “any conditions should be enforced”

Re: A5/014 – Reworded Policy R3

RD088 South Canterbury Trust represented by J & J Design (20305)

RD134 English Heritage (20511)

- (f) fails to recognise that the impact on the setting of heritage sites. Add “and their settings where appropriate”
- Omission of explicit reference to tourism or community uses inconsistent with Policy R1 which advises that these are preferable to residential conversions. Add 'or provide for tourism or community uses'

Reasoning and Conclusions

6.5 What is said in paragraph 5.19 about protecting the best agricultural land accords with what is said on this important matter in PPS7's paras. 28 and 29. Given the high incidence of land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification within the District, any stronger statement would be very impractical. This is because the Local Plan inevitably has to take some of this high value land when the Council has no alternative but to make allocations elsewhere than on previously developed land, or on undeveloped land within an Urban Area Boundary.

6.6 The Council has put forward two Proposed Changes. PC5/001 adds mention of community facilities to the third sentence of paragraph 5.18. PC5/002 amends new Paragraph 5.18a, adding tourism and community uses to the favoured categories of uses. I consider that these Proposed Changes are adequate to give religious bodies like the South Canterbury Trust a legitimate reason to use Policy R3 in pursuit of their interests, and that no specific change to the Policy text is necessary. I see no good planning reason to make mention of fish farming, a specialised activity, within a section of the Plan dealing with rural and agricultural matters.

6.7 I think that there would be no harm and some possible planning usefulness in redrafting the end of criterion (f) to read: “...nature conservation interest, or on sites of architectural or historic importance, or their settings where appropriate; and...”.

Recommendation

6.8 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes Nos. PC5/001 and PC5/002, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 6.7 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY R4 - RURAL DIVERSIFICATION - AND PARAGRAPHS 5.20-5.21

Objections and Key Issues

Policy R4 – New Buildings in the Countryside

RN080 Dover District Council (1560)

RN120 English Nature (470)

RN278 South Canterbury Trust represented by J & J Design (1766)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2518)

- The list of criteria would be more appropriate in a general policy as it is important to read the Plan as a whole
- Amend Policy to include; "or meet local needs for community facilities including places of worship"
- Size should be related to what is needed. No executive houses for managers, and should be protected from any change of use not connected with the rural economy
- Amend to refer to nature interests

Re: A5/016 – Reworded Policy R4

RD088 South Canterbury Trust represented by J & J Design (20303, 20304)

RD134 English Heritage (20512)

- Policy R4 d) fails to recognise that the impact on the setting of heritage sites could also be important. Add the words: "and their settings where appropriate"
- Policy omits any explicit reference to tourism or community uses. This is inconsistent with text at paragraph 5.18, which acknowledges local community needs. Add 'and tourism or community uses' to Policy R4.
- Criterion (c) should read 'use', not 're-use' - typographical error

Reasoning and Conclusions

6.9 The Council's redrafting of the Policy in the Revised Deposit Draft accords well with PPS7. Changes include an adequate reference to nature interests. An error is put right by Proposed Change PC5/003, deleting "re-use" from criterion "c". As to the objection of the South Canterbury Trust, I see no reason to mention community facilities or places of worship in the Policy. The Council has put forward a more logical change, which should meet the objector's essential planning needs; this is in Chapter Seven of the Plan, through a new paragraph following 7.58 (Further Amendment No. FA7/003), which I discuss in due course.

6.10 As in Policy R3, I do think that there would be no harm and some possible planning use in redrafting the end of criterion (d) to read: "...nature conservation interest, or on sites of architectural or historic importance, or their settings where appropriate; and...".

Recommendation

6.11 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC5/003, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 6.10 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

NEW POLICY R5a – SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS - AND PARAGRAPH 5.23-5.29

Objections and Key Issues

Re: A5/019 – paragraph 5.23 Protected Countryside

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20637)

- Add: “in so far as it exists”

Re: A5/020 – new Policy R5a

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20709)

- Should the second line of the second part read “over other planning considerations”?

Reasoning and Conclusions

6.12 The Council has met the BSF objection by putting forward Proposed Change PC5/004, amending new Policy R5a by removing the words “landscape planning considerations”, and substituting “planning considerations”. No other alteration is necessary.

Recommendation

I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC5/004, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY R6 - AREAS OF HIGH LANDSCAPE VALUE - AND PARAGRAPHS 5.23-5.32

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 5.30 – Areas of High Landscape Value

RN023 Foreman (639, 640)

- Green Gaps or AHLV policy should also cover area immediately to north of Popes Lane and Hawe Lane, Sturry to prevent development spreading to ancient woodland & high landscape area to the north
- Parts of the Broad Oak valley presently uncovered by AHLV should be designated as AHLV

Policy R6 – Areas of High Landscape Value

RN080 Dover District Council (1559)

RN103 McCabe (551)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1583)

RN152 University of Kent at Canterbury represented by BSF Planning Consultants (951)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2602)

RN242 R & P Marshall (2071)

RN322 English Heritage (1782)

- The AHLV is too general and restrictive, and should not be used as a means to stop development. The AHLV also ignores the 8 landscape character areas
- Those parts of the Campus of the University of Kent not in the City's valley setting should not be in the AHLV
- Add that the countryside has its own intrinsic value
- This policy could place unnecessary constraint on Blean Primary and Simon Langton Boys School. Add a caveat to policy; "unless there is an overriding need for the development."
- The archaeological heritage is worthy of a mention in support of preserving the existing landscape character
- Amend the boundary, as these are broad areas, containing opportunities for the diversity of sites within it
- There is conflict with Policy R11. The inconsistency creates confusion, and development proposals would have to meet different tests

Re: A5/023 – Amended Policy R6 AHLV

RD134 English Heritage (20517)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20712)

- Object to inclusion of historic setting within the criteria.
- Could be less ambiguous if reference was made to historic significance rather than setting in this instance

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.13 I have considered many objections classified by the Council as being made to this Policy in my findings on particular omission sites. An Area of High Landscape Value around Canterbury is a lower order, local landscape designation, inaugurated at District Council level. It is not analogous to a Green Belt, with a very strong presumption against most activity other than agriculture or forestry. It is seen by the Council as an area definition, within which normal open countryside policies obtain, identifying some specific landscape character and/or role that must be taken into account when any development is contemplated.
- 6.14 Inspector O'Rourke's 1997 report on her Local Plan Inquiry first considered this topic. She recommended that the Council carry out a landscape assessment to determine the landscape qualities, function and boundaries of the following areas: (i) the valley setting to the City of Canterbury; and (ii) Chislet Marshes. She recommended certain defined exclusions from those two definitions, but did not otherwise make boundary definitions. She required the Council to consider rigorously the function of and justification for the proposed designation of Area of High Landscape Value. She wanted any AHLV policy to "refer to the definition of the areas considered to have local landscape importance in terms of the particular quality/qualities of their landscape and the special landscape function they perform". She held that the policy approach should not preclude development, including diversification, but it would have to indicate necessary measures if development was permitted in the Areas. The wording of her recommendation left it clear that a defined AHLV could have two reasons for designation. One reason was that it possesses a landscape quality, revealed through the landscape assessment she required to be carried out. The other reason which might – but did not have to – coincide with landscape quality, was that an area had a special landscape role to perform in the control of development.
- 6.15 Inspector O'Rourke's report mentioned the conclusions of the EIP Panel, after it had considered the City Council's case for designating Special Landscape Areas in the Great and Little Stour Valleys and the Chislet Marshes, following the EIP into the Third Review of the Structure Plan in April 1994. She noted that "while the Panel considered that the areas contain many attractive features and were of great interest for their historical connections and in terms of nature conservation, they could not accept that, in landscape terms, either area could be described as unspoilt, nor could they define a common and consistent character in them".
- 6.16 My many site visits inside and outside Canterbury City have given me a familiarity with the surrounding landscape over the various seasons of the year. I also have a good visual acquaintance with other parts of the county, and adjoining areas of Sussex. Based on this knowledge, and with the evidence of the landscape quality of nearby AONBs and SLAs, I find that the actual landscape quality of the unbuilt land closest to Canterbury is no greater than pleasantly attractive open countryside of varying character. Of course I am not a landscape architect, but I am a Town Planner of long experience, possessing some visual

sensitivity. I have seen and heard much written and spoken evidence on the matter, and that is my considered view. I must add that what I call “normally attractive open countryside” is land which the adopted and emerging Structure Plans state “will be protected for its own sake”, whether it has a special designation or not. PPS7 makes it clear that criteria-based policies are to be considered sufficient for most landscapes that are highly valued in a locality, with local landscape designations only seen as justifiable where such policies cannot provide necessary protection.

- 6.17 The City Council's subsequent “Canterbury Landscape Appraisal” appeared in November 1998 (CD5.2), the same month as the Adopted Local Plan in which Policy R5 designated one AHLV at the Wantsum Channel. The Appraisal identifies eight “landscape character areas” surrounding and related to the City. It categorises them as to character, condition and sensitivity, giving an idea of their tolerance to change. There is no doubt as to the value of the Appraisal as a tool in assessing development proposals of any kind, and as a prompt to making specific landscape improvements. These are wide reaching areas, considered to have a real relationship to the City. However, they are not the same thing as the precise terrain that has a special landscape role within the development control process, when the issue is the physical impact of a proposal on the historic setting of Canterbury. I find no tenable objection to the Revised Deposit Draft's addition to the policy text concerning this “historic setting”. To me, this phrase seems easily understandable in the broad sense. Canterbury remains a modestly sized city which does not sprawl greatly, even after post-war expansion. It is not perceived by the adopted Structure Plan or this emerging Local Plan as a City which will grow appreciably beyond its present physical confines, although its framework will contain enhanced housing and employment activities.
- 6.18 I am convinced that there is a good case to identify a Canterbury-related AHLV, providing additional protection over that afforded by ordinary open countryside-related policies. However, this necessary Canterbury AHLV would not have a role of local importance simply because of the visual quality of its landscape. The AHLV's special landscape role should be the prevention of visual damage to the City's historic setting. For this purpose I do not find the title of this AHLV helpful. The designation will need to cover more than what is narrowly the river valley, while it must not stray into land not needed for the purpose. I consider the most apt area description would be: “Open Land beyond the City Edge Important to the Historic and Landscape Setting of Canterbury”. Thus I find no reason to make specific mention of archaeology in the Policy or supporting text, as English Heritage would wish. Paragraph 5.31 of the Local Plan should be redrafted and expanded to make what I have defined as the planning purpose of the Canterbury AHLV more clear.
- 6.19 As regards the boundary of this re-titled designation, this must sensibly be confined to land that makes a real visual contribution to the valley setting of the Historic City, the latter to this day dominated by its great cathedral. I consider that there should be omitted all the open land that is screened by the landform from human view to and from the Historic City and the upper parts of the Cathedral. These omissions should include land only offering intermittent views of them. I recommend using once more the determining factors of a point 60 m high on Bell Harry Tower, and a notional observer height of 1.5 m. I find that this 60 m point, relatively high on the Tower, would signify to any observer in his or her view from the approaches to the City. Of course, the precise height to use is an intrinsically subjective matter. Nevertheless, it is significant that no objector has suggested any more plausible alternative height in evidence.

- 6.20 I consider it important that the definition of the relevant landform should exclude any areas of land from which views are blocked by existing built development, or by significant areas or lines of planting on the land surface, even after leaf fall. It is not sensible to take no notice of these categories on the grounds that they might, in theory, disappear at some point in the future. Subsequent Plans/Development Frameworks can always make necessary adjustments if these elements change significantly in the future. In defining the exact boundary line on the Proposals Map, the logic of my favoured approach would only use a road or visible field boundary, when the latter was very close indeed to the physically assessed stop to human view. In all other cases the actual extent of visibility, perhaps a particular woodland edge, contour or ridge line, would form the Proposals Map boundary of the AHLV.
- 6.21 The only exception to this methodology should be open land bounding the built-up area that lies in the floodplain of the Stour; the outer boundaries of this floodplain land seem to me reasonably defined at present. The present boundaries of the AHLV differ in their distance from the historic City, but there would be no need to draw them further in, unless the resurvey established that they do not meet the criteria I have set out.
- 6.22 The process I commend will inevitably somewhat diminish the defined area of the AHLV on the Draft Local Plan's Proposals Map. It is not possible or desirable for me to say in detail the precise extent or location of land that will be removed. Some University of Kent land to the north of the major ridgeline on its campus seems a strong candidate for removal. The fact some open land still within the AHLV after re-survey will contain existing or permitted University of Kent buildings within campus parkland does not affect the purpose of the designation, or its relevance as an assessment tool for future University projects.
- 6.23 Obviously, the Broad Oak land that I have recommended as a housing allocation would be removed, but other open land around it would also be resurveyed, so a greater extent of land than the allocation could also disappear. Around the Barton Farm Business allocation, seen as a potentially expandable 20 ha core just beyond the built-up area, I consider that the re-appraisal would logically involve resurvey of the envisaged small but significant permanent separation of those two entities by open land, as well as the potential land for expansion. Whether every contiguous part of the green edge to the built-up area should be included within the AHLV would depend on the evidence of the re-survey, the criterion being always an identifiable contribution to the landscape setting of the City.
- 6.24 Thus far I have discussed only the Canterbury related AHLV. The actions I have thought necessary do not affect the Wantsum Channel AHLV definition, which has not attracted specific objection. This definition is clearly prompted primarily by the quality of "the dramatic open landscape", and it does not present remotely the same problems or ramifications as the other defined area.

Recommendation

- 6.25 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording, and actions as suggested in my paragraphs 6.13-6.24 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY R7 - GREEN GAPS - AND PARAGRAPHS 5.33-5.41

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 5.39 – Green Gaps

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2520)

- Green Gaps are important and need protecting. For example, Fishpool to Littlebourne

Re: A5/025 - Amended Paragraph 5.39

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20638)

- Add: “other than in the Rural priority Area/Regeneration Zone / the remainder of the Former Colliery land at Hersden” after “outside the urban areas”

Paragraph 5.41 – Green Gaps

RN103 McCabe (554)

RN274 Davis (1748)

RN315 Blean Parish Council (2306)

RN311 Bridge Parish Council (2280)

RN359 Harbledown Conservation Association (1945, 1946)

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (1303)

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne (2323)

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2351)

RN023 Foreman (638)

RN029 Bridge Parish Council (436)

RN004 Chislet Parish Council (602)

RN061 PACE (33)

RN183 Sturry Parish Council (12)

- Council should take a bolder initiative with Green Gaps - relatively small area covered
- There is no reference to a Green Gap between Canterbury and Bridge/Patrixbourne. Should be an explicit reference to a policy to prevent developmental encroachment between Canterbury and Bridge
- List of Green Gaps excludes gap between Upstreet and Hersden
- Land between Herne and Greenhill should be designated a green gap
- The land between the north boundary of UKC and Tyler Hill, Blean should be added to the list of Green Gaps
- The area between Harbledown and Canterbury should be included in the list of Green Gaps
- A green gap should be retained between Herne and Greenhill to retain separate identities
- Between Westbere and Sturry and between Sturry and Westbere are green gaps that are being filled in
- Green Gap or AHLV policy should also cover area immediately north of Popes Lane and Hawe Lane, Sturry to prevent development spreading towards ancient woodland & high landscape area to the north
- Bridge should be in the list of green gap villages
- There should be a green gap for playing field adjacent to Whitstable Road/ Giles Lane, The Salt Way and Park Wood
- The Green Gap between Canterbury and Sturry should be a true Green Gap, without the spread of polytunnels or other temporary structures
- Would like to see some specific commitment in this plan to protecting the gap between Canterbury and the villages to the south which are seen as being under significant threat
- The area between Rough Common and Canterbury should be included in the list of Green Gaps

Policy R7 – Green Gaps

RN017 Harbledown Parish Council (608, 610, 612)

RN061 PACE (34, 35, 36)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2593)

RN275 Mr Baker etc (1757-1759)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN306	Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne (2324)
RN311	Bridge Parish Council (2279)
RN314	Kingston PC (2297)
RN315	Blean Parish Council (2300)
RN316	Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (1304)
RN328	Westbere Parish Council (2412)
RN348	Littlebourne Parish Council (2521)

- Is unclear whether the overall character of the landscape in relation to the Green Gap relates to the area beyond the Green Gap or the Green Gap itself
- Land between Herne and Greenhill should be designated a green gap
- This policy as it applies to Montgomery School is covered by the protection playing fields (C21) and could add an additional constraint on the school. Add "Community facilities" and clause b) of C21
- Should be a Green Gap between Tyler Hill and Blean
- Should be a Green Gap between Bridge and Canterbury
- Should be a Green Gap between Tyler Hill and Canterbury
- Preserve Green Gap between Gate Inn at Canterbury and Bridge village
- Object to Bridge not being included in the list of Green Gap villages
- Protect the gap between Canterbury and villages to the south
- Criterion (a) falls short of the aim to retain openness and should be strengthened and clarified
- A Green Gap is needed at Rough Common to protect the rural character of the area from development
- The break between Rough Common and Canterbury should be subject to the policy through two defined breaks on open land both sides of the A290
- Land north of Oaks Park Road should be a Green Gap to separate Rough Common and Blean
- There should be a green gap for playing field adjacent to Whitstable Road/ Giles Lane, The Salt Way and Park Wood
- A need for a Green Gap between Harbledown and Canterbury
- Include areas between Westbere Conservation Area and The Villas at eastern end of parish
- There should be Green Gaps on land on both sides of the A290, west and north of St Edmund's School; also on land west of the A290 at Tile Kiln Hill, Blean
- Land between Canterbury and Littlebourne should be a Green Gap

Re: A5/036 – Amended Policy R7

RD018	Gilbey (20026)
RD019	Kingston Parish Council (20028)
RD099	Maydowns Road Residents Association (20260)

- The words "and obtrusive" could be counterproductive. Unobtrusive development could weaken protection too

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.26 The supporting text makes it clear that this is a policy where the Proposals Map designations are limited to modest "pinch points", where closely related settlements are at particular risk of coalescence. In such gaps, even the smallest developments could harm the retention of separate identities. It is a depressing but true to realise that the Policy almost always stems from past failures to control development with adequate rigour and foresight. Agricultural buildings, and rural clutter can exacerbate the problem, and can be less easy to control.
- 6.27 It is quite understandable that a number of objectors with altruistic motives would like the Policy extended to other areas perceived as gaps. This often reflects a worry that the normal kind of policies applicable in open countryside will be less than effective in checking sprawl and require an additional designation – a kind of "belt and braces" approach. Though I appreciate the latent concerns, I do believe that this kind of policy must be used sparingly, where the gap is very narrow, or it will run the risk of being regarded as a rural commonplace, and devalued.

- 6.28 The Council has responded positively to First Deposit Draft representations seeking an additional Gap between Canterbury and Tyler Hill. I have visited all the remaining candidate areas, some on more than one occasion. I have judged each against the written policy criteria, and have compared the physical circumstances of each against the seven favoured Green Gaps. None really amounts to a pinch point, where one or two further developments could obliterate the distinction between two settlements. Proper adherence by the Council to its existing open countryside policies should meet potential problems affecting separation in all the areas that understandably concern objectors.
- 6.29 The Policy does not amount to a total prohibition on all development requiring planning permission. Two criteria refine the application of the policy, and I consider that the wording in the Revised Deposit Draft will be able to capture and control every proposal that would materially narrow a Green Gap. I find that the added words “and obtrusive” in (b) strengthen the Council’s intention and would not in reality allow smaller development to be built more easily than before. All the Gaps are seen as potentially useable for open-air sport and recreational uses. This will require a restrictive and properly sceptical attitude from the Council when it considers proposals, in order to minimise inescapable ancillary structures. Nevertheless, these uses may sometimes prove to be the best long-term solution in certain Green Gaps.
- 6.30 The Council has put forward three Further Amendments in this section. FA5/001 deletes the words “on some small pockets of land” from paragraph 5.36. FA5/002 deletes the words “by a proliferation of Green Gaps” from the end of the third sentence of paragraph 5.39. FA5/003 amends the final sentence of Policy R7 by a tightening of the wording concerning related built development, bringing in specific mention of criteria (a) and (b). All three Further Amendments appear to me to refine the text and make it more effective in controlling development.

Recommendation

- 6.31 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment Nos. FA5/001, FA5/002 and FA5/003, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY R8 - TOURISM - AND PARAGRAPHS 5.42-5.43

Objections and Key Issues

RN179 Kent Wildlife Trust (189)

- Criterion (e) wording not specific enough

Re: A5/029 – Amended Policy R8 Tourist Accommodation

RD134 English Heritage (20513)

- Policy R8 e) fails to recognise that the impact on the setting of heritage sites could also be important. Add: “and their settings where appropriate”

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.32 The Council has significantly expanded the wording and scope of criterion (e), and I find it quite adequate in scope. The contents of the Policy and all its complementary criteria

make yet more wording about “setting” unnecessary here, given other heritage related material in Plan Chapter Six .

Recommendation

6.33 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICIES R9 & R10 - VILLAGE FACILITIES AND SERVICES - AND PARAGRAPHS 5.44-5.46

Objections and Key Issues

Policy R9

RN054 Attwood (79)

- Take out “need”; insert “demand”

Paragraph 5.44 – Village Facilities and Services

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2364, 2365)

- Where appropriate, small village businesses as pubs and post offices should be assisted by granting them zero rating for business tax
- Village and church halls should be added to the list public amenities that the City Council wishes to protect

Re: A5/031 – amended policy R9 Loss of Village facilities and Services

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20559)

- Community facilities could apply to schools & other KCC services. Use of word “demand” is not correct; replace “demand” with “need” in criterion a)

Reasoning and Conclusions

6.34 Policy R9 now includes mention of village halls. The word “demand” seems to me more appropriate in criterion (a) than “need”, as it conveys the better the harsh realities of declining custom for particular facilities in one particular place, when an alternative is available and generally preferred. “Need” on the other hand is a quality that is easier to claim than to prove.

Recommendation

6.35 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY R11 – LEISURE, RECREATION AND ACCESSIBILITY – AND PARAGRAPHS 5.48-5.49

Objections and Key Issues

Policy R11 – Sports and Recreation facilities in Countryside

RN103 McCabe (558)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- RN179 Kent Wildlife Trust (190)
RN224 Sport England (1688)
RN228 Kent County Council (1638)
RN322 English Heritage (1783)
RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2526)
- Criteria (a), (b) and (c) overly restrictive and inflexible
 - Add to the criteria: "No extra noise"
 - Could expand to cover golf course development, with issues of landscape/re-contouring works requiring waste materials, with a need for County Council input

Re: A5/033 – Amended Policy R11

- RD086 Sport England (20314)
RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20639)
- Add to (b): sites or features of acknowledged nature conservation interest
 - Amendments do not address previous objection

Reasoning and Conclusions

6.36 This is a general all-sports policy, with no particular need to mention golf courses specifically. The wording has been expanded and somewhat strengthened in the Revised Deposit Draft, but I find that the requirements of the policy could all be met without undue difficulty if potential sites were searched for outside the most sensitive areas. There is no planning need to qualify the term “sites and features of nature conservation interest” further in this context.

Recommendation

6.37 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY R12 - HORSE RELATED DEVELOPMENT - AND PARAGRAPHS 5.50-5.51

Objections and Key Issues

- RN103 McCabe (559)
RN179 Kent Wildlife Trust (191)
- Should be more safe bridleways and shared use with cyclists
 - Reword criterion (b)

Re: A5/034 – Amended Policy R12

- RD134 English Heritage (20514, 20515)
- Policies R11b) and R12 b) fail to recognise that the impact on the setting of heritage sites could also be important. Add the words: “and their settings where appropriate”

Reasoning and Conclusions

6.38 Criterion (b) has been expanded to meet the points made by the Kent Wildlife Trust. The contents of the Policy and all its complementary criteria make yet more wording about “setting” unnecessary here, given the existence of other heritage related material in Plan Chapter Six. I see no planning need for extra policy content.

Recommendation

6.39 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

PARAGRAPHS 5.52-5.55 – RURAL TRANSPORT

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 5.52 – Rural Transport

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2530)

- More cycle routes are needed

Paragraph 5.53 – Rural Transport

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2528)

RN103 McCabe (590)

- There should be more safe bridleways and shared use with cyclists. Cyclists have been using bridleways since the 1980 Countryside Act
- No horses should be allowed on the Public Right of Way

Paragraph 5.54 – Rural Transport

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2531)

RN183 Sturry Parish Council (16)

- Reference should be made to heavy lorries accessing farms & damaging roads and riverbanks
- Better controls are required for the management of traffic in rural areas. The drivers of heavy vehicles ignore the restrictions

Re: A5/035 – Amended Paragraph 5.54

RD090 Bekesbourne with Patixbourne Parish Council (20207)

- Supports amendment referring to damage by heavy traffic but no joined-up thinking linking this to the lack of any Policy or objective to contain growth of traffic in rural areas

Paragraph 5.55 – Rural Transport

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2532)

- Rural lanes need protecting from rat runners and made safe for walkers and cyclists

Reasoning and Conclusions

6.40 The Council has written what I regard as four unexceptionable paragraphs on rural transport, but without a specific policy. The objections tend to ask for a range of actions, some not the province of town and country planning. Other matters are pursued in the Council's Canterbury District Transport Action Plan (CD7.8). The text in the Revised Deposit Draft is not in need of alteration.

Recommendation

6.41 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

CHAPTER SEVEN

7. OBJECTIONS TO THE CHAPTER ON PRESERVING, ENHANCING AND CONSERVING OUR BUILT AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS

POLICY BE1 – HIGH QUALITY DESIGN - AND PREAMBLE IN PARAGRAPHS 6.1-6.29

Objections and Key Issues

Re: 6/001 - Paragraph 6.6 - Good Design Principles

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20640)

- Say "residential development on derelict & underused brownfield land on south facing slopes should be particularly encouraged"

Paragraph 6.7 – Good Design Principles

RN228 Kent County Council (1636, 1655)

- There is not much encouragement to use secondary aggregates or other recycled materials or minimise waste
- The checklist should include the location of the site relative to the range of transport modes currently available or that may be provided as part of the development

Paragraph 6.20 – Context and Local Distinctiveness

RN060 Coker (2240)

- St. Edmunds Road should be designated as a home zone

Policy BE1- High Quality Design

RN010 Wilks (337)

RN216 Symons (814)

- Noise policies inadequate & should be amended to incorporate WHO Guidelines for Community Noise 2000. Say that all applications and EIA will be examined thoroughly & Council will object if such problems arise
- In a new policy take account of the ten-foot ways between the rear gardens of housing estates in Tankerton

Re: A6/004 Policy BE1 - High Quality Design

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (20448)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20641)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20708)

- Add to BE1(a) "and the need to deal with derelict, damaged & neglected brownfield land". Add new (l) "and the need to take full advantage of south facing locations"
- Amend BE1 amend by adding (m) Flood Risk
- Should the need for the development be a criterion for all development proposals?

Reasoning and Conclusions

7.1 The policy follows a long, but never irrelevant section of supporting text touching on key matters like good design and local distinctiveness. I am satisfied that in drafting the Policy, the gist of a number of objections have been incorporated into the Revised Deposit Draft text. I find nothing unacceptable about the legitimacy of the Council considering the principle of need, among other factors, in considering a particular development; also, that consideration may often, perhaps nearly always, legitimately concern a part, rather than the whole of it. The flooding issue has no need of a mention here, since it is dealt with in detail in Plan Chapter Seven. Finally, I do not think it possible or necessary to make mention of a specific candidate for the Home Zone concept, or of the Tankerton foot-ways in the text.

7.2 The Council has put forward two Proposed Changes. PC6/001 considerably expands the text in an explanatory manner about relevant supplementary planning guidance. PC6/002 removes a minor textual error. The Council has also put forward Further Amendment FA6/001, inserting new text in new paragraph 6.29a to expand on the context for noise generating or noise affected development. The changes are all improvements without any obvious drawbacks.

Recommendation

7.3 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes Nos. PC6/001, PC6/002 and Further Amendment FA6/001S, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY BE2 - THE PUBLIC REALM - AND PARAGRAPHS 6.30-6.52

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 6.34 – Place-making: The Urban Design Approach

RN161 Ramblers Association (1906)

- Preserve areas of natural land within built environments for the benefit of wildlife

Paragraph 6.39 – Landscape Design

RN322 English Heritage (1785)

- Such a Landscape Design Strategy should address conservation area character where there is an overlap

Paragraph 6.43 – Outdoor Lighting

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2372)

RN199 East Kent District Green Party (1525)

RN161 Ramblers Association (1907)

- Resist additional - and if possible reduce existing - light pollution
- Insist on well designed lighting fixtures on any new development
- Council should positively encourage good design of outdoor lighting, and warn against poor design

Paragraph 6.46 - Outdoor Lighting

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2373)

- Reject the suggestion that high density lighting is necessary for safety

Paragraph 6.47 – Outdoor Lighting

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2374, 2375)

- Reject the suggestion that high density lighting is necessary for security
- The Council should take powers to prevent light spillage outside properties where it is a nuisance or a hazard

Paragraph 6.50 - Outdoor Lighting

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2534)

- With regard to lighting, care needs to be taken about light pollution and public/highway safety

Policy BE2

RN255 GOSE (2639)

- rephrase

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.4 The Council has adopted English Heritage's suggestion for rewording in paragraph 6.39. The sentiment in the Ramblers Association objection does not invalidate or suggest to me a need to add to the well drafted sentiments already contained in paragraph 6.34.
- 7.5 The objections about lighting have induced the Council to expand and greatly improve text about outdoor lighting. I find it gratifying that this is no longer a Cinderella subject, and I consider that the Council is now addressing the matters that can be controlled, while clearly setting out its stance against the harmful and wide ranging problems caused by crude overuse of unsympathetic installations. A local Plan document has to make its points strongly but succinctly.
- 7.6 Textual strengthening comes in six Further Amendments put forward by the Council. FA6/002 amends paragraph 6.50 to expand on the need to avoid proposals which have adverse lighting characteristics. However, the wording goes against the GOSE objection about words or phrases that are unclear, imprecise or ambiguous. I consider that a better form of words would use the text of FA6/002 as far as the end of the third sentence. The fourth sentence should be reworded as: "Planning permission will not be granted for such schemes. Relevant proposals should aim to achieve good design, enhancement of the urban fabric, energy efficiency, and avoidance of significant impact on the surrounding countryside, sites of nature conservation value and the amenity of local residents". I find the remainder of the amended paragraph to be uncontroversial.
- 7.7 Further Amendment FA6/003 to the last sentence in paragraph 6.45 makes the Council's intention to encourage sensitive illumination more positive. Further Amendment FA6/004 to paragraph 6.47 adds a final sentence enlarging on appropriate action to reduce light pollution and the creation of deeply shadowed areas. Further Amendment FA6/005 adds two sentences to paragraph 6.48 to increase the information it offers already. Further Amendment FA6/006 adds an informative sentence to paragraph 6.49. Further Amendment FA6/007 adds a new paragraph 6.50a to follow paragraph 6.50: this mentions specific needs of different kinds of development proposals, points to County level policy and guidance, and signals the production of supplementary planning guidance on outdoor lighting.
- 7.8 I realise that some objectors still want more text on this subject in the Local Plan. However, the new text gives notice of the Council's intended Lighting Design Strategies for the District's three urban areas, refers to the supplementary planning guidance it is publishing, and mentions the best external written advice: the Institute of Lighting Engineers' Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution. The one useful improvement still missing is a very succinct description of what the three Lighting Strategies will do; the present mention in the text is not quite adequate.

Recommendation

- 7.9 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment Nos. FA6/002 – FA6/007 inclusive, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest above in paragraphs 7.6 and 7.8, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY BE3 – DESIGN STATEMENTS AND DEVELOPMENT BRIEFS – AND PARAGRAPHS 6.53-6.59

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 6.59 – Design Statements and Development Briefs

RN229 Property Review & Development (2595)

- Objects to Development Briefs, as more detail is required in terms of permissible land uses, and the mechanism for adoption of the Briefs

Re: A6/008 Paragraph 6.59– Development Briefs

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20561)

- CCC misunderstands the relationship between Policy in a statutory plan & SPG. SPG cannot be used to make a Policy - it should elaborate & explain Policy. Insert text to clarify role of SPG. Amend plan to clearly describe CCC's land use & development requirements for identified sites

Re: A6/009 Paragraph 6.59a– Development Briefs

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20562)

- CCC misunderstands the relationship between Policy in a statutory plan & SPG. SPG cannot be used to make a Policy - it should elaborate & explain Policy. Insert text to clarify role of SPG. Amend plan to clearly describe CCC's land use & development requirements for identified sites

Policy BE3 – Design Statements and Design Briefs

RN255 GOSE (2647)

RN322 English Heritage (1776)

- Given the importance of the historic environment, English Heritage is concerned that development briefs include consideration of it
- Objection to use of “appropriate”

Re: A6/010 Policy BE3 – Design Statements and Design Briefs

RD079 GOSE (20176)

RD092 BT Group Plc Represented By RPS (20224)

- The word “appropriate” makes the Policy unclear
- Objects to the inclusion of sustainability statements. Policy does not clarify what a sustainability statement is nor does it provide details of circumstance where statements should be provided. Paragraph should be removed

Reasoning and Conclusions

7.10 I find the text of this section unsatisfactory, in that it does not clearly spell out to an applicant or potential applicant the circumstances in which a design statement, or development brief, or sustainability statement will be expected. PPS1 of 2005 (which needs to be mentioned) talks of the critical importance and benefit of pre-application discussions. The whole text should be revisited, together with the following uncertainties:

In 6.53, if the Council means that all applicants for planning permission should provide this written statement for all new built development, then it should say this in terms. If it does not, it should instance the kinds and/or scale of development not thought significant enough to merit a written statement.

In 6.54a, the Council should make clear if this is also expected for all applications, or if the Council will inform the applicant of the need to produce one in pre-application discussions or, if there are no such discussions, on receipt of an application if the need is perceived by officers.

7.11 The wording of the Policy itself should be revised to meet the GOSE objection; I agree that “appropriate” is quite unsuitable here. It seems easier, and best, to set out clearly and briefly in the Policy text what these “circumstances” are, in a way that is easy for an

applicant or developer to understand. The time delays that will inevitably stem from failure to discuss development ideas with Council officers before an official application should also be spelt out in an applicant-friendly way in the supporting text. In other respects I consider that the revised text addresses deals adequately with objectors' specific concerns.

7.12 Council has put forward Proposed Change PC6/003, which adds explanatory text to new Paragraph 6.54a about sustainability statements. I consider this useful and adequately detailed.

Recommendation

7.13 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC6/003, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraphs 7.10 and 7.11 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICIES BE5 & BE6 - LISTED BUILDING ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSIONS - AND PARAGRAPHS 6.67-6.71

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraphs 6.67 to 6.71 – Listed Buildings

RN010 Wilks (358)

- New policy needed to record and protect buildings from 1920's onwards. E.g. Buildings of light construction erected in 1920's, and typical 1920's & 1930's semi's found throughout Tankerton

Policy BE5

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1855)

RN325 Mr R Strickland represented by Christian Leigh Town Planner (2406)

- Delete the words; "consider the need for the alterations to..." as these are not covered by PPG15
- Local Listing has no statutory role. These references should be deleted

Re: A6/012 Policy BE5 – Listed Building alterations

RD134 English Heritage (20519)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20706)

- Is it a function of the planning authority to consider if alterations are required or desirable?
- Listed building Policy should also refer to safeguarding their setting in the wider context, because development in the vicinity can also affect the setting of a listed building

Policy BE6

RN255 GOSE (2640)

- Rephrase policy wording avoiding "encouraged"

Re: A6/013 Policy BE6 – Listed Building extensions

RD134 English Heritage (20520)

- Listed building policy should also refer to safeguarding their setting in the wider context, because development in the vicinity can also affect the setting of a listed building

Reasoning and Conclusions

7.14 I agree that the Council has no need or obligation to deal with inter-war buildings of perceived interest in this Local Plan. The matter is better taken up through local recording and research by individuals, perhaps acting with local societies in consultation with a

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

national body such as the Twentieth Century Society. The Council reference to local list buildings in Policy BE5 and its supporting text seems to me useful, enlightened and absolutely appropriate in a Local Plan for a District with such varied and interesting building stock – likewise the policy text stating that the requirement for, and desirability of, specific alteration to buildings of interest will also be examined.

7.15 The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC6/004, which usefully expands on the setting of a building, to meet the point made by English Heritage. The Revised Deposit Draft text also meets GOSE's well-made objection about use of the term "encouraged".

Recommendation

7.16 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC6/004, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICIES BE7 & BE8 - CONSERVATION AREAS - AND PARAGRAPHS 6.72-6.84

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 6.72 - Demolition

RN322 English Heritage (1786)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1856)

- Local Listing has no statutory role. These references should be deleted
- The Plan should reflect the tests for demolition of locally listed buildings set out in PPG15

Re: A6/014 Paragraph 6.72 - Demolition

RD134 English Heritage (20521)

RD146 BSF Planning Consultants (20707)

- Demolition of locally listed buildings - the approval of the Planning Authority is not always required outside Conservation Areas. The Policy should be reworded
- Amendment fails to make the point that efforts to find alternatives uses should have manifestly failed & there is no charitable or community ownership prospect as an alternative

Policy BE7

RN017 Harbledown Parish Council (613)

RN164 Railtrack PLC (599)

RN226 BT Group Plc Represented By RPS (1679)

RN274 Davis (1750)

- New building given permission alongside existing homes should be appropriate in scale and design to those already there
- This policy should not seek to place undue restrictions on development, and should have regard to Policy ED6
- Conservation areas must not delay maintenance and upgrading of the railway network. Railtrack's permitted development rights should be acknowledged in the local plan
- Open land south of Kent College at Harbledown suggested as a Green Gap should be also be designated as a Conservation Area to protect it

Reasoning and Conclusions

7.17 I see nothing incorrect or ill-judged in the Council's text about locally listed buildings in conservation areas; the text gains support from what is said in paras. 4.27 and 6.16 of

PPG15. The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC6/005, which answers specific objections, clarifying and expanding the context and requirements in paragraph 6.72 that might make demolition of locally listed buildings acceptable.

7.18 As to the specific objections about Policy BE7, none of them is so central or relevant that the wording needs to be amended or extended. As to the merits of the Harbledown land mentioned, I did not see this land as possessing the pinch point characteristics necessary for a Green Gap designation; any claims to conservation area status seem to me, after visiting the area, to fall down in respect of identifiable or significant architectural or historical interest.

Recommendation

7.19 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC6/005, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY BE10 - HISTORIC LANDSCAPES, PARKS & GARDENS, & POLICY BE11 – SHOP FRONTS - AND PARAGRAPHS 6.88-6.91

Objections and Key Issues

Policy BE10

RN161 Ramblers Association (1903)

RN179 Kent Wildlife Trust (194)

RN322 English Heritage (1787)

- There is no reference to archaeological features such as standing remains and earthwork monuments as a component of the historic landscape
- The policy does not sufficiently emphasise and protect the nature conservation importance of historic landscapes and gardens, veteran trees and hedgerows. It needs also to protect ancient woodland
- Fully support preservation of the historic landscape including Parish boundaries, historic landmarks etc

Policy BE11

RN255 GOSE (2636)

- Rephrase policy wording

Reasoning and Conclusions

7.20 The Council has amended Policy BE10 to take account of the English Heritage point about archaeological features, but I see no need further to augment a Policy that covers the relevant matters fully but succinctly.

7.21 Policy BE11 could be more directly worded to aid planning, listed building and conservation area control if the first line read: "Permission will not be given to alter or replace existing shopfronts... (etc)".

Recommendation

7.22 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 7.21 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY BE12 - ADVERTISEMENTS - AND PARAGRAPHS 6.92-6.99

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 6.97 - Advertisements

RN055 Outdoor Advertising Association represented by Malcolm Judd & Partners (86)

- This paragraph unfairly implies a blanket restriction on certain types of advertisements in conservation areas, and should be amended to reflect PPG19

Policy BE12 – Advertisements

RN055 Outdoor Advertising Association represented by Malcolm Judd & Partners (87)

RN255 GOSE (2648)

- This policy should avoid being overly prescriptive, and should reflect PPG19.

Re: A6/021 Policy BE12 – Advertisements

RD102 Highways Agency (20266)

RD079 GOSE (20177)

- The word “appropriate” makes the Policy unclear
- Amend criterion a) as follows: The advertisements do not constitute a risk to public safety or to road safety and do not visually harm their landscape or townscape setting. Supporting text should refer to safety hazard distracting drivers

Reasoning and Conclusions

7.23 In the Revised Deposit Draft the Council has taken pains to incorporate objectors’ points into its rewordings within paragraph 6.97 and the Policy. It has also put forward Proposed Change PC6/006, which brings in the consideration of road safety to criterion (a) of Policy BE12. The only remaining point of substance is the GOSE objection to “appropriately” in the first line of the Policy. I consider that the first sentence would be clearer if it read: “Advertisements should demonstrate a high quality of design, and should be located to maximise visual amenity and public safety”.

Recommendation

7.24 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC6/006, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 7.23 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY BE13 - BLINDS, AWNINGS AND SECURITY - AND PARAGRAPHS 6.100-6.103

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 6.102 - Blinds Awnings and Security

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2162)

- Objects to the last sentence in this paragraph. The Herne Bay conservation area covers the whole retail centre. External roller shutters should not be resisted in conservation area and on listed buildings

Policy BE13 – Blinds Awnings and Security

RN130 Herne Bay and District Residents Association (1611)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2164)

- The plan needs to be reconsidered in the light of the activity of insurers. E.g. Retailers may be required to fit external shutters.
- There is a conflict in the policy, and as worded, forbidding external shutters will send insurance premiums up and have an adverse impact on retail activity

Paragraph 6.103 – Street Furniture

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2371)

- There is proliferation of traffic signs, bollards etc. in residential and rural areas which create a harsh and unfriendly ambience. Should conduct a review of signs and only retain those necessary

Reasoning and Conclusions

7.25 Paragraph 6.103 concerning street furniture has been amended to meet the Parish Council points, in major part. The objections to Policy BE13 are quite understandable. Herne Bay town centre is the subject of a conservation area designation, the size of which I can only describe as very generous. However, it is a fact, and I have no reason at all to doubt that socio-economic conditions in the town may require quite elaborate and expensive security precautions for certain shop and commercial premises. In essence, I find the Policy and supporting text reasonable and well-argued.

7.26 I think in practice it will be possible for owners of street front premises in Herne Bay – on all but statutory or local list buildings – to argue for adequate external physical security measures to protect façades. Criterion (d) and the supporting text are there to assist the owner or occupant in this regard. However the whole tenor of the Policy is that the avoidance of harm to the visual appearance of the premises and street scene is the primary consideration, so the design and scale of the proposals must always be of demonstrably high quality. The impressive draft of supplementary planning guidance on Shopfront Design (CD6.4) convinces me that its final form will demonstrate a number of good and affordable solutions to this problem.

Recommendation

7.27 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICIES BE14, BE15 AND BE16 - DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING ARCHAEOLOGY - AND PARAGRAPHS 6.104-6.112

Objections and Key Issues

Policy BE14 – Scheduled Ancient Monuments

RN265 Cerullo (2232)

RN322 English Heritage (1788)

- Inconsistency with PPG16; policy should consider “setting” of other nationally important archaeological sites
- Archaeologists are not advised of all planning applications in archaeologically sensitive areas. The Archaeological Adviser to the Council should be informed of all planning applications in areas suspected of having archaeological implications

Paragraph 6.106 - Archaeology

RN322 English Heritage (1789)

- The reference to the database should be developed by reference to the intention to undertake assessment and strategy phases based upon the database

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Re: A6/023 Paragraph 6.106 - Archaeology

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (20449)

- Amend para 6.106 after “in the city”; add “and elsewhere in the District”

Policy BE15 - Archaeology

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (398)

RN010 Wilks (332)

RN226 BT Group Plc Represented By RPS (1680)

RN265 Cerullo (2233)

RN322 English Heritage (1790)

- Unreasonable for applicants to undertake a full archaeological evaluation before an application is determined; say prior to commencement of development
- Criterion (c) could be misconstrued by appearing to put preservation in situ and preservation by record on an equal footing. Preference is for in situ preservation
- Desktop analysis more appropriate with an agreed programme of archaeological works after permission granted
- Archaeological Adviser to the Council should be informed of all planning applications in areas suspected of having archaeological implications
- Policy only covers known sites. Expand or add new policy to ensure enough archaeological work is carried out on all relevant land in District to make sure what is beneath the land in question

Re: A6/025 Paragraph 6.109 - Archaeology

RD134 English Heritage (20525)

- Should refer to the setting of nationally important sites

Policy BE16 – Archaeology

RN322 English Heritage (1791)

- LPA should determine whether or not disturbance of remains is unavoidable or not feasible. Also, a competent archaeological organisation should be referred to

Reasoning and Conclusions

7.28 The detailed text of this section in the Revised Deposit Draft, which already closely follows the tenets of PPG16, has been sensibly revised to take account of informed objections. It does not impose any burdens on a developer not envisaged or encouraged by that national policy guidance. The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC6/007, which adds mention of the Countywide Sites and Monuments Record in paragraph 6.106, to cover archaeology matters in the District outside the Historic City.

7.29 I do not really understand the wording of the Revised Deposit Draft text of BE16, even after its revision to meet the English Heritage objection. I assume it deals with cases where physical disturbance of archaeological remains is unavoidable. So I cannot see why it does not start: “Where the City Council considers that disturbance of archaeological remains or deposits is unavoidable, and physical preservation in situ not feasible, the developer will be requested....”.

Recommendation

7.30 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC6/007, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 7.29 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY NE1 - DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING PROTECTED AND IDENTIFIED SPECIES
- AND PARAGRAPHS 6.113-6.126

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 6.114 – The Natural Environment

RN021 Leatham (632)

- SNCI in Area N.W. Wincheap Industrial Estate adj. A2 to Canterbury/Ashford railway is low quality, little nature conservation interest, and no landscape value. Should be used for North Canterbury Park and Ride

Paragraph 6.115 to 6.120 – Protected Sites

RN284 RSPB (980)

RN120 English Nature (474)

RN061 PACE (169)

- There is an absence of specific local plan policies to protect designated sites of wildlife interest
- Include a policy which makes some categories of land within the district sacrosanct, with absolute protection from development
- International, national and county level sites are listed in the plan. No mention, however, is made of the nature reserves in the district

Paragraph 6.117 to 6.122 - Protected Sites

RN120 English Nature (471)

RN179 Kent Wildlife Trust (195, 202, 203, 205)

- The Policy should make clear that there is a rolling programme of designations of SNCIs
- A Local Plan policy is needed for each KSP policy
- A policy should be drawn up to protect semi-natural habitats against adverse impacts
- For SNCI's there would have to be a regional overriding need, and for SSSI's an overriding national need
- Policies relating to SSSI's should explicitly reflect the obligations under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000
- There should be a specific policy for sites of international importance and the provisions of the European Habitats Directive would apply
- The proposals maps only show the SSSI boundaries, not those sites to which European legislation applies, as implied in the text

Paragraph 6.118 - Protected Sites

RN120 English Nature (473)

- There are 15 SSSI's within the district, rather than 14 as stated in the paragraph

Paragraph 6.120 - Protected Sites

RN034 National Grid represented by Malcolm Judd & Partners (1603)

- The National Grid requests that the SNCI designation will not restrict essential utilities development

Re: A6/038 Paragraph 6.120 - Protected Sites

RD085 National Grid Company Plc represented by Malcolm Judd and Partners (20302)

- Concerned that the SNCI designation at the National Grid's Canterbury Substation site may restrict essential utility development

Paragraph 6.121 to 6.122 – Nature Conservation outside Protected Sites

RN048 Stebbing (430)

- The downs at Beltinge also need protection; wildlife is present there in abundance

Paragraph 6.125 – Protected Species

RN329 Environment Agency (2489)

- There are more species than those named. The text should refer to the species identified as some of those listed under the European Habitats Directive

Re: A6/031 Paragraph 6.125 – Protected Species

RD110 PACE (20403)

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (20450)

- Amend para 6.125 after several bat species: add and wintering birds, such as Brent geese

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Paragraph 6.126 - Protected Species

RN329 Environment Agency (2488)

RN120 English Nature (475)

- English Nature objects to this point as it implies that permission will be granted regardless of the presence of protected species
- Translocation may not be an acceptable form of mitigation, and should only be considered after all other options have been pursued

Policy NE1 - Biodiversity

RN120 English Nature (476)

RN179 Kent Wildlife Trust (197)

RN329 Environment Agency (2487)

- English Nature objects to this point as it implies that permission will be granted regardless of the presence of protected species
- Amend to consider alternative sites, minimising impact on species, and appropriate/agreed mitigation
- Policy now implies that development will be permitted provided mitigation proposals are submitted. These measures should be satisfactory and enforceable through conditions

Reasoning and Conclusions

7.31 The text has been improved in detail, and occasionally as to facts, in response to informed objections. Most importantly, NE1 has been rephrased to avoid any impression that a development proposal on a sensitive nature site will prevail, provided certain measures are carried out. I am satisfied of its robustness in the Revised Deposit Draft version, and nothing now needs to be added. I am in agreement that relevant matters in Structure Plan policies do not need to be re-iterated or directly paraphrased in the Local Plan, as both together comprise the development plan for the District.

7.32 The range of development plan policies on this matter do allow for the vital interests of a statutory undertaker like the National Grid in undertaking necessary works, although there would always be negotiation to mitigate adverse effects. As to the objection about the SNCI designation near the Wincheap Industrial Estate, the Local Plan is not the vehicle for altering a SNCI designation; the content of the objection is, in any event, scanty and unconvincing about any particular deficiencies in the features of special interest for which the site was designated.

Recommendation

7.33 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY NE2 - DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING SEMI-NATURAL HABITAT - AND PARAGRAPHS 6.127-6.130

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 6.127 to 6.130 – Enhancing Biodiversity

RN329 Environment Agency (2485)

RN284 RSPB (985)

RN010 Wilks (374)

- New policy required to create a nature reserve on protected open space bounded by the rear gardens of Millstream and Stream Walk, Whitstable

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Amend text to: "Development should, where practical, make positive contributions to the retention, creation and management of wildlife habitats that could contribute to a network of wildlife corridors
- Objects to the absence of a policy for the enhancement of biodiversity

Policy NE2 – Semi-natural Habitat

RN179 Kent Wildlife Trust (199)

RN329 Environment Agency (2486)

- The policy should add the requirement of planning conditions to strengthen obligations to protect and enhance a site's wildlife interest
- A provision should be included to minimise any impact upon semi-natural habitats

Reasoning and Conclusions

7.34 The desire for a new nature reserve in Whitstable must be taken up outside the Local Plan process. The other objections are expressing ways of improving the Plan text, but none of the suggestions appears to me necessary or relevant enough to demand changes.

Recommendation

7.35 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY NE3 – BLEAN WOODS SLA AND THE WANTSUM CHANNEL AHLV – AND PARAGRAPH 6.131. POLICY NE4 - SEASALTER AND GRAVENEY LEVELS - AND PARAGRAPH 6.132

Objections and Key Issues

Policy NE3 – Enhancement of Biodiversity

RN010 Wilks (372)

RN255 GOSE (2664)

RN284 RSPB (986)

- Apply Policy to all the District, not just the Blean Woods SLA
- Containing material not directly relating to specific sites/areas without providing certainty re the determination of development proposals or land use
- Need for a new policy to treat the area of Benacre Wood as SNCI + open space

Paragraph 6.132 - Seasalter

RN010 Wilks (324)

- How will this be achieved? How will land be cleared and how will CCC prevent problem recurring? Might require purchase of more of the sites, money, staff time, perseverance and bold enforcement

Policy NE4 - Seasalter

RN120 English Nature (478)

RN255 GOSE (2665)

- English Nature would like to support the Council's policies regarding enhancing biodiversity on the Seasalter and Graveney levels.
- This is a promotional statement, rather than a land use policy

Reasoning and Conclusions

7.36 All the above text is appropriate if stated succinctly in a Local Plan. However, NE3 and NE4 are effectively statements of intent: that is, they simply express an intention to carry

out a future programme of work. They are not, as drafted, innately connected to the planning decision process. The text should be redrafted as supporting text, and inserted within the Plan Chapter at the most appropriate place, possibly the introductory section.

Recommendation

7.37 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 7.36 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY NE5 - TREES, WOODLAND AND HEDGEROWS - AND PARAGRAPHS 6.133-6.137

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 6.133 to 6.135 – Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

RN010 Wilks (365)

- Would like to see maximum policy protection for Honey Wood, Tyler Hill. Should also be protected by TPO due to high amenity value and natural history interest

Policy NE5

RN010 Wilks (315)

RN179 Kent Wildlife Trust (201)

RN221 E Kent Hospitals Trust represented by Broadway Malyan (1697)

RN274 Davis (1732)

- Take account in the policy wording of the importance of trees, etc to the bio-diversity and nature conservation interest of a site
- The protection of these features should be enforced through the policy
- Policy need for protection of hedgerows with a function as linear nature reserves
- The policy should ensure an appropriate balance between the retention of important features and efficient re-use of brownfield sites

Reasoning and Conclusions

7.38 Honey Wood, Tyler Hill is already protected as a SSSI and a conservation area, says the Council, and there is no need for the Plan to deal with it specifically. The Policy has been strengthened on the lines suggested by the Kent Wildlife Trust. It is strongly worded, but not in a way that is intrinsically hostile to a developer who approaches a potential site with sensitivity and ingenuity.

Recommendation

7.39 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITES IN HERNE AND BROOMFIELD PARISH: HERNE COMMON

Objections and Key Issues

RN274 Davis (1754, 1755)

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2381-2388, 2390-2392)

- Curtis Wood Park should be designated open space and Curtis Wood marked as a local nature reserve
- Designate the fields on Home Farm adjacent to Canterbury road as open space, to protect the open setting of historic Herne Village
- Land on Home Farm from Canterbury Fields Estate to Carden's Field should be designated as open space to safeguard the setting of the village
- Object to the non-allocation of land at end of Bogshole Lane, Broomfield, adjoining public footpath CH47 as protected open space
- Object to the non-allocation of land to the rear of the Huntsman and Horn public house as protected open space for public use
- Object to the non-allocation of land at Broomfield Community Woodland Park, Ford Road as protected open space (no longer being pursued)
- Object to the non-allocation at Broomfield Pond as public open space

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.40 It is obvious that the Parish Council has put much thought into its Local Plan submissions. It has a vision of a connected series of improvements to facilities, in what it somewhat ruefully recognises as a Parish that has become a dormitory settlement of some 9,000 people. I have looked at all the areas mentioned in the objections.
- 7.41 The sites in this "wish list" brought up by the Parish Council have all run into opposition from the Council for a variety of reasons, which have been made known to the Parish Council. I agree with the Council the logic of not extending open space protection policies outside demarcated Urban Area Boundaries, because normal countryside protection policies do this job with equal efficiency. Significantly, both types of policies are not absolute stops to development in all circumstances, so the effect of the Council's thinking does not result in a materially different effect, in safeguarding a particular area from development.
- 7.42 The Council's evidence is that it is still in the process of producing a District-wide review of its open space provision. While it has not produced any evidence of positive enthusiasm for any of the suggested sites, it does say that none should absolutely be ruled out of contention before this work is produced, and public consultation has been carried out. Open space with access rights on what is private land implies substantial expenditure. Any recommendation by me involving public expenditure really requires me to have a comparative view of all other candidate sites in the District, but I do not possess that knowledge. No single site brought up by the Parish Council appears to me to be needed urgently to fill a critical deficiency of public open space; thus I am not recommending any site as a specific new allocation. The best way forward appears to be participation by the Parish Council to the utmost degree possible in the process leading to production of the final District-wide review.

Recommendation

- 7.43 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

CHAPTER EIGHT

8. OBJECTIONS TO THE CHAPTER ON INVESTING IN OUR COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

POLICY C1 - THE CANTERBURY TRANSPORT PLAN - AND PREAMBLE IN PARAGRAPHS 7.1-7.14

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.1 – Our Transport Objectives

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne (2326, 2331)

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2343)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1862)

- Specifically acknowledge the growth of traffic in Canterbury's south-east quadrant and put forward some suggestions for its reduction and management
- Canterbury Transport Plan should be part of local plan to allow a full public debate
- Containing rural traffic is not mentioned in the traffic objectives although there is an objective which specifically concentrates on containment of the traffic growth in urban areas
- The traffic problem is growing faster than the measures suggested can solve it

Re: A7/001 – Paragraph 7.3

RD090 Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council (20199)

- There should be recommendations for alleviating acknowledged rural traffic growth problems

Paragraph 7.4 - Our Transport Objectives

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2352)

- Transportation - What are your objectives? How do you unlock the chaos in Canterbury?

Paragraph 7.5 - Our Transport Objectives

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne (2325)

- The plan recognises the problems of traffic and vehicle speed in villages, but makes no specific recommendations to alleviate any of the rural problems

Paragraph 7.7 – Road hierarchies

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2552)

- If Littlebourne Road (A257) is a primary route, Littlebourne will need a by-pass

Paragraph 7.8 – The Local Transport Plan

RN067 Whitstable Society (692)

- Local Transport Plan is key to planning town centre; difficult to see how key decisions affecting Local Plan can be made before Action Plan's completion. Identify issues Action Plan must address

Re: A7/004 – Amended Paragraph 7.8

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20642)

- Insert reference to Regeneration Zone at Hersden & opportunity for reopening Chislet Halt as a station for Hersden as part of integrated housing employment & transport strategy

Paragraph 7.10 – The Canterbury District Transport Action Plan

RN086 Thomas (442)

RN255 GOSE (1719)

- Plan fails to make connection between Canterbury, traffic problems and the need for Herne Bay residents to travel to Canterbury for shopping. A better spatial provision of retail provision would be beneficial
- The Canterbury Transport Plan should refer to the County Local Transport Plan and show areas of common ground and how conflicts would be dealt with

Paragraph 7.11 - The Canterbury District Transport Action Plan

RN161 Ramblers Association (1911)

- Fully support safer routes with good road crossing facilities. The A2 and its bus stop and public rights of way crossings very much comes to mind

Paragraph 7.13 - The Canterbury District Transport Action Plan

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2553)

- This paragraph should support the Kent & Canterbury Hospital

Policy C1 – Canterbury District Transport Action Plan

RN001 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (9)

RN024 Gogrin (641, 643, 644, 645)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1575)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1861)

RN164 Railtrack PLC (600)

RN185 Lowe (158)

RN232 Bartlett (1620)

RN281 Martin (978)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2554)

- The policy is framed around the Canterbury Transport Plan which does not yet exist
- A stronger commitment should be made to assess all industrial development proposals, adjacent to railway lines, for the potential of transporting freight to and from the development (part e)
- Extend A2 link under Patricxbourne to link to Sandwich Road at Bramling up to A28 between Hersden and Upstreet
- A tramway from the coach park and bus station, which the respondent suggests should be provided at the site of the railway station he proposes in Wincheap, should be installed to the city and Sturry
- Should have a coach park and bus station at area at back of Wincheap which respondent proposes should be used to provide a railway station
- This policy should address rat runs through country lanes
- Canterbury transport plan should be part of local plan to allow a full public debate
- Criterion (e) needs to give preference to proposals which do not require the use of cars or lorries for access or deliveries; and (f) should seek improvements in environmental conditions
- There should be proposals for a Canterbury (A28) bypass

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.1 Objectors to the Local Plan made their representations before the adoption of the Canterbury District Transport Action Plan in March 2004. The document has been developed alongside the Local Plan, with the aim to “tackle the problem of traffic congestion, by improving accessibility, choice and road safety, whilst maintaining the economic vitality for business and safeguarding the environment for the residents in the District” (CD7.8). The actions and targets within it are fed into the second Local Transport Plan for Kent (2006-2011). No doubt the supporting text setting the context for the Chapter will contain necessary factual changes to reflect the position when the Plan is finally adopted.
- 8.2 I consider that the objections seeking particular action have been briefly but well answered in the Council's schedules of responses to representations (CD1.3, CD1.22). Some requests for action are realistically unachievable. On occasions, the matter disputed is treated elsewhere in this Plan Chapter.
- 8.3 A little alteration could improve the proposed Policy, which now reads more as a statement of intent, only loosely related to the planning process. The opening words of the Policy would be better re-drafted to read: “In considering the location or control of new development, or the relocation of existing activities, the Council will always take account of the following principles of the adopted 2004 Canterbury District Transport Action Plan: ”.

Recommendation

- 8.4 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 8.3 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

POLICY C2 – BUS AND RAIL TRANSPORT – AND PARAGRAPHS 7.15-7.18

Objections and Key Issues

Re: A7/012 – Amended paragraph 7.15 Improving Travel Choices

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20643)

- Add fourthly: locating homes close to the large clusters & concentrations of new & existing employment development

Paragraph 7.17 – Improving Travel Choices

RN345 Oaten Hill & District Society (2448)

- The bus station is unwelcoming. Add to second part of sentence: "and Canterbury's new station has failed to remedy this"

Paragraph 7.18 - Improving Travel Choices

RN164 Railtrack PLC (1801)

RN207 Reeves and Neylan (753)

- 7.18 should include reference to a Parkway railway station & safeguard & identify land for this purpose. Access to existing stations very crowded
- The reference to investigating increases in rail freight with railway companies needs to be more explicit and wider

Re: A7/074 – New Paragraph 7.18a

RD124 Stansfield (20340)

- Any parkway station should not be carried out so that facilities for passengers wishing to arrive within walking distance of the city are lost. Canterbury West should represent an impressive arrival into the City

Policy C2 – Bus Priority Measures and Rail Network Improvements

RN185 Lowe (159)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1505)

RN285 Strategic Rail Authority (831)

- Add at end: "and in particular the Council will give favourable consideration to reopen the former Chislet railway station at Hersden in association with other development on former colliery land"
- The policy needs to support new railway stations, and implement circular rail routes around East Kent and between Canterbury stations
- Policy too restrictive: add other rail improvement proposals, whether or not they are included within the Transport Plan

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.5 Articulate objection has been made to the less than ideal arrangements and faulty detailed planning of the new Canterbury bus station newly built beside the Whitefriars development. The objectors are unwilling that the text should give unmerited praise to the new station. Honours might be even if the opening of paragraph 7.17 was recast to say: "Canterbury has a new bus station as part of the Whitefriars development. However, buses and trains continue to have a relatively poor image, and stations and stops are often unwelcoming". I think it possible that continued articulate and constructive criticism may help further improve the new bus station, given the existing mechanisms for consultation

and improvement. As to the possible Parkway station, there must be real doubts about its credibility, but it is very likely the Council will have more detailed knowledge of the full ramifications of the CTRL for station building and/or upgrading by the time the Local Plan is adopted, and I can say nothing useful on the matter.

8.6 To relate the Policy better to the planning process, I consider it would be desirable to reword it to read: "Planning permission will not be granted for proposals that prejudice effective implementation of the bus priority measures or the rail network improvements arising from the Canterbury District Transport Action Plan".

Recommendation

8.7 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 8.6 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

POLICY C3 – CYCLING AND WALKING – AND PARAGRAPHS 7.19-7.22

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.19 – Cycling and Walking

- RN301 Wanstall (2264)
- RN166 Pedestrian Association (1823)
- RN010 Wilks (325, 326, 364, 369)

- Title and text should be described as 'Walking and Cycling', not the other way round
- Walking is not good for health if worried about cyclists on footpaths etc. Establish a proper walking/disability officer without any connection to the cycle lobby group
- Object to total lack of consultation on cycling and walking proposals. Before proposals are adopted all groups must be consulted especially pedestrians, the blind and disabled etc.
- New policy required: Review and record access ways for pedestrians and horse riders to reach the beaches from Faversham Rd, Seasalter. Clear those obstructed and provide new ways, if review shows it is desirable
- Faversham Rd (esp. between Blue Anchor Corner and Red Sluice) is dangerous for walkers. Could widen verge by taking up some carriageway or provide walkway along sea wall (owned by EA). Could be acknowledged as footpath

Paragraph 7.20 - Cycling and Walking

- RN274 Davis (1730)
- RN301 Wanstall (2265)
- RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2379)
- RN161 Ramblers Association (1914)
- RN103 McCabe (591)
- RN083 C. E. Murch Ltd. (419)

- Object to total lack of consultation on cycling and walking proposals. Before proposals are adopted all groups must be consulted especially pedestrians, the blind and disabled etc.
- Propose the upgrading of footpath links CH23, CH24, CH21, which connect the Herne Village centre, to the status of a cycle lane
- The pedestrian / cycle routes have been identified on the map prior to full consultation. In the absence of full information on sharing, segregation and width, must object to the proposals
- Would welcome a cycle path along the coast from Seasalter to Reculver to link with a coastal route to Thanet
- Object to opening of the Canterbury to Whitstable railway line as a cycle path because the area is well supplied with paths. It was previously agreed there was no pressure to open the railway and land is in other use.
- No further duplication of the Crab and Winkle Line route is needed down the old line which is in private ownership, part of farms and gardens and a nature reserve. Amend the proposed cycle routes

Re: A7/014 – Amended paragraph 7.20

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RD017 Christophers (20024)
RD090 Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council (20200)
RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20563)

- Re-instate cycle route from Bekesbourne to Littlebourne
- Re-instate the Northgate to St John's car park route. A valuable link for pedestrian and cyclists using Northgate shops and students walking from North Holmes Road to leisure facilities without using busy roadside pavement
- Insert new 2nd sentence. Any new route must be safe for all users and should not compromise the efficient operation of any of the sites it links or provides access to

Paragraph 7.21 - Cycling and Walking

RN274 Davis (1731)
RN301 Wanstall (2266)
RN166 Pedestrian Association (1825, 1826)

- Canterbury's cycle standards do not conform to the County's
- Object to total lack of consultation on cycling and walking proposals. Before proposals are adopted all groups must be consulted especially pedestrians, the blind and disabled etc.
- Walking is also of local and national importance on a much larger scale. Pedestrians require decent safe pathways. The unsafe and unhealthy practice of shared use routes should be stopped
- Rather than facilities for cyclists there needs to be a safer cycling policy adopted. Equally, pedestrians should have more public toilets and benches provided. Include enforcement of illegal cycling

Paragraph 7.22 - Cycling and Walking

RN301 Wanstall (2267)
RN166 Pedestrian Association (1827, 1829, 1830)
RN010 Wilks (327)

- The biggest hindrance is allowing cyclists onto footpaths, pavements and promenades. Stop the practice of 'shared use' and painting white lines on all pedestrian routes
- It is disgraceful that the walking and cycling strategies are not yet prepared. It needs to be incorporated into the local plan so that it can be considered at the public inquiry
- Object to total lack of consultation on cycling and walking proposals. Before proposals are adopted all groups must be consulted especially pedestrians, the blind and disabled etc.
- Cyclists should not be on any footway. It is an unhealthy and unsafe practice. 'No cycling' signage should be promptly put up (e.g. Promenade at Tankerton) and police and council support is required
- The requests from the pedestrian and disability groups to the Walking Strategy should not be called a wish list. The walking strategy should not be weakened by dividing people up

Policy C3 – Proposed Pedestrian and Cycle Routes

RN008 H. Mount and Sons (301)
RN010 Wilks (328, 329, 330, 331, 340, 341, 342, 371)
RN083 C. E. Murch Ltd. (420)
RN103 McCabe (592)
RN164 Railtrack PLC (1802)
RN166 Pedestrian Association (1828, 1832)
RN209 PACE (785)
RN287 Safer Walking & Cycling Campaign (834, 987)
RN288 Canterbury & District Access Group (971)
RN289 Design & Management Consultants (976)
RN290 Atkins (977)
RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne (2327, 2328)
RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2380)
RN333 Hubbard (2418)
RN355 Transco represented by Lattice Property (2492)

- Objects to the cycle route across the Gas Holder Station, Wincheap as the land is operational and this proposal raises health and safety issues
- Object to opening of the Canterbury to Whitstable railway line as a cycle path, particularly through Amery Court Farm, Blean, because the area is well supplied with paths. It was previously agreed there was no pressure to open the railway and land is in alternative use. Adverse effect on nature conservation, and activities like spraying and shooting

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Object to proposals for cycle path through Woolton Farm
- The alleys in Whitstable should be kept clean and tidy and those that are obstructed should be opened up
- Acknowledge alleys described in the WUDC survey of 1951/52 as public ways; the remaining alleys should be investigated as to their correct status and value to the built environment of Whitstable
- A new policy should be set out which recognises the value of town alleys: a traffic free way to use the built environment and an asset loved by visitors
- As part of policy, include plans for enforcement and explain how juveniles are to be incorporated into cycle routes without damage to themselves and others. Remember that to pedestrians, cyclists are traffic
- Note that Tankerton Parade is a public footpath
- The policy needs to include reference to supporting additional routes as the opportunity arises
- No permissive cycle routes to be set out
- Include in policy that all changes from public footpath status (KCC definitive rights of way maps) are done under the Cycle Tracks Act 1984
- Opposes a route through the garden and driveway of The Malt, Tyler Hill Rd. Will be intrusive and impact upon privacy, wildlife and countryside when there is no need for an additional route
- Need for further arterial cycle routes linking major urban clusters & upgrading of whole Crab & Winkle route. Also routes to Ashford & secure the old Elham Valley Railway line as a cycle route
- Objection, as no consultation with groups such as visually impaired and blind, the disabled, the elderly, vulnerable, pedestrians and ramblers
- Object to proposed cycle routes affecting Preston Parade area including Admiralty Walk
- Remove existing Sustrans NCR1 route from BR footpath at Whitstable Station, through Stream Walk, past Westmeads School, through 'one way' Albert Street and back. It includes steps and a one way street.
- Objection because of lack of consultation with organisations representing the disabled and vulnerable
- No further duplication of the Crab and Winkle Line route is needed down the old line which is in private ownership, part of farms and gardens and a nature reserve. Amend the proposed cycle routes
- Propose the upgrading of footpath links CH23, CH24, CH21 which connect the Herne Village centre to the status of a cycle lane
- Proposed cycle route from Bekesbourne to Littlebourne not an alternative to the route parallel to Bekesbourne Lane, linking Bekesbourne to Littlebourne which has been requested for years
- Only include new proposed cycle routes in the plan after they have been discussed and agreed in principle with the landowner
- CCC and KCC have not adhered to DETR's shared use by cyclists and pedestrians brochure and consultation guidelines. Policy C3 should be withdrawn and re-established with better consultation, including ROSPA
- Where proposed cycle routes pass over, under or across railways and are only designated as public footpaths or bridleways, CCC should enter an agreement with Railtrack regarding the increased burden
- Breaches govt guidance; proposed cycle routes don't recognise that walkers are at top of vulnerable highway users hierarchy; consultation on proposed routes inadequate; walking & cycling strategies need to be linked

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.8 The Canterbury District Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy of April 2003 (CD7.10) has yet to be adopted, but I am informed that this is likely to occur between receipt of my report and the adoption of the Local Plan. However, the Council says the Strategy has already been approved by the County and District Councils. Apart from its propagation of the benefits of using these modes to a greater extent, the land use aspects of the Strategy comprise indicated cycle/pedestrian routes on the Proposals Map. The Strategy states that the routes shown would be “subject to further local public consultation as schemes come forward for implementation”. The Council says there that it intends to work closely with the Joint Walking and Cycling Forum, whose members include the Pedestrians Association, and to consult them on the detailed design of all walking and cycling schemes, at an early stage. Of course, it will be necessary to seek the agreement of landowners.
- 8.9 The objections show a strong number of fears and complaints about the perceived dangers stemming from shared use of certain parts of proposed cycle routes within the District. The Council's evidence to the Inquiry indicated that “the decision to prepare a joint walking and cycling strategy was prompted by groups representing pedestrians and

mobility impaired people when the coastal cycling route was first being considered. This has enabled the walking side to catch up with the considerable amount of work already carried out in respect of cycling...”.

- 8.10 I do understand what lies behind some of the concerns of the anti-shared use objectors, and the passage quoted indicates the strange position where cycling – an admirable, practical but minority activity with vocal and well placed advocates – can be portrayed as “go-ahead” and unquestionably virtuous while walking, a universal but almost uncelebrated activity save in the guise of “rambler” activity, can be seen as mundane and scarcely worthy of extensive policy formulation. It would be desirable and sensible to title the section of text from paragraph 7.19 onwards “Walking and Cycling”, echoing the title of the Strategy document.
- 8.11 I have visited the areas where all the proposed Cycle and Pedestrian Routes run, to assess the practicality and general acceptability of what is proposed in the Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy. Given the requirement for detailed consultation and problem solving, and the need to comply with statutory procedures, I do not consider it necessary to voice any planning reservations on the routeing shown on the Proposals Map, or what is said clearly and concisely in the Policy and supporting text, save in one instance.
- 8.12 In planning shared cycle/pedestrian routes, it is obviously necessary to bear in mind that it needs only a very few cyclists to act aggressively or inconsiderately, for the fast moving and heavy rider/bicycle combination to become a very dangerous weapon on any shared thoroughfare demarcated by nothing more than a painted white line. I agree with objectors’ concerns about the public footpath which is Tankerton Promenade, where the path is relatively narrow, with an un-walled steep drop to the beach below. This is a well-used seaside footpath of course, but numbers of the pedestrians using it walk across, rather than along the path, between the beach area and Tankerton Slopes, the latter well-lined with beach huts and access paths. This cross-path pattern of movement on a narrow space, used much more by pedestrians than cyclists, will inevitably cause problems and incidents if anything less than exemplary, slow cycling is practiced by every cyclist at all times. At the very least, I consider that this potential hazard should rule out shared use of the Tankerton Promenade footpath from the early morning to the early evening during the conventional seaside seasons of the year.
- 8.13 I realise that that there are articulate proponents of cyclists having access along the lower promenade, and that this idea has been promoted for some years. I, though, see no good reason why cyclists should not use the perfectly feasible alternative of an unconstrained cliff-top route along the axis of the relatively quiet and under-trafficked Marine Parade. This could run along either a marked section of the carriageway itself, or perhaps a newly constructed, low key cycling path over the grassed area near the cliff top, surfaced in a material like hoggin, if a good sea view is considered the real priority. I should like the Council to consider this matter dispassionately, before finally deciding the cycle and pedestrian route through Tankerton.

Recommendation

- 8.14 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified in accordance with actions suggested in my paragraphs 8.13 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C4 - TRANSPORT ASSESSMENTS AND TRAVEL PLANS - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.23-7.25

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.23 - Coaches

RN128 Dean and Chapter of Canterbury (119)

RN 345 Oaten Hill & District Society (2446)

- Specify that the dropping off facilities should be within the area of the city centre
- The City Council should identify a permanent coach park for Canterbury

Paragraph 7.24 – Freight Travel

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2556)

RN025 Cutler (658)

RN164 Railtrack PLC (1803, 1804)

RN285 Strategic Rail Authority (826)

- Plan doesn't sufficiently address the importance of transferring freight movements to rail & the movement of freight by means other than road
- Should consider the use of country lanes for access to farms. Produce could be collected in smaller lorries for delivery to a central point served by lorries
- Council should carry out a study about potential sites that could be designated as a rail freight interchange (in accordance with PPG13)
- Refer to the important part Canterbury District can make to SRA's National Transport Strategy; show support for the 80% growth target for rail freight
- Is Council having any input into suggestion for foreign lorry charging

Paragraph 7.25 – Travel Plans

RN274 Davis (1737)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1574)

- The paragraph is framed around the Canterbury Transport Plan which does not yet exist
- Traffic needs reducing as safer routes to school, children walking or sharing minibuses will assist

Re: A7/016 – Amended paragraph 7.25

RD022 Bartlett (20054)

- Add after “air quality” the words "and traffic noise"

Policy C4 – Transport Assessments and Travel Plans

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1573)

RN185 Lowe (161)

RN226 BT Group Plc Represented By RPS (1682)

- Clarify “major development”. All developments that will have significant transport implications should be supported by Transport assessments/Travel Plan
- The policy does not make reference to PPG13
- To add that all major proposals must be supported by a Transport Assessment showing how transport demand is to be reduced and how monitoring arrangements will be secured

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.15 The objectors to this policy and text in general want it to say much more, and more vigorously. However, I consider that the present degree of coverage is adequate, either because – as with coach parking – the answers are not yet worked out, or because the kind of additional text wanted is unnecessary, impractical or merely rhetorical.

8.16 The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC7/001, adding traffic noise as a consideration in the last sentence of Paragraph 7.25, which I consider an improvement. Using the text of PPG13 as a guide, I think it would be more practical to rephrase the opening of the Policy to read: "Development proposals considered by the Council to have significant transport implications are to be supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan..."

Recommendation

8.17 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC7/001, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 8.16 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C5 - ROAD BUILDING - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.26-7.37

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.26 – Road Building

RN052 Parkinson (62)

- Council should have a road pricing policy

Paragraph 7.28 - Road Building

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne (2329)

- Welcome additional slip roads at the A2 / Patrixbourne interchange, but the benefits for Patrixbourne should be recognised as well as the reduction of traffic in the Canterbury urban area

Re: A7/017 – Amended paragraph 7.28

RD090 Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council (20201)

RD150 H. Mount and Sons Ltd (20389)

- Proposed cycle route (no. 31) a good idea in principle, but need to see detailed plans for the route
- Known benefits should be itemised specifically in the plan

Policy C5

RN052 Parkinson (60)

RN311 Bridge Parish Council (2284)

- Objects to A2 link roads
- Object to alteration of interchanges on the A2, without specific alterations proposed and clear policy statement

Paragraph 7.30 – Road Schemes

RN311 Bridge Parish Council (2286)

RN112 Canterbury City Partnership (516)

RN183 Sturry Parish Council (20)

RN315 Blean Parish Council (2298)

- Remove references to developer-funded road schemes in the plan. Could serve their own requirements only
- Eastern relief route is essential to Sturry due to effect of Manston and Hersden on Traffic levels
- Make reference to the Whitstable Road link road
- More measures are need to remove traffic from the city, particularly from A28

Re: A7/018 – Reworded paragraph 7.30

RD022 Bartlett (20055)

RD093 Austin (20225)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- After Military Rd area, say it remains for consideration whether the possible benefits would outweigh the significant environmental damage which it would cause, since it would trasverse an AHLV which is currently unaffected by traffic noise & movement
- Removal proposals for short Sturry bypass. Environmental implications of developer funded bypass not identified i.e. several hundred houses which is totally unacceptable, will transfer traffic problem, no indication of the route lack of clarity

Paragraph 7.31 – Road Building

RN359 Harbledown Conservation Association (1947)

RN057 Harbledown Parish Council (1939)

- Against idea of a western link road. This would negate the Plan's environmental polices applied to Harbledown parish, the Canterbury AHLV review and Conservation Area policies

Re: A7/019 – Reworded paragraph 7.31

RD004 Blean Parish Council (20216)

RD106 Bridge Parish Council (20292, 20293)

- Remove reference to Eastern bypass
- Objects to western link road from A2050 to A290 as this will generate extra traffic through Blean
- Para 7.31 seems contrary to para 7.28. Unlocking the gridlock suggests alteration to the interchange on existing bypass, but no map details are given

Paragraph 7.32 - Road Building

RN311 Bridge Parish Council (2285)

RN228 Kent County Council (1644)

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patricbourne (2330)

RN209 PACE (786)

- The Barrack Link would not necessarily relieve congestion in the city centre, and the reasons for abandoning the Eastern Bypass need to be explained.
- Object to the inclusion of the A28/A2 Eastern Bypass. Remove mention of the scheme as it is reported it is unlikely to receive funding from public sources
- Mention should be made of the benefit to the villages in the south east quadrant of Canterbury by the creation of a Canterbury Eastern Bypass
- Eastern Traffic By-pass would decimate areas of high scenic value & increase car usage. Traffic in eastern area could be overcome by upgrading Tourtel Rd to Littlebourne Rd link

Re: A7/020 – Deleted paragraph 7.32

RD090 Bekesbourne with Patricbourne Parish Council (20202)

- Deletion of Eastern Bypass means no solution is suggested. Plan should address growth of traffic in SE Quadrant & suggestions for reduction & management of traffic

Paragraph 7.33 - Road Building

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (1302)

- Object to building of a Herne bypass. Re-designation of the A291 as a B road would discourage heavy traffic.

Paragraph 7.34 - Road Building

RN054 Councillor Attwood (85)

RN228 Kent County Council (1645)

RN328 Westbere Parish Council (2413)

RN183 Sturry Parish Council (21)

- Paragraph misleading and should be omitted. Funding would need to be substantial and restrictions of para. 2.52 of the draft would preclude any development in the vicinity
- There should be a strong policy objection to further retail along Sturry Road by reason of heavy traffic through Sturry/ A28
- Objects to the Sturry By-Pass. Delete this Paragraph in its entirety
- The A28 Multi Modal Study considered a short by-pass as an option and this could be mentioned

Paragraph 7.36 - Traffic management

RN052 Parkinson (61)

RN131 Clarke Cooper & Co (112)

RN185 Lowe (162)

- Traffic management should introduce road charges; add a policy to protect traffic management systems
- The Council should reduce congestion by reducing speed of traffic
- No solutions are offered to traffic and parking problems

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.18 I find no great weight or content in the objections to Policy C5 and its supporting text. The Council's premise is that traffic must be kept moving, but that road building proposals must show real environmental benefits and must be accompanied by traffic management schemes. More detail is available in the Canterbury District Transport Action Plan, so I find what is said in the Plan quite adequate. The Council's given reasons for not pursuing a road pricing policy are realistic.
- 8.19 The Plan text from paragraph 7.30-7.35, amended in the Revised Deposit Draft, performs what I consider a useful function. It brings into the open concepts that have been envisaged or advocated in public, but which have no specific allocation or approval. The text contains specific caveats about some schemes, and I find that it generally maintains an even-handed tone. Of course, to some objectors any mention of a possible scheme is interpreted as actual Council support, but discussion of a matter is not the same as its endorsement. I do think that it would be helpful to Plan users to insert some additional text; this would briefly spell out that none of the concept schemes is seen as likely to come forward for implementation within the Local Plan period, but it would also indicate the procedure for any scheme to be formally brought forward through the Local Transport Plan for Kent. It would also be wise to add to paragraph 7.30 a statement that there is no potential development envisaged to fund any of the schemes mentioned.
- 8.20 The one exception to what I have said concerns Sturry. Here, the long-standing saga of successive aborted bypass schemes means that any text must be very nicely judged. This vulnerable village needs to maintain its separate identity from the periphery of the City. I find that the text following the bullet point in paragraph 7.30 does raise as many fears as it seeks to dispel; development to fund a Short Bypass might affect the degree and quality of separation between Village and City. If the Council accepts my recommendation for a Broad Oak housing allocation, that development would be accompanied by an east-west road between Herne Bay Road and Shalloak Road with some of the characteristics of a Sturry Bypass, and other transport funding benefiting Sturry. It is for the Council to decide if that new road would effectively remove any realistic case for a separate Short Bypass. I leave it to the Council to devise new text about the Sturry situation.
- 8.21 The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC7/002, bringing in mention of environmental impact to the first sentence of paragraph 7.30. This should certainly be incorporated in any re-drafting of the paragraph.

Recommendation

- 8.22 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC7/002, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraphs 8.19-8.20 above, but that no other modification be

made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C6 - PARK AND RIDE IN CANTERBURY - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.38-7.39, 7.41-7.42

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.38 – Park and Ride in Canterbury

RN061 PACE (38)
RN209 PACE (784, 787)
RN021 Leetham (634)
RN186 Strutt & Parker (178)
RN025 Cutler (657)
RN185 Lowe (163)
RN010 Wilks (334)
RN210 Furley Page Solicitors (798)
RN024 Gogrin (642)
RN228 Kent County Council (1660)

- The Park and Ride car park should be extended to the railway station the respondent proposes at back of Wincheap (see comment 641)
- Current park and ride scheme, though meeting the needs of certain sectors of the community is not suitable in terms of speed & convenience for business
- Is park and ride really reducing cars?; the buses always look mostly empty
- Park and ride sites a waste of the precious agricultural land resource
- Park & Ride sites haven't been developed in a manner that maximises their utility. City edge P&R should have been smaller; should be small P&R on axial public transport routes into the City
- Although true to say 'The City's PARC Plan strategy has been successful in contributing to the reduction of urban traffic levels over the past 10 years', this is now a misleading statement
- Any allocation of the 4th park and Ride at Halls Place, Harbledown should respect its existing or potential alternative use
- Objects to site from area N.W. Wincheap Industrial Estate adjacent to A2 to Canterbury/Ashford railway not being identified as a site for extending the Wincheap Park and Ride

Paragraph 7.41 - Park and Ride in Canterbury

RN311 Bridge Parish Council (2287)
RN209 PACE (793)
RN183 Sturry Parish Council (22)

- Bridge PC has concerns that expansion of all three park and ride sites is envisaged. The South Canterbury site should not be expanded
- Expansion of the PARC sites is welcomed. Satellite park and ride sites for Sturry could be considered to gather up those travelling from Herne Bay and Thanet before reaching Sturry
- Under no circumstances should the present Park and Ride facilities be enlarged

Policy C6 – Sturry Road Park and Ride extension

RN208 Thanet District Council (767)
RN209 PACE (789)

- Under no circumstances should the present P&R facilities be enlarged.
- Objection to safeguarding further land for car parking expansion at Sturry Park and Ride; will attract more shopping trips from outside the District. Delete extension & apply other traffic management measures

Re: A7/028 – Amended paragraph 7.41

RD106 Bridge Parish Council (20295)

- Disappointed to see no reference to the expansion of Dover Road P&R site

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Re: A7/029 – amended paragraph 7.42

RD138 G W Finn & Sons (20529)

- Should be a site on A257

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.23 This text and Policy deal with a well established concept, which the Council keeps developing and improving on a regular basis. PPG13 sets out in its paragraphs 59-63 a large number of relevant considerations, and says that appropriate schemes may vary considerably in size and purpose. The manner in which the Council operates appears to me to avoid the potential pitfalls and mis-applications of the concept highlighted in PPG13. This text is suitably circumspect about any specific enhancement of two of the three existing park and ride sites and the possible new fourth site on the A257, in association with other measures to reduce travel demand and congestion. It does safeguard an area of land for extension at Sturry Park and Ride facility. I do not find there to be any forceful argument against what is no more than a potential Sturry expansion, save a somewhat far-fetched objection about adverse effects on Thanet District.

Recommendation

8.24 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

NEW POLICY C5a – HARBLEDDOWN PARK AND RIDE FACILITY, AND PARAGRAPH 7.40

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.40 - Park and Ride in Canterbury

RN315 Blean Parish Council (2301, 2302)

RN359 Harbledown Conservation Association (1948)

RN021 Leatham (633)

RN112 Canterbury City Partnership (515)

RN017 Harbledown Parish Council (609)

- Objects to approach to Park and Ride. No additional sites should be identified, rather improvements to existing locations and management and provision of services and facilities
- There does not appear to be a reference to the land set aside for the fourth park and ride
- Land north west of the Wincheap industrial estate to the Canterbury / Ashford railway and adjacent A2 should be re-designated for North Canterbury Park and Ride, Parkway Station and Coach Park
- A Park and Ride site in the Harbledown area could lead to pressure for development
- A disastrous effect on Harbledown Parish in terms of landscape and impact on the Conservation Area. The scheme should be abandoned

Re: A7/026 – amended paragraph 7.40

RD004 Blean Parish Council (20006)

RD041 Leatham (20088)

RD061 The Baker Family (20129)

- Object to P&R site: area is congested and a crash black spot, and should be protected as a green gap
- Paragraph 7.40 P&R allocation at Harbledown does not preserve or enhance conservation area, unacceptable harm within AHLV; adverse impact on green space between Rough Common & Canterbury; light & noise pollution; increased traffic through Rough Common; consider alternatives on A2 at Dunkirk

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Re: A7/027- New policy C5a Harbledown Park and Ride site

RD003	Ravenscourt Road Residents' Association (20004)
RD004	Blean Parish Council (20007)
RD041	Leatham (20089)
RD060	Beattie (20128)
RD061	Baker (20130)
RD062	Docherty (20131)
RD074	Murdoch (20150)
RD089	George (20196)
RD102	Highways Agency (20267)

- Worse traffic problems, congestion, hazards, reduction of green land between Rough Common/Canterbury
- More traffic and rat running thro Rough Common; need to reduce number of large vehicles using road; dangerous for children trying to cross, site should remain green land; go for alternative sites on A2 & at Whitstable. Should have “village only” traffic policy for Rough Common
- Wincheap park and ride, using new A2 slip roads, should be expanded
- Need to ensure traffic impact of such sites is properly assessed. Say a prior transport assessment will be prepared to consider the impact of the proposed development on surrounding highway network
- Increased pollution for St Michael's Road residents, air pollution, traffic and associated noise, light pollution, loss of rural greenfield view. More appropriate sites at A2/Dunkirk. Decrease in property values

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.25 The Council has a long-established system of park and ride sites in Canterbury, which appear to operate well. It is undoubtedly true that the absence of a facility in the north-west area of Canterbury amounts to a lost opportunity to keep more Canterbury-bound vehicles away from the Historic City. Clearly, the way in which the concept is fleshed out in a detailed scheme is critical, as regards matters such as siting, the impact on landscape and the curtailment of undesirable rat-running into potentially vulnerable residential areas like Rough Common (where present traffic levels are still well within the capacity of Rough Common Road and its junction with the A290). All this work has yet to be undertaken, and put out for consultation.

8.26 None of the (necessarily un-detailed) objector evidence before me suggests that an expanded Wincheap area, or locations further out on the A2, are inherently better than the land north of Hall Place as a traffic interception point for this north-west area of the City. However, the supporting text in paragraph 7.40 does promise further work on alternative options for park and ride “on the A2 corridor”, which suggests to me that the Council is prepared for alternative thinking if detailed technical examination reveals really serious problems arising from a Hall Place location. Also, the Council has put forward Proposed Change PC7/003, bringing in mention of a transport assessment to consider the impact of any facility on the surrounding highway network, in a new last sentence of Paragraph 7.40. These positive factors lead me to support what I find to be a reasonable concept, which should be capable of considerable refinement before it is built.

Recommendation

8.27 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC7/003, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C7 - PARK AND RIDE AT HERNE BAY AND WHITSTABLE - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.43-7.44

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.43 – Park and Ride along the Coast

RN228 Kent County Council (1661)

- The Park and Ride sites at the coast should not seek to serve Canterbury. Any link to Canterbury from them should be through improved bus measures

Paragraph 7.44 - Park and Ride along the Coast

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2394)

RN207 Reeves and Neylan (749)

- Not convinced there is any need for a Park and Ride at this location. Parking in Herne Bay is not severe, and there an adequate bus service which needs improvement
- In para 3.44 the terms "business innovation centre" & knowledge/research park" are not defined & don't make clear the proposed activity on the safeguarded land at University of Kent

Policy C7 – Park and Ride at the Coast

RN208 Thanet District Council (768)

- The Plan should more fully clarify the reasons for allocating an additional Park and Ride facility at Herne Bay, together with its future size and proposed role

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.28 The wording used here indicates that the case for applying the park and ride concept at Herne Bay and Whitstable is yet to be justified in detail. However, the Council has had the foresight to identify a possible park and ride location at Eddington golf course, and the policy and supporting text allow the concept's potential to be exploited and perhaps expanded at some time in the Local Plan period. That seems very reasonable to me.

Recommendation

8.29 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICIES C8 & C9 - PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARKING - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.45-7.54

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.45 – Public and Private Parking

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1860)

RN025 Cutler (659)

RN010 Wilks (360)

- Why is there any doubt over controls of non-residential parking as is implied by the phrase in para 7.45 "controls may be introduced"?
- Free car parking would help shopping centres and attract visitors e.g. Newmarket in Suffolk. Label certain car parks 'short visit car park' and 'long visit car park'
- There is no justification for control over private non-residential parking. Delete reference

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Paragraph 7.46 - Public and Private Parking

RN285 Strategic Rail Authority (832)

- Say adequate car parking for rail users is important to encourage public transport use. In line with PPG13, rail industry should be consulted to establish car parking levels

Re: A7/031 – New paragraph 7.46a Public and Private Parking

RD024 Wratten (20058)

- Car parking for resident & visitors is one of main problems for Whitstable & is not addressed (except park and ride). Should state an intent to acquire land for car parking if it becomes available

Paragraph 7.48 – Residential parking

RN221 E Kent Hospitals Trust represented by Broadway Malyan (1698)

- The residential parking standards should be amended to reflect Government Guidance.

Re: Paragraph 7.49 – Improving Travel Awareness

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2347)

- Village traffic plans should embrace education within their communities. How do we educate those from other communities who use local roads as short cuts?

Paragraph 7.50 - Improving Travel Awareness

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne (2332)

- Frustrated by the lack of real action on safety on rural lanes. The Quiet Lane schemes have not proved to be of any benefit and any reference to them should be removed from the plan

Policy C8 – Vehicle Parking Standards

RN084 WM Morrison Supermarkets Plc represented by Peacock and Smith (1932)

RN088 Lovegrove (717)

RN210 Furley Page Solicitors (802)

- The public will always own at least one car and any new housing should cater for this
- On the basis of current car parking policy, parking on brownfield developments will be inadequate
- Object to appendix 2: Vehicle Parking Standards: The cycle parking standard will be in excess of demand and inefficient use of land. Amend A1 Food superstores to 5% of vehicle parking standards

Policy C9 – Parking requirements in town centres

RN085 Marks & Spencer Plc represented by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (1839)

RN125 Snook (107)

RN131 Clarke Cooper & Co (111)

RN184 Kent Maritime Chamber of Commerce (148)

RN255 GOSE (2653)

- This policy will force certain types of business to leave the City centre
- Only implement after satisfactory alternatives have been put in place to safeguard the City centre
- Limiting parking to operational levels will prejudice Council's vision for Tannery by threatening commercial viability. At end of 1st sentence add: "Except where such an approach would prejudice other Local Plan objectives or the redevelopment of key sites"
- Access and parking militate against the economy. Need to consider alternatives
- Reword Policy to allow for assessments/plans only being required for proposals with significant transport implications

Re: A7/032 – Amended policy C9

RD079 GOSE (20179)

- In Policy C9 the word "reasonable" makes the Policy unclear

Re: A7/033 – new paragraph 7.54a Travel Wise

RD128 Unite represented by Turley Associates (20354)

- Positive connections should be made between the adoption of travel plans with car free development options and good access to public transport

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.30 I find the Council's approach to vehicle parking matters to be well-judged. It sticks to the application of County Council adopted standards, but sets out a reasoned approach to residential parking that seeks to avoid problems like unsightly street parking stemming from unrealistic provision in uncontrolled areas, while displaying an encouraging attitude to new housing with reduced parking and car-free development in appropriate controlled areas. No convincing case has been made out for a departure from the current adopted County standards for particular developments. However, a small rewording in C9 removes a potential conflict on the important Tannery site, without weakening it. I find that in the specific context of this Policy, the use of the subjective term "reasonable multi-modal access" is hard to improve on; it is a matter that will have to be debated in the context of a particular development in a specific location, but that does not show an intrinsic weakness of approach by the Council.

8.31 I do not find there is a need to make general comment on parking for rail users in this policy, but there would be no harm and some sense in making a reference to possible enhanced parking demand at Canterbury West Station after CTRL completion, and how this fits with the principles of the C9 Policy. The Council will be in possession of more information by the time it considers my report, and that will determine precisely what is to be said further on the matter. I endorse the Council's three Proposed Changes concerning this text. PC7/014 removes the last sentence in paragraph 7.46 on parking standards. PC7/015 moves paragraph 7.46a to follow 7.48, and PC7/016 expands the text about uncontrolled parking areas in 7.48.

Recommendation

8.32 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes Nos. PC7/014, PC7/015 and PC7/016, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 8.31 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICIES C10, C10a & C11 - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.55-7.60

Objections and Key Issues

Policy C10

RN189 South Canterbury Trust (1764)

RN255 GOSE (2643, 2649)

- Rephrase Policy wording
- Refer in the text to cemeteries and places of worship

Re: A7/036 – Amended policy C10

RD079 GOSE (20173)

- object to words "will be encouraged"; makes the meaning of the Policy unclear

Re: A7/037 – New policy C10a Community Use. Allocations

RD024 Wratten (20057)

RD085 National Grid Company Plc represented by Malcolm Judd and Partners (20300)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Objects as no community allocation for Whitstable
- Brief for any development at Vauxhall Avenue must take account of high voltage overhead lines

Policy C11 – Loss of Community Uses

RN118 Dept of Health represented by Inventures (501)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2578)

RN255 GOSE (2637)

- The use of the term community facilities is taken to include NHS health-care buildings or land. It is unclear whether this is the case. Specify that policy does not apply to NHS health care facilities
- Retain health facilities and get the Government to revamp in specialist departments

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.33 The Council has augmented the text about the types of appropriate social infrastructure in the Revised Deposit Draft. It has also put forward Further Amendment FA7/003, which inserts a new paragraph 7.58a to follow paragraph 7.58. This expands in what I consider to be a useful way on relevant factors when considering new “informal facilities” in rural locations, whether re-using existing building or seeking new premises. Its text can now be altered to refer to PPS7 of 2004, in which para.6 alludes to development of this kind.

8.34 I do not find the use of the words “will be encouraged” inappropriate in Policy C10; the sentiment reflects the Council’s attitude, and it is yoked to a policy oriented to the control of development. The two locations specifically named for community purposes in Policy C10a can be augmented by others so far not identified, under Policy C10. I do believe the opening words of Policy C11 could with profit be made more relevant to the control of development if they read: “planning permission will not be granted for development involving the loss to other uses of public or privately operated buildings, or uses for community purposes, unless there is no....”

Recommendation

8.35 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment No. FA7/003, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 8.35 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C12 - HEALTH FACILITIES - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.61-7.63

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.62

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2354)

- Retain healthcare facilities, and get the Govt to revamp in specialist departments

Policy C12

RN068 Bellway Homes Ltd (702)

RN096 Chestfield Parish Council (733)

RN255 GOSE (2650)

- The principle is OK but there may be circumstances where requirement for health facilities will be waived. Insert at end: 'providing this would not prejudice the realisation of other planning objectives'
- Concerned over impacts of 5000 new homes on infrastructure, especially doctors and dentists surgeries; wish to see policy on health expanded to cover these potential problems

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Avoid "appropriate"

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.36 There is no basic opposition in principle to this Policy, which confines itself to the planning aspects of provision, and does not venture uselessly into wider health policy issues. The suggested additional wording at the end would only fudge a clear message, and the word "appropriate" is entirely acceptable in this particular verbal context.

Recommendation

8.37 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICIES C14 & C15 - EDUCATIONAL NEEDS - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.65-7.76

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.65 - Education

RN229 Property Review & Development (2606)

- Reword last sentence to clarify County Council's role: "The County Council, however, as Education Authority has statutory responsibility for the provision of state education." Make a clear reference to adult education

Paragraph 7.67 – Primary and Secondary Sector

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2368)

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2155)

- A new primary school should be located on the outskirts of Broomfield to alleviate the capacity problems at Herne and Broomfield
- Future schooling plans should be mentioned. Herne Bay needs more primary school places

Paragraph 7.69 - Primary and Secondary Sector

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2367)

- There is chronic under-provision of school places in both the primary and secondary sectors

Paragraph 7.72 - Primary and Secondary Sector

RN229 Property Review & Development (2598)

- Amend to correct school names, add the state sector schools and include consultation with the LEA and church education authorities as appropriate

Paragraph 7.75 - Primary and Secondary Sector

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2156)

RN096 Chestfield Parish Council (734)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2577)

- Note the possibility of a secondary school in the Green Gap between Herne Bay and Whitstable. But, there is no mention of the possibility of use of the site for sports facilities: would support this use
- Herne Bay will need another secondary school soon to the east of the town centre. A site should be identified
- KCC view is no need for a secondary school at the coast during the lifetime of the Plan. But, there will be a need for a primary school and possibly other education provision on the coast during the Plan period

Re: A7/042 – Reworded paragraph 7.76

RD086 Sport England (20317)

- Concerned that expansion of schools may lead to loss of playing fields. Suggest '...provided there is no conflict with other Policies in the plan' is added to the end of the last sentence.

Policy C14 – Educational needs arising from new developments

RN068 Bellway Homes Ltd (703)

RN144 Persimmon Homes represented by Tetlow King Planning (491)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN221 E Kent Hospitals Trust represented by Broadway Malyan (1699)

RN255 GOSE (2651)

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2369)

- Policy is too vague. It does not spell out what the 'appropriate mechanisms' are in the policy or the sub-text
- The principle is OK but may be circumstance where requirement for education facilities will be waived. Insert at end of C15: "providing this would not prejudice the realisation of other planning objectives"
- Agree with policy proposals which support a new secondary school, but suggest that the policies should enjoy a greater degree of urgency
- This policy should acknowledge that such mechanisms will not be necessary where there is existing capacity in local schools

Re: A7/043 – Amended Policy C14

RD079 GOSE (20178)

- The word "appropriate" makes the Policy unclear

Policy C15 - Educational needs arising from new developments

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2370)

- Agree with policy proposals which support a new secondary school, but suggest that the policies should enjoy a greater degree of urgency.

Re: A7/044 – Reworded Policy C15

RD086 Sport England (20318)

- Revised wording weakens the Policy. New Policy would be contrary to advice in PPG17 if it did not include criteria related to the protection of playing fields

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.38 Apart from those objections lobbying for a particular area need to be filled – a matter for the County Council as Education Authority – the Council has responded positively to accommodate suggested textual improvement and clarification. I find that no planning problem arises from the use of the word "appropriate" in Policy C14, as it is entirely acceptable in this particular verbal context.

8.39 The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC7/004 adding a new last sentence to paragraph 7.76 about expansion that affects playing fields. The Council has also put forward two Further Amendments: FA7/009 and FA7/010; these update and reword the lists of secondary schools, and information about the development plans they are encouraged to prepare, in paragraphs 7.72 and 7.73; the wording accords with the County Council's representations on the matter. I find that another County Council concern, about specific mention of adult education, is satisfactorily met through existing text in paragraph 7.78. All these Changes are uncontentious, in my opinion.

Recommendation

8.40 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change PC7/004 and Further Amendment Nos. FA7/009 and FA9/010, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C16 AND NEW POLICY C16a – CANTERBURY COLLEGE AND HADLOW COLLEGE – AND PARAGRAPHS 7.77 –7.84.

POLICY C18 - NEW OR EXPANDED CAMPUSES – AND PARAGRAPHS 7.83-7.86.

POLICIES C19 AND NEW POLICY C19a – INSTITUTIONAL LAND AND BUILDINGS – AND PARAGRAPHS 7.87-7.88.

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.81 – Higher and Further Education

RN274 Davis (1745)

RN235 Hadlow College represented by GVA Grimley (1707, 1708, 1709, 1710, 1712, 1713)

- The Council fails to recognise the presence of Hadlow College as a further education institution specialising in agriculture and horticulture
- Make a new policy for the college site, with supporting text about its strategy for the site
- Remove the Open Space designation on the Proposals Map and replace it by educational land at Hadlow College

Paragraph 7.82 – Canterbury College

RN212 Canterbury Christ Church University College (803)

- Plan does not show a significant level of support for the University College's own development objectives. Are not optimistic that needs of the College will be met in the urban area

Policy C16 – Education allocations

RN010 Wilks (335)

RN062 Hull (446)

RN064 Westhall (444)

RN065 Weiss (686)

RN069 Illes (708)

RN070 Hughes (710, 712)

RN071 Nicoll (713)

RN072 Rogerson (714)

RN073 Storrs (715)

RN075 Brown (56, 57)

RN076 Tyler (97, 98)

RN091 Mackenzie (919)

RN092 Chambers (719)

RN093 Brown (54)

RN101 Spain (920)

RN102 Mackenzie (918)

RN117 Langton & Nackington Residents Association (904)

RN127 Greenway (123)

RN157 Mather (929)

RN165 Hiscot (931)

RN185 Lowe (149)

RN209 PACE (780)

RN213 Martin (806)

RN223 O'Rorke (1201)

RN256 Herbert (2154)

RN273 Phipps (1729)

RN332 Mason (2417)

RN345 Oaten Hill & District Society (2443)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN346 Miller (2438)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2561)

RN127 Greenway (124)

RN213 Martin (807)

- Support the AHLV designation in the area at and surrounding the proposed education allocation for Canterbury College (Policy C16)
- Object to allocation of land at Nackington Road for educational use by Canterbury College; impact on the AHLV, traffic congestion, urban sprawl, accessibility and pollution
- Canterbury College should be encouraged to remain local to its existing campus
- Would reduce the status of the site to brownfield, but should be AHLV
- The land would be better as a landscaped public park

Re: A7/047 – Amended policy C16

RD040 Beddall (20081)

RD112 Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee (20431)

- Object to the education allocation at Hadlow College, Spring Lane. Impact on neighbouring properties, site is haven for wildlife and flora. Should undertake a study of flora and fauna
- Would like to see restrictions on scale of an educational development on Hadlow site. Currently small scale development for horticultural work in low rise buildings glasshouses & open plots. Over scaled building could adversely impact on residential properties adjacent

Re: PC7/017: amendment of Proposals Map to identify revised education allocation at Hadlow College (Policy C16)

APC078 D Hatton (30093)

APC121 Hadlow College, represented by David Hicken Associates Ltd (30156)

- Increase in traffic, diversity of wildlife needs to be maintained, possibility of further building. Objects to reduction in land available for educational use
- Will severely prejudice Hadlow College's ability to provide desired courses

Re: A7/048 – New Policy C16a – Nackington Road Education allocation

RD006 Rogerson (20013)

RD007 Tyler (20014)

RD010 Welsh (20017)

RD012 Hughes (20019)

RD013 Baldock (20020)

RD014 Parkinson (20021)

RD023 Spain (20076)

RD031 Westall (20065)

RD033 Brown (20067)

RD034 Brown (20068)

RD047 Mather (20106)

RD057 Earle (20122)

RD065 Langton & Nackington Residents' Association (20135)

RD066 Parkinson (20138)

RD090 Bekesbourne with Patribourne Parish Council (20203)

RD106 Bridge Parish Council (20294)

RD112 Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee (20432)

RD123 Miller (20336, 20337)

RD152 Smith (20738)

- The land at Nackington Road, designated for college purposes, should be returned to its proper designation and should no longer be available for education use
- Object to allocation of new college campus on traffic grounds and loss of grade 1 agricultural land
- The college allocation should be de-allocated and the AHLV reinstated

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Should revert to agricultural land
- Allocation conflicts with reducing travel demand. Exacerbates travel impact associated with secondary schools
- No justification for retaining education allocation, as Canterbury College has withdrawn their application. Permission granted on overriding need can not be applied to just any college
- Should not be allocated in light of results of public inquiry. Unlikely to be need in future with falling birth rate
- Generates urban sprawl
- ODPM refused to acknowledge land was suitable for education; should go before public inquiry
- Why in face of such local opposition is land being allocated? Erodes green land between Canterbury & villages, will increase traffic on rural roads + A2/Patrixbourne interchange
- Inadequate services; remote from City centre and public transport
- Allocation may render site for ever brownfield

Paragraph 7.84 – Canterbury Christ Church University College

RN322 English Heritage (1795)

RN061 PACE (39)

- Canterbury Christ Church University College maintains an option to develop land on the Dover Road. It is misleading not to include this on the development plan
- The development brief should give due consideration to potential impact upon the historic environment and World Heritage Site Management Plan

Policy C18 – New Education Campus

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1511)

RN228 Kent County Council (1662)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2581)

RN345 Oaten Hill & District Society (2445)

- Add criterion "any relocation to the edge of the city shall be on the side of the city corresponding to the direction from which students travelling to the institutions come"
- The policy should recognise and acknowledge the proposals for major growth in the student population
- Amend first sentence: "Planning permission will only be granted for the establishment of a new higher or further education campus." etc

Re: A7/052 – Amended Policy C18

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20575)

- Maintains original objection. Use of word "further" in this context is confusing. Does it mean further & higher or additional education? Clarify

Policy C19 – Loss of Institutional Land or Buildings

RN052 Parkinson (58)

RN118 Dept of Health represented by Inventures (2630, 2631)

RN221 E Kent Hospitals Trust represented by Broadway Malyan (1700)

RN228 Kent County Council (1663)

RN235 Hadlow College represented by GVA Grimley (1711)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2562)

- Nunnery Fields Hospital should be converted properly and not demolished
- Loss of institutional land or buildings will be acceptable where such facilities are vacant and the Council has allocated the site for an alternative form of development
- Modify to deal only with the loss of institutional land and a separate policy for new campuses and expansion of existing. The policy should stop after criterion (c)
- Amend to include no intrusion onto greenfield land, and sustainable transport links being in walking distance

Re: A7/054 – Amended Policy C19

RD079 GOSE (20172)

- Words "will resist" make the Policy unclear

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Re: A7/055 – New policy C19a

RD020 Wilks (20087)

RD079 GOSE (20187)

RD086 Sport England (20319)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20644)

- Reference to the impact of development on recreation and open space in this Policy. It is therefore not in accordance with the advice in PPG17 on Policy for recreation and assessing development proposals
- Include recognition in Policy of need for additional housing to student accommodation requirements, and the hardship for those seeking housing in open market, if needs not addressed by additional housing provision
- Policy appears vague and ambiguous
- Delete “onto previously undeveloped land”. This development must go on previously developed land

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.41 I now consider the long list of objections above, all together and in one place. This is because, since the First Deposit Draft, a series of revisions have highlighted inter-actions between various policies in this chapter that deal with future possibilities for particular bodies. These bodies are: (a) what the Plan calls “Institutions” – a wide category of uses that include education of all kinds, defined in paragraph 7.87 and the subject of Policies C19 and C19a; and (b) Further or Higher Educational Institutions, the subjects of Policies C16, C16a, and C18. The only Institution that everybody implicitly considers to be adequately housed on a large site that can accommodate its foreseeable expansion needs is the University of Kent; I treat objections to Policy C17, devoted exclusively to the University, separately below.

8.42 The passage of policy and text concerning Policies C16 and C16a throws up two main matters. One concerns the appropriate designation of the green field site east of Nackington Road, which the Council wishes to see retained as a potential new campus for an educational institution. The other concerns the way that Hadlow College is treated as an allocation and designated on the Proposals Map. I now address them in turn.

The Nackington Road Site

8.43 In the April 2002 First Deposit Draft text, paragraph 7.82 was drafted in the expectation that Canterbury College would move there to satisfy its future needs. The College no longer needs the site, as it intends to develop on existing sites within Canterbury. The Council’s uncontradicted evidence is that the College opted for redevelopment on its existing site because it was worn down by the lengthy process of trying to get a detailed, implementable permission. There is no evidence that Canterbury Christ Church University College, which also considered the site at one stage, retains any active current interest. The Revised Deposit Draft announced a Council stance that this site should be safeguarded as a potential new college campus, for a user or users as yet unknown, in preference to any other, less desirable green field site that might be advocated if there were no suitable location within the Canterbury Urban Area Boundary. It has put forward Proposed Change PC7/005, requiring Policy C16a to be applied in conjunction with Policy C18, which requires any applicant institution to satisfy six specific criteria for location onto a new site.

8.44 This large site of nearly 29 ha is now largely fallow, but is said to have some residual fruit farming activity. It is in open countryside with a draft AHLV designation, just south of the City’s Urban Area Boundary; it had no specific allocation in the 1998 Adopted Local Plan. The allocated land excludes a former agricultural packing station on the Nackington

Road frontage at present, although this seems an anomalous exclusion, and the Council may wish to re-visit the reasons for its exclusion.

- 8.45 The Development Brief prepared by the Council in March 2000 portrays the site as a flat open area, not possessing great visual or landscape sensitivity, with no features of significant ecological or archaeological interest. It considered the best form of development as a campus of relatively low-rise buildings set within a landscaped parkland. Development principles should not “extend into the green wedge between (any) campus and the village of Bridge”, and should “retain and safeguard open, undeveloped land between (any) campus and the residential areas to the north-east”. The Brief saw vehicular access being obtained from either Nackington Road, or the New Dover Road park and ride site, or both, but with any submission backed by a full transport assessment.
- 8.46 In Inspector O'Rourke's 1997 report she considered a number of issues to do with the desire of further and higher education institutions to relocate. In her paragraph c52.17 she gave a view on the University College's request that the emerging Plan should specifically refer to the south-east quadrant of the City as the most suitable area to meet its expansion needs. She did express the view that the south-east quadrant was a sensible option to pursue. Her reasons were that the land between Nackington Lane and New Dover Road had the topographical benefit of relative containment in the landscape. She also found benefits in the transport links in the south-east: proximity to the nearby park and ride, the latter's potential as a transport node, and the location being on the “right side of the City for ease of links with the existing College campus”. I should add that this ease-of-links consideration also applies, now and for the future, to other existing educational Institutions: Canterbury College, the KIAD and Hadlow College, as well as a number of schools. I appreciate the argument that in a perfect world, this south-east quadrant area would not be an ideal choice for locating institutions, in view of the longer access journeys from other urban areas of the District and Thanet. However, it is not at all clear to me how a better site in transport terms could realistically be found in or around Canterbury City, given other planning and conservation constraints. Moreover, by acknowledging problems and addressing them boldly through a transport assessment and travel plan exercise for any Nackington Road campus scheme, travel perceptions and behaviour might be considerably altered for the better. In this respect, I am influenced by the Council's good past record of decisive action to encourage further use of public transport.
- 8.47 The Nackington Road site also received rigorous examination at a Public Inquiry after which the Secretary of State gave an outline planning permission, in September 2001, for 30,000 m² of educational facilities and outdoor sports on this Nackington Road site. His decision was subsequently quashed, because of a failure to deal with Environmental Impact Assessment considerations, but the Inspector's reasoning in her report and the GOSE decision letter both emphatically endorsed the planning merits of the site proposals, seeing them as in accord with the Development Plan. The high agricultural value of the site was not perceived as a serious impediment, given the need argument. A location on the City edge was seen as failing to meet the aims of paragraph 38 of PPG13, because it is not a location that maximises accessibility by public transport. However, the mitigation of this problem by a Green Travel Plan was seen as a way of ensuring that many journeys would be made by public transport. The Inspector shared Inspector O'Rourke's view of the merits of a location in the City's south-east quadrant, and found that the site topography and existing landscape features made the impact of development acceptable.

- 8.48 I acknowledge that I am looking at a policy – C16a – that is not tied to the relocation of a specified institution, but I do not see that this fact makes it unnecessary, or capable of adequate replacement by Policy C18 alone. Further Education is a business, as well as a moral good. Furthermore, it is a growth business, and Canterbury is a showpiece location which grows that specialised kind of business with huge success for a City of its modest size. As I write, it has just been announced that Canterbury Christ Church University College is to gain full university status, a measure that may well lead before long to some re-appraisal of the scale and range of its activities. The planning process does not allocate sites for housing, or business and employment, requiring knowledge of the future occupants. In like measure, I do not believe it necessary for an unproblematic site, capable of development and occupation without long delays, to be ruled out because no specific institution is knocking on the door in 2005. Allocation seems a prudent measure; it offers opportunities in the next few years for expansion of existing institutions, or the immigration of an expanding institution from elsewhere, or even a brand new institution. An allocation now does not rule out the ability to review, refine or even remove the policy in a future Development Framework. A reliance on Policy C18 alone would be likely to raise all the old problems of delay and uncertainty that blighted beneficial development here before.
- 8.49 Policy C18, as amended in the Revised Deposit Draft, and by a subsequent Proposed Change, to avoid unclear expression, complements Policy C16a and sets relevant tests for any proposed new or expanded campus serving a further/higher education institution. Policy C19a would also apply to any development at Nackington Road, allowing issues of need, design and landscaping to be investigated in detail. The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC7/006, which alters the opening of the Policy C18 wording, to talk of “the establishment of a new or further or higher education campus”. C18 is relevant to the site at Nackington Road, or other sites inside or outside the Urban Area Boundary, and I find that it now needs no further amendment.

The Hadlow College Site

- 8.50 The Adopted Local Plan of 1998 showed the College's site as existing and protected open space, together with the adjoining area of public open space (King George's Field), and so did the First Deposit Draft of 2002. After objections from the College, the whole of its site was given an education designation in the Revised Deposit Draft. At the end of April 2004, the Council put forward Proposed Change PC7/017, which amends the Proposals Map, identifying a revised education allocation at Hadlow College. This puts a tight boundary round the main block, glasshouses and workshop built immediately north of the Spring Lane entrance in the 1960s. Much the greater part of the College site is re-instated as protected open space, as defined in Policy C20.
- 8.51 Unchallenged evidence reveals that this agricultural and horticultural institution, which has been active on the site since 1968, is in the process of intensifying the amount of land based, post-school education it delivers on this site for the Canterbury area. The College has already put up two temporary buildings in the south-east part of the site, permitted until 2009, and has identified a need for more floorspace in that area of the site. Future development needs are seen as incremental rather than very large, but they will include accommodation space for teachers and administrators as well as students. Active use is made of the various areas of the site. Activities in the open area require a substantial amount of large polytunnels, and some now occupy land in the northern part of the site. There is a substantial low-rise animal care centre complex near the eastern boundary with

King George's Field. The majority of the site is now open land, but that land is, and will be, actively used for open air activities affecting the look of the grounds in various ways.

- 8.52 As I saw on visits at different times of year, whether leafed or un-leafed, the central woodland area on the site, together with the effective boundary hedging, still reveal to the outside observer glimpses of structures and activities throughout the College site. I believe that what is seen comprises merely unexceptionable development within a generously landscaped campus. The Council's Open Space Core Proof of February 2004, written before the Council's change of heart, puts the matter well: there is very limited public access, and "its value as open space is essentially limited to the valuable visual contribution the site makes as a green corner to the wider King George's Field Open Space".
- 8.53 The Council's stance is still that it sees no impediment to some expansion of activities on site. Amended Policy C16 in the Revised Deposit Draft already states that "any significant redevelopment on (this site) shall be the subject of an approved Development Brief"; I see that as an effective safeguard against proposals that would seriously detract from the perception of this site as a landscaped, tree-fringed site where buildings are set in green surroundings. It is also open to the Council to make use of Tree Preservation Orders to safeguard significant group planting on site. Of course, other normal development control policies like BE1 and NE1 are relevant and applicable here.
- 8.54 My study of Policy C20 convinces me that its provisions are not an appropriate mechanism for planning control of the majority of this educational institution's land. Criterion (c) is plainly inapplicable, as it requires an owner to demonstrate that there is no alternative site for a proposed development on site, and that any "harm" resulting from development could be offset by providing other open space of like quality nearby. A Policy C20 designation means that development has to be specifically justified, and that there is a presumption against it. As the Council itself thought, until it was persuaded otherwise in its Proposed Changes (seemingly through local residential pressure), the actual prevention of harm can be just as effectively achieved without a C20 designation. It is open to the Council to develop the words of Policy C16 or its supporting text further, to indicate what kinds of development it wants to constrain or closely control on this site.

Matters concerning Policies C19 and C19a, and the supporting text

- 8.55 The Council has accepted that the original C19 would be much improved by division into two separate policies differentiating between loss, relocation and expansion. There are two more Proposed Changes in this section. PC7/007 adds a new last sentence to paragraph 7.88, bringing in the necessity for a reference to policies C18 and C19a when assessing new proposals. PC7/008 adds a last sentence to Policy C19a, bringing in reference to Policy C18. I find both unexceptionable. I see no planning reason to make special mention of development impact on recreation and open space in C19a, given the presence of more relevant policies elsewhere in a Plan which has to be read as a whole.
- 8.56 The reasonable GOSE objection to Policy C19 could easily be met by re-wording the opening line to read: "Planning permission will be refused for proposals involving the loss of institutional land or buildings...". There is no need for any further alteration.

Recommendation

8.57 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes Nos. PC7/005, PC7/006, PC7/007 and PC7/008, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraphs 8.57 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C17 - UNIVERSITY OF KENT- AND PARAGRAPHS 7.85-7.86

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.85 – University of Kent at Canterbury

RN152 University of Kent at Canterbury represented by BSF Planning Consultants (944)

- Modify text to include "This Master Plan sets out the development needs of the University and has been revised in the University's Estates Strategy 2001-2006"

Paragraph 7.86 - University of Kent at Canterbury

RN152 University of Kent at Canterbury represented by BSF Planning Consultants (945)

- Seek deletion of "these needs must also be balanced...other Local Plan objectives" from text of para. 7.86

Policy C17

RN152 University of Kent at Canterbury represented by BSF Planning Consultants (947, 948)

- Re requirements for a transport assessment and preparation of travel plan and improvements to Giles Lane/St Stephen's Hill junction. The latter has now been constructed, so delete wording about it. Former is unreasonable save for major developments
- Policy should include the term "educational and ancillary uses"

Re: A7/051 – Amended policy C17 University of Kent at Canterbury

RD109 University of Kent at Canterbury represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20402)

- The change in rider to Policy C17 concerning Transport issues does not overcome previous objection
- There should be a separate Inset map for the University with a defining edge

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.58 I have already discussed the objection made by the University to the proposed AHLV designation, in my consideration of Policy R6 above. The Council has stated in evidence that it agrees the Proposals Map should contain a defined campus area of the same dimensions as that in the Adopted Local Plan. It agrees the removal of text in the Policy about the now completed St Giles Lane/St Stephen's Hill junction. It agrees to the requested additional rewording sought in supporting text paragraph 7.85, and to the deletion of the whole of paragraph 7.86, as not really necessary for the interpretation of the Policy. Finally, it is content to reword the last paragraph of the Policy to read: "Major development proposals at the University shall be subject to a transport assessment, within the context of the existing transport impact of the University, and preparation of a Travel Plan".

Recommendation

8.59 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording set out in my paragraph 8.59 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C20 - PROTECTION OF OPEN SPACE - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.88a-7.100

Objections and Key Issues

Re: A7/057 – New Paragraph 7.88a Open Space

RD020 Wilks (20083)

- Say PPG17 is to be the deciding factor whenever it is applicable, & to have priority over other Policy from boundary with Thanet to boundary with Swale

Re: A7/058 – New Paragraph 7.88c

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (20451)

- Para 7.88c after “grass” add “sand, shingle”

Paragraph 7.89 – Open Space

RN010 Wilks (317)

RN349 Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee (2459)

- Planning permissions on open spaces should be revoked. This should be achieved, starting with land at Skinners Alley. Development is not more important than open space
- Concerned about its gradual erosion in the development process

Re: A7/061 – Paragraph 7.90b

RD020 Wilks (20032)

- Objects to word order of 2nd para: should be the environment, leisure and recreation

Re: A7/062 – New Paragraph 7.91a

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20578)

- Maintain previous objection & objections to new para 7.91a. Audit needs to be carried out in partnership with LEA. Reword para 7.91a

Re: A7/063 – Amended paragraph 7.92

RD020 Wilks (20033)

RD086 Sport England (20326)

- Concern about possible late production of the SPG. Mention ensuring full consultation
- Clarify that the review of identified deficiency will be based on local standards

Paragraph 7.94

RN061 PACE (168)

- Extra provision will be needed for open areas within towns if they are to have higher densities

Re: A7/064 – Amended Paragraph 7.94

RD020 Wilks (20035)

- Para 7.94 Object to the fact that not all beaches are included. Should be a continuous length from boundary with Thanet to boundary with Swale

Re: A7/077- Amended Paragraph 7.97

RD020 Wilks (20037)

- Para 7.97 amendments should be cancelled. Should be no exceptions; everything has impact on open character of beaches

Policy C20 – Loss of Protected Existing Open Space

RN010 Wilks (318, 319, 320, 362, 363, 367, 368, 373)

RN034 National Grid represented by Malcolm Judd & Partners (1604)

RN177 Rogers (208)

RN224 Sport England (1692)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2583)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Protection of open space at the Canterbury National Grid Station should not restrict the essential utilities development that may be required through expansion of existing operations
- Mark in the policy that the small area of woodland/scrub on the southern edge of the Church Street, Whitstable, playing field must not be taken for any other purpose, especially not car parking.
- The Oval, Whitstable, should be designated as protected open space
- Reeves Beach, Whitstable, should be shown as protected open space
- Area of Benacre wood on south side of A2990 should be treated as protected open space
- Mark in the policy that special protection is given to the green strip (Invicta meadow) behind the gardens of Clifford Road.
- All open space within the district should be set out as protected open space
- Refer to the positive provision of public open spaces. Say public open space will be sought where development of private open space is proposed
- Beaches that are not registered as town or village greens should be designated as open space
- Objects to the word "need" in criteria (b). "Need for" should be replaced by "benefit of"
- This policy potentially affects County Council as service provider and landowner. Amend policy and supporting paragraphs to remove blanket coverage from all playing fields and other green areas within schools, unless they perform, in whole or part, a visual amenity function. Delete the following: Pilgrim's Way CPS, Simon Langton GS for Girls, Orchard School, Beauherne CPS, Kingsmead CPS, Parkside CPS, Joy Lane CPS, Reculver C of E PS, Herne Bay County Infants and Junior Schools
- Policy should read: "Proposals which would result in the loss of protected open space will not be permitted"

Re: A7/066 – Amended policy C20

RD020 Wilks (20034, 20038)

RD085 National Grid Company Plc represented by Malcolm Judd and Partners (20301)

RD086 Sport England (20329)

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (20454)

- (d) must be deleted, as all open space has potential in the future
- Open space designation at National Grid Canterbury Substation site may restrict essential utility development
- Add another criterion (e): there would be no incremental future risk to property & human life due to flood risk
- Welcome commitment to an open space SPG does not, however overcome objection to C20
- Beaches must have maximum protection against continuing pressures to develop. Cover all beaches by Open Space protection

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.60 The Council is in the process of preparing an Open Space Strategy for the District, which will form supplementary planning guidance, but no draft of the document was available during my Inquiry, and the Council stance is that the Plan should not be delayed while it is being completed. The Open Space designations on the draft Proposals Map therefore closely echo those in the Adopted Local Plan. The Policy is meant to protect defined existing Open Spaces within urban boundaries. It has four criteria, and the last is drafted in anticipation of the forthcoming Strategy, being a requirement that open space should be assessed as making no positive contribution to the Council's overall strategy on open space, if proposals for its removal are to be countenanced.

8.61 I have considered some site-specific objections to this Policy elsewhere, when reporting on particular Council allocations or omission sites. Objections seeking Open Space designation for particular sites have been answered by the Council saying that local needs assessments will be carried out in the Strategy; I accept this is all that can usefully be said until that work is finished, and it would be desirable for the Council to revise the designations and make considered deletions and additions before the Local Plan is adopted. That said, it is obvious that, in the Adopted and emerging Local Plans the Council has pursued an approach which identifies virtually all open areas within the Urban Area Boundaries as "protected open space", rather than identifying only the very

best quality open sites. That may change as a result of current Strategy work, but it does not appear likely on present evidence.

- 8.62 The Revised Deposit Draft, like the Adopted Local Plan, has included school grounds and playing fields in the same terms as other open land, as being appropriately protected under C20. This is despite the fact that a separate policy, C21, deals with the loss of public or private playing fields. The Council reasons that, despite little or no public access, the main consideration for their inclusion has been the visual amenity they possess. I have looked at the sites of the schools that particularly concern the County Council as Education Authority, and I cannot disagree that all have an appreciable amount of visual amenity, even where they are relatively inconspicuous to public gaze.
- 8.63 If, as seems likely, the Council wants to protect a large number of open spaces in urban areas, it will have to face the prospect that at some time in the future, individual protected open spaces will be found to be unavoidable candidates for some sort of needed development, varying from a very small incursion up to major loss of the protected land. I regard the District Council as a responsible body; it should have a right to make its own informed decision on what to protect, rather than me making a number of individual value judgements now, without being in possession of the information in the detailed Strategy. But such a right has consequences, and I consider it inevitable that the wording of C20 has to change. The tenor of the Council's proposed wording might be acceptable if a relatively small number of unarguably valuable sites were allocated, but wide scale designation requires greater flexibility.
- 8.64 I find that the kind of words favoured by Inspector O'Rourke in her report, when she considered draft policy D39 (CD1.8, page 93) are the most appropriate to use here. Thus, with the addition of the gist of the Council's draft criterion (d), which I find appropriate in present circumstances before the production of the Strategy, I that consider a realistic, equitable and workable policy would read:

Proposals which would result in the loss of protected open space will only be permitted if:

- a. there would be no material harm to the contribution the protected open space makes to the visual or recreational amenity of the area;
 - b. where there would be material harm, this would be balanced against demonstrable need for the development;
 - c. there is no alternative site available to accommodate the proposed development, and any harm that might result from the development could be offset by the provision of other open space of comparable quality, size, character and usability in the locality;
 - d. the open space has been assessed by the Council as making no positive contribution to its overall strategy on open space.
- 8.65 The Council has made some amendments to supporting text in response to objections, and I find these to be adequate. Some objectors simply want to make virtually all open space inviolate, but that is far too simplistic, especially as designation has so far not been

ungenerous. The Policy wording I endorse leads me to conclude that the inclusion of a structure such as a substation – which may need replacement or augmentation – within a designated Open Space, should not cause undue problems to its operator because “need” is specifically acknowledged in the criteria.

8.66 Answering a Sport England objection, the Council has put forward Proposed Change PC7/009, adding mention of locally determined provision standards to paragraph 7.92, when considering local needs, surpluses or deficits of open space. The Council has also put forward Further Amendment FA7/012, but this is overtaken by my new policy wording. I endorse the Proposed Change.

Recommendation

8.67 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC7/009, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 8.65 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C21 - PLAYING FIELDS - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.101-7.102

Objections and Key Issues

Policy C21 – Playing fields

RN224 Sport England (1695)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2584)

- Policy potentially affects KCC as service provider and landowner. Amend to avoid situation where some building may encroach on edges of playing areas, re-define to relate to loss of non-school playing fields for their recreational or amenity value, Remove last clause of (a); refer to recreation space, not open space in (d); say “for public recreation”, not “as public open space” in (e)
- Replace “need” by “benefit in (b); delete (e) as it weakens policy and its criterion (d)

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.68 The conclusions I have reached on Policy C20 inevitably colour my attitude to C21, since public and private playing fields in the District are presently classified by the Council as protected open space. The draft Policy C21 is very similar to D39 in the Adopted Local Plan, save for a new criterion (a), and a new sustainability consideration in (d). I consider that its wording, and that of the supporting text, sits well with my amended C20 and with the thrust of PPG17 of July 2002. I believe that the suggested alterations would not materially improve its effectiveness in controlling proposed development by taking account of all relevant issues.

Recommendation

8.69 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C22 - OUTDOOR PLAYING SPACE - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.103-7.105

Objections and Key Issues

Policy C22

RN068	Bellway Homes Ltd (705)
RN221	E Kent Hospitals Trust represented by Broadway Malyan (1701)
RN224	Sport England (1693)
RN229	Property Review & Development (2585)
RN255	GOSE (2652)
RN144	Persimmon Homes represented by Tetlow King (494)

- Scoring in Appendix 6 too simplistic, without a full range of criteria, or explanation of how arbitrary scores will be applied
- This policy potentially affects KCC as service provider and landowner. Amend policy and supporting paragraphs to distinguish between new playing field provision and other forms of outdoor recreational space. Be consistent in references to “outdoor playing space” and open space”
- Shouldn't seek contributions to playing space where adequate provision exists. Scale of provision should take into account likely type of occupants. At end of 1st sentence add: “the type of accommodation”
- Policy should recognise that developments should contribute more widely to sport and recreational facilities, including the social infrastructure
- A reduced on-site provision may be allowable to achieve a layout appropriate to a Conservation Area or to maximise regeneration benefits. An off-site provision would suffice in these cases
- Do not use the word “appropriate”

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.70 The supporting text in paragraph 7.105 preceding this Policy now states clearly that the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Open Space will reflect the provisions of PPG17. That supporting text is most helpful in complementing the Policy wording and keeping it short. I find no planning need to say more, despite the urgings of objectors. I agree with GOSE that in this instance, the inclusion of the word “appropriate” in line one is unnecessary. The Policy makes equally good sense without it.

Recommendation

8.71 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 8.71 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C23 - LAND AT GREENHILL, RIDLANDS FARM AND FOLLY FARM, AND PARAGRAPH 7.106; AND POLICY C24 – LAND ALONG THE STOUR CORRIDOR, AND PARAGRAPH 7.107

Objections and Key Issues

Policy C23

RN140	Brett Waste Management Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (64)
RN164	Railtrack PLC (1805)
RN255	GOSE (2654)
RN352	Robert Brett & Sons Ltd represented by Lee Evans de Moubray (2465, 2466)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Objects to the proposed playing fields on the southern fields of the housing allocation at Folly Farm, Kemsing Gardens, Canterbury, as there are other playing fields in the area within walking distance
- Site could be a good expansion point for Canterbury, near existing housing
- The proposed open space at Folly Farm will be adjacent to railway lines. The site should either be moved northwards or appropriate fencing provided and maintained if this is not possible
- Object to word "protected"

Policy C24

RN255 GOSE (2654)

- object to word "protected"

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.72 I do not regard the objections from Messrs Brett as any more than the most brief and general of attempts to advance the cause of housing development over playing field provision. The rail-related objection is more a flagging up of problems to be avoided, than an objection in principle. I find the use of the words "protected from development" in both policies to be clearly understandable in a development control sense, and not to need amendment.

Recommendation

8.73 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICIES C25 & C26 - ALLOTMENTS - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.108-7.109

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.108

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2563)

- Allotments are important; CCC should contribute to their upkeep. Wildlife habitat may not be appropriate

Policy C25

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2396, 2397, 2340)

- Allocate land at Lower Herne Road as an allotment
- Allocate David's Field, north of former landfill site and adjacent to the new proposed Broomfield Woodland site as an allotment

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.74 The Council's view is that if there is an identified need for an allotment site (or sites) in Herne and Broomfield Parish, the appropriate means to pursue the idea would be the formulation of a planning application. This sounds sensible to me. It means that the proponents, the Parish Council, must produce convincing evidence that a realistic need exists and that actual take-up of plots would be likely to result if a site were given permission. The attitude of the present land-owners, and who should bid for and produce the purchase price, also need to be worked out before the Council is approached formally. There is certainly not enough information available at present to persuade me to suggest any specific site as a Local Plan allocation.

Recommendation

8.75 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICIES C27, C28, C29 & C30 - FLOODING AND COASTAL DEFENCE - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.110-7.127

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.110 – Flooding and Coastal

RN161 Ramblers Association (1916)

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2157)

- Need for vigilance to continue to ensure that the district throughout is always in a state of readiness in the event of flooding in the future
- The Chamber of Commerce cannot follow the logic of the Plan's statements on building on flood risk areas with the schedules for housing development. It appears CCC is breaking its own guidelines on flooding

Paragraph 7.112 – Flood Scrutiny Panel

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2160)

- CCC's flood scrutiny panel has better information than is shown in the documentation

Policy C27 – Drainage Impact Assessment

RN178 Southern Water (231)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1506)

RN329 Environment Agency (2474)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2564)

- Parish Councils should be consulted on the drainage impact assessments
- Objects to the area of tidal flooding which appears to cross the railway
- Instead of this policy, say: All areas at risk of flooding or increase of surface water run-off shall be subject to a flood risk assessment, and measures to mitigate affects are installed and maintained
- Include Reference: in policy to the principles of SUDS, and “national guidelines when available”

Re: A7/068 – Amended Policy C27

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20645)

- Add additional wording referring to PPG25 and not removing flood storage capacity by building in the floodplain

Paragraph 7.119 – Coastal Flooding

RN329 Environment Agency (2480)

- This sentence confuses coastal flooding and fluvial flooding

Re: A7/069 – Amended Paragraph 7.119

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (20455)

- Amend para 7.119 - after “coastal floodplain” add “or outside sea defences as shown on the Proposals Map”. Relevant mapping sections are no included in the revised deposit

Paragraph 7.123 – Fluvial Flooding

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2339)

- Tackling the risk of flooding where funds permit is not good enough. Be much more active and allocate funds

Paragraph 7.124 - Fluvial Flooding

RN341 Nasons (2435)

RN140 Brett Waste Management Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (63)

RN209 PACE (792)

- Objects to Nason's site in Wncheap Estate falling within the Environment Agency's Area at Risk of Flooding as this affects price of land, build costs and regeneration
- Objection to Shelford Waste Management facility site being designated at risk from fluvial flooding
- More sophisticated models needed to replace very primitive Environment Agency mapping of potential flood areas

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

Policy C28 – Development within floodplains

RN130 Herne Bay and District Residents Association (1606)

RN292 Charles F. Jones & Son (2242)

- Objects to inclusion in area at risk of flooding of site east of Sturry Road Sewage Works
- The Proposals Map should show the up-to-date information from the Flooding Scrutiny Panel.
- Needs an additional paragraph to clarify that extensions to caravan parks – an instance being the Alberta Holiday Village, Faversham Road, Seasalter – would comprise 'exceptional justification' if no additional units were involved and environmental improvement sought

Policy C29 - Development within floodplains

RN130 Herne Bay and District Residents Association (1607)

RN255 GOSE (2656)

RN329 Environment Agency (2476)

- The information from the Flooding Scrutiny Panel should be included on the Proposals Map
- The policy should be amended to ensure that each case is treated on its own merits having regard to the risks attached
- Change “certain provisos”

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.76 The emerging Local Plan shows on its Proposals Map the areas at risk of flooding taken from the Environmental Assessment's indicative flood plain maps. The text in paragraph 24 of PPG25 – Development and Flood Risk is quite candid about the limitations of the information on those maps and says that they will be revised and updated over time. The Council's own careful records and the work of the Floods Scrutiny Panel set up in 2001 supplement the broad brush information from Environmental Assessment sources. I agree with the Council that the best course of action in this imperfect situation is to use the Environmental Assessment indicative mapping on the Proposals Map, but also to supplement the Revised Deposit Draft text by pointing out all the other sources of information and necessary consultations for prospective developers. Those objectors who object to inclusion of their land in areas at risk of flooding on the Proposals Map are simply arguing fruitlessly against known facts and the best risk summations available. I see no good reason to write into the Plan text any exceptional justification for extensions to caravan parks; such development has to be argued on its own merits.
- 8.77 The Council's stance on housing allocations in places where there are concerns about flood risk is that it has consulted with the Environment Agency, and has proceeded on the basis that the flood risk can be resolved through appropriate design solutions for particular sites. Nothing in the evidence suggests to me that particular allocations are foolhardy or materially contradict national policy guidance in PPG25. The Council has put forward a number of useful additions to the Revised Deposit Draft text; I consider all of them to be improvements, which make the text about flooding more informative and helpful, and I find no further need for alteration. There are firstly three Proposed Changes. PC7/010 and PC7/011 amend paragraph 7.119 by moving some text on development within a floodplain to the fluvial flooding section in paragraph 7.122. PC7/012 amends Policy C29, adding mention of other local plan policies to the first sentence.
- 8.78 The Council has also has put forward four Further Amendments. FA7/006 further alters and expands text in paragraph 7.119, specifically adding mention of the need to take account of the Council's own detailed flood information; it also states the Council view that flood risk areas could include land seaward of the coastal defences. Further Amendment FA7/007 adds a final informative sentence to paragraph 7.124, to say that the

Environment Agency are making continual improvements to flood plain mapping and consult with the Council engineers.

- 8.79 Further Amendment FA7/008 inserts a new paragraph 7.125a, which informs the public how they can find out more detailed information on flood risk from the Council's detailed sources. Further Amendment FA7/011 rephrases and improves the sense of Policy C27, introducing mention of the Council's Guidance Note. However, the word "their" in the last line of the Policy is unclear; presumably it means "the developer", and these words should be used instead.

Recommendation

- 8.80 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes Nos. PC7/010, PC7/011 and PC7/012, and Further Amendment Nos. FA7/006, FA7/007, FA7/008 and FA7/011, all as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 8.80 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C32 – UNDEFENDED COAST – AND PARAGRAPH 7.129

Objections and Key Issues

Policy C32

RN010 Wilks (322, 370)

RN322 English Heritage (1793)

- New policy required to protect gaps east and west of 230 Faversham Road, Seasalter - not built on with chalets - from development; they have considerable historic and natural history interest. Existing policies not enough. Village Green protection does not extend to the road where these open patches of beach are
- While scenic quality and character are discussed there is no discussion on the scientific side, which could refer to the archaeological value
- All non Council owned beaches should have Art. 4 Dir. on them. This would bring beaches under tighter planning control (inc. freedom of 28 days use). Not necessary on registered Village greens or below mean HWM

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.81 None of these objections have sufficient substance to merit altering a clear and simply expressed policy. There is no need to introduce mention of archaeological matters when these are caught elsewhere in the Plan. The various little areas of undeveloped land in Faversham Road, Seasalter, do not appear to me to merit a special policy of their own, but there is a measure of protection already, stemming from the land's inclusion within a Special Landscape Area, subject to policies C28 and C32 (Overtopping hazard Zone, and Undeveloped Coast). As to the objection about Article 4 directions and beach protection, this is not an appropriate matter for specific mention in a Local Plan.

Recommendation

- 8.82 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C33 - PROVISION OF INFRASTRUCTURE - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.130-7.136

Objections and Key Issues

Policy C33

RN185 Lowe (150)

- Change wording of the policy to include "will only be permitted"; bear in mind that existing consumers can be adversely affected by new development

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.83 The point sought in this objection would not really alter the meaning or tone of voice of the existing Policy wording, which I find sufficiently forceful. After the withdrawal of objections by proponents of a new reservoir at Broad Oak, the Council has put forward two Further Amendments to deal with the implications of such a scheme. FA7/004 removes all reference to any new reservoir at Broad Oak from paragraph 7.134. Further Amendment FA7/005 inserts a new following paragraph 7.134a; this sets out the actions that would be expected of the proponents of major development options, such as a reservoir, prior to making a formal planning application.

Recommendation

8.84 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment Nos. FA7/004 and FA7/005, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

POLICY C34 - RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.137-7.138

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.137 – Renewable Energy Sources

RN026 ETSU for the DTI represented by Terence O'Rourke plc(670)

- Add ref to: paragraph 8, PPG3; reference to government renewable energy target for 2010 & report on renewable energy for SE & renewable sources for Canterbury; need to balance renewable energy benefits with impact on local amenity

Paragraph 7.138 - Renewable Energy Sources

RN025 Cutler (666)

RN209 PACE (790)

- Weak support is given to wind farms. Promote, as is it is an opportunity to reduce dependence on fossil fuels
- As well as solar and wind power, coppiced woodland no longer needed by the paper industry is a source of renewable energy

Policy C34

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (403)

RN025 Cutler (662)

RN061 PACE (164)

RN255 GOSE (2657)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Council should be bolder and give more encouragement to plans for off-shore wind turbines. More marine areas should be designated
- Canterbury Council should set a cut-off date after which it is no longer permitted to build or renovate without incorporating photovoltaic tiling or similar
- Refer to government support for CHP energy sources

Re: A7/071 – Amended Policy C34

RD079 GOSE (20180)

- The word “support” makes the Policy unclear

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.85 As one would expect, objectors are keen to gain the Council's active support for particular forms of renewable energy sources that they especially favour. The Council has chosen to stick with its First Deposit Draft text, save for a mention of combined heat and power generation, and I do not believe that a more fact-filled Policy and supporting text would increase the utility of this section, which is flexible and positive. However, I cannot see a good reason not to accede to the GOSE point; a rephrased Policy opening saying: “planning permission will be granted for developments which utilise renewable ...” would be better orientated to the effective control of development.

Recommendation

8.86 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 8.86 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C36 - POTENTIALLY POLLUTING DEVELOPMENT - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.144-7.145

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.144 – Potentially Polluting Development

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2344)

- Noise/light/traffic/rubbish/ emissions must be controlled

Policy C36

RN216 Symons (815)

- Noise policies inadequate & should be amended in a single stand-alone modern policy to incorporate WHO Guidelines for Community Noise 2000. Should say that all applications and EIA will be examined rigorously

Re: A7/073 – Amended Policy C36

RD141 Canterbury & Coastal Primary Care Group (20531)

- Amendment inadequate; developments that have the potential to have an impact on the health of a community should be required to submit a health impact assessment to the LPA with planning application

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.87 The Council deals with the issue of noise pollution first in policy BE1 and its supporting text (spelling out relevant considerations in deciding applications for built development), and then here. The Council's unchallenged evidence is that, in determining planning applications, it uses a number of sources of advice and guidance, and it has quoted PPG23,

PPG24, various British Standards, and approved codes of conduct published by the CIEH, the Noise Council, the HSE, the Institute of Acoustics and the WHO.

8.88 The objections of Mr Symons and the Canterbury & Coastal Primary Care Group have led the Council to revise the Policy and supporting text. The Council originally put forward Proposed Change PC7/013 in paragraph 7.145, adding as a factor the possible need to submit a Health Impact Assessment for development that may cause noise pollution. It subsequently put forward Further Amendment FA7/002, further refining the Proposed Change: this adds mention of Policy ENV20 of the adopted Structure Plan and PPG24 to the text, as factors that will be taken into account in reaching decisions in addition to Local Plan Policy BE1. Although Mr Symons put forward a detailed policy wording of his own, I find that the treatment of this important subject in the Plan is now comprehensively dealt with by the Council's preferred text, albeit not in one place in the Plan. That last factor is not important to the effective consideration of potentially polluting development.

Recommendation

8.89 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment No. FA7/002, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C37 - WASTE MANAGEMENT AND RECYCLING - AND PARAGRAPH 7.146

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.146 – Waste management and Recycling

RN061 PACE (165)
RN209 PACE (791)
RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2340)

- Although primarily a KCC concern, the CCC should have more in their plan about recycling
- Surprise that paragraph 7.146 doesn't mention the planned SWERF waste incineration plant at Brett's landfill site in Broad Oak Road, which should not be permitted
- Plan weak on waste management; include much more on the need for waste minimisation; stop Ashford dumping waste in the district

Policy C37

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1507)
RN228 Kent County Council (1633)

- Specific mention of waste management sites in the Canterbury District required: e.g. The expansion of the Shelford site should be prevented
- The Council should favour developing land despoiled by former mining activity, such as the East Kent Coalfield villages
- This policy is inappropriate and unnecessary as KCC is the appropriate determining Authority.

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.90 Despite waste management being a County function, the Council justifies its policy on the grounds that the relevant issues (a)-(k) identified in its text are those that it would be concerned about, when formally consulted by the County Council about any proposal. On balance, that seems to me a consideration meriting a specific policy, rather than a mere textual reference. The lead role of the County Council on the waste topic removes any need for this Plan to mention any of the site-specific matters that concern some objectors.

Recommendation

8.91 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY C38 - TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.147-7.153

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 7.152 – Telecommunications Development

RN025 Cutler (664)

- Government & NRPB do not protect us or help towards an open examination of new research. Research by NRPB on non-thermal effects isn't disclosed. Need more open discussion with future providers of masts

Policy C38

RN025 Cutler (663)

- Believes mobile phone masts are feared by many; they are hardly mentioned in the Local Plan; unclear on the Council's policy and if it is anything more than abiding by Government guidance

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.92 The objector voices fears and uncertainties that are shared by a number of people about the health effects of mobile phone base stations/masts. I find that the Council deals with the matter clearly and responsibly. The government's planning guidance on the subject of telecommunications - Planning Policy Guidance Note 8, states a clear government view that the planning system is not the place for determining health safeguards. However, it does say that health considerations and public concern can in principle be material considerations in determining applications for planning permission and prior approval, and that the local planning authority as decision-maker must determine what weight to attach to such considerations in any particular case (see the PPG's paragraphs 97 and 98). The Revised Deposit Draft's paragraph 7.152 shows the Council's desire to monitor and act on any new material that comes into the public realm about health effects, when considering telecommunications development. I do not consider it necessary to amend the Policy and text further in respect of health matters.

Recommendation

8.93 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE (LEISURE): LAND WEST OF ALBERTA HOLIDAY VILLAGE, FAVERSHAM ROAD, SEASALTER, WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN292 Charles F. Jones & Son (2242, 2245)

- There should be a tourism policy providing appropriate criteria for applications seeking upgrading of existing static caravan sites and their extensions; main consideration to be overall environmental improvement, and no material conflict with other Plan policies
- Allocate land for the expansion of the site on to Fields "A" and "B", west of the existing Caravan Park, both within a Special Landscape Area

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.94 I have already considered the objectors' submission in respect of Policy C28 above. The objectors say they are seeking alteration to the Plan as a "global objection and not a site-specific objection", but given their illustration of the problems facing the Alberta Holiday Village site, and the outline of a case justifying its expansion, it is difficult not to see this avowed aim as a means of overcoming a real problem for the owners of that site. That problem amounts to an inability to accommodate on an existing site the 400 caravans that the relevant planning permission would theoretically allow. There is a concomitant desire to re-plan the Alberta site, allowing for modern space and amenity standards for holiday makers, in contrast to the rather stark, close-set caravan layout now on site. Hence the desired expansion on to two adjoining fields.

8.95 The problem for such an aim is that the existing site and the adjoining fields happen to lie within an exceptionally sensitive area. It carries the designations of Site of Special Scientific Interest, a Special Protection Area, and a Wetland of International Importance identified under the Ramsar Convention, all protecting both habitat and wildlife. The Council makes clear its negative attitude towards the kind of expansion indicated, but very fairly states that only a properly supported planning application could settle the matter on the Alberta site.

8.96 There is no specific Local Plan policy about static caravan sites, though ED2b does concern touring sites. The tenor of the Council's evidence is that it does not like this type of development, because of the often-found adverse effects on the local environment and landscape. It does, however, acknowledge that static caravan sites are a significant part of the self-catering holiday sector in the District. I agree with the Council's reasoning that all relevant matters to do with new or expanded static caravan provision can very well be considered under Local Plan Policy TC5, even though this does not directly mention the words "static caravans"; TC5 sets out the criteria to consider in dealing with applications for new tourism development of all kinds, including self catering accommodation. Also, adopted Structure Plan Policy TO4 is highly relevant, and part of the development plan. TO4 is well-disposed to the proposed up-grading of static caravan sites, though with important caveats about inappropriate extension.

Recommendation

8.97 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

OMISSION SITE (LEISURE): ST MICHAEL'S EMBANKMENT, ST MICHAEL'S ROAD, CANTERBURY

Objections and Key Issues

RN339 The Crab & Winkle Line Trust (2428)

- The Proposals Map should show the route of the Historic Line – for public access between Canterbury and Whitstable, including a pedestrian path and a safe cycling route – incorporating some 400 m of embankment near St Michael's Road

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.98 The Council's evidence is that it has rejected the routeing suggested because it would affect a number of houses and gardens immediately abutting the embankment land and involve expensive land acquisition. This consideration, and the existence of the quiet residential St Michael's Road as an alternative local route to accommodate walkers and cyclists, leads me to agree with the Council's views.

Recommendation

8.99 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

OMISSION SITE (LEISURE): STATION ROAD WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN339 The Crab & Winkle Line Trust (2429)

- The Proposals Map should show the route of the Historic Line – for public access between Canterbury and Whitstable, including a pedestrian path and a safe cycling route – complete up to the corner of Station Road and Westgate Terrace

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.100 The Council's Assessment of Site Proposals (CD1.16, pages 131-132) considers this request and comes to the view that "it is important to ensure that land is safeguarded for the construction of this cycle route in the future and, if possible, to be developer funded". The land that would accommodate this part of the route is allocated as a housing site in the emerging Local Plan, given planning permission in March 2002, and is now built and occupied, without a cycle route within the site. The draft Proposals Map accompanying the Revised Deposit Draft does not show the "cycle and pedestrian route" notation traversing the site up to the vicinity of Westgate Terrace; instead, it ceases to be marked at a point on the east side of Station Road, just north of the junction with Diamond Road, but within the housing allocation. I am not sure from the evidence just what the Council intends to do about the matter for Plan purposes, given what it says in CD1.16. Consequently, I must leave the matter to the Council's good judgement after it receives my report, and I make no formal recommendation.

CHAPTER NINE

9. OBJECTIONS TO THE CHAPTER ON ENSURING IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND REVIEW, AND TO THE APPENDICES

POLICY IMP1 – COMPULSORY PURCHASE POWERS – AND PREAMBLE IN PARAGRAPHS 8.1-8.13

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 8.1 – Objectives of the plan

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1512)

- Plan should not rely on Supplementary Planning Guidance or legal agreements not tested at a public Inquiry

Paragraph 8.4

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2571)

- Paragraph 8.4 should go on to say enforcement is applicable when conditions on a permission are not met

Paragraph 8.9 – Compulsory Purchase Powers

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1572)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1857)

- There should be commitments to funding and suitably qualified staff if the Council will commit to using its Compulsory Purchase Order powers
- Too heavy an emphasis on brownfield sites, at expense of other land use planning considerations

Paragraph 8.10

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2355)

- Compulsory Purchase Orders may be required for new roads

Paragraph 8.11

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1571)

- The Urban Housing Capacity Study overestimates the housing coming forward in the Plan period. Necessary greenfield sites should be set out in the Plan following the sequential test

Policy IMP1

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (404, 405, 406)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1601)

RN144 Persimmon Homes represented by Tetlow King Planning (492)

RN255 GOSE (2658)

- Imprecision results from use of “intervene” and “assist”
- This policy does not add anything to the plan. There is no need for a policy to state the Compulsory Purchase Order position. The uncertainty is how often powers will be used
- The Council will need to commit funds to the Compulsory Purchase Order process
- Funding for the purchase of land subject to a Compulsory Purchase Order should be clarified. The method for bidding from private sector companies for funding the land purchase should be clearly stated
- The policy should state that the council will make planning applications at its own cost on sites listed, so that it is empowered to utilise its compulsory purchase powers
- Council should list those sites in which it intends to use Compulsory Purchase Orders if it has any real likelihood of achieving housing targets

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 9.1 In the light of my findings on the Council's draft housing allocations, the wording in paragraph 8.11 will need some alteration: perhaps by the Council stating the opinion that the great majority of the District's housing targets are capable of being met within the urban areas, and predominantly on previously developed land (rather than "brownfield", which is not a term employed in PPG3).
- 9.2 In all other respects, the Council has quite adequately dealt with objections to the supporting text leading to Policy IMP1. The Council has honestly stated that it is not strictly necessary to have a policy on compulsory purchase, but that it is a way of emphasising the Plan's commitment to this approach. I sympathise with the sentiment, and in view of the Council's desire to allocate housing sites that are often semi- or predominantly-occupied at present, such powers will certainly be needed. Indeed, I agree with the objectors who remind the Council that the task it has set itself will demand considerable staff time and funds. As to the precise wording of the Policy, having considered other ways of conveying the intended sentiments, I have come to the conclusion that the Council's words and phraseology are clear and effective.

Recommendation

- 9.3 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 9.1 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

POLICY IMP2 - LEGAL AGREEMENTS - AND PARAGRAPHS 8.14-8.18b

Objections and Key Issues

Re: A8/004 – New paragraph 8.18a Legal Agreements

RD095 House Builders Federation (20238)

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20581)

- This section should draw together all references to contributions from elsewhere in the plan to assist developers and landowners
- New text contrary to provision of Circular 1/97. It is requiring developers to make up for existing deficiencies in provision over & above that made necessary by the development itself

Re: A8/005 – New paragraph 8.18b New Housing Development

RD095 House Builders Federation (20239)

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20582)

- New text contrary to provision of Circular 1/97. It is requiring developers to make up for existing deficiencies in provision over & above that made necessary by the development itself
- List for guidance should refer to other relevant community facilities that arise directly from development

Policy IMP2 – Developer Contributions

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (407)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1508)

- The policy should refer to Supplementary Planning Guidance, which will provide S106 agreements to speed up the process of negotiation
- The Plan should not rely on legal agreements that have not been tested at Inquiry

Re: A8/010 – Amended policy IMP2

RD079 GOSE (20181)

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20668)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Policy IMP2: objection to the whole of the first sentence
- Substitute for this the Kent Planning Officers Group standard policy on development contributions

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 9.4 I do not agree with the HBF that the Council's wording here implies that will be requiring anything other than contributions relevant to, and commensurate with, the scale and type of development permitted. Paragraph 8.16 makes that plain. However, the Council has in other respects improved the Revised Deposit Draft text and tried to meet the most relevant points made by objectors.
- 9.5 The Council has put forward two Proposed Changes. PC8/001 adds a category of directly related "other relevant community facilities" arising as a result of development to paragraph 8.18b. PC8/002 adds a further paragraph to the text of 8.18f, making direct reference to the KPOG guidance about provision of certain community facilities. The Council has also put forward Further Amendment FA8/001, adding to Policy IMP2 a new penultimate sentence which instances in list form the kind of facilities that might merit contributions through planning obligations. I consider that these changes will satisfy some major concerns of the County Council, which has been anxious that the District Council should flag up in the Plan's text the need for contributions for buildings and facilities which the County Council provides, which may become over-extended as a direct consequence of new development. I do not find that the verbal expression of the Policy is unclear or deficient, and I consider it should stand unchanged from the Revised Deposit Draft wording.

Recommendation

- 9.6 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes Nos. PC8/001 and PC8/002, and Further Amendment No. FA8/001, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

PARAGRAPHS 8.19-8.49

Objections and Key Issues

Paragraph 8.27 – Strategic Environmental Assessment

RN284 RSPB (982)

- Appears to have been absence of Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment at time of First Deposit Draft

Paragraph 8.30 - The Managed Release of Housing Sites

RN144 Persimmon Homes represented by Tetlow King (493)

- Mechanisms put forward to ensure that the housing requirement can be met are insufficient. Greenfield sites should be identified and at least allocated as reserve sites

Paragraph 8.31

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1858)

RN118 Dept of Health represented by Inventures (498)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1600)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- The UHCS should be required prior to the local plan inquiry
- Questionable if the UHCS demonstrates that land is available to meet needs for a range of housing types. Refer to provision for housing needs, which should be in consultation with NHS
- Brownfield sites should be realistically assessed.

Re: A8/015 – Amended paragraph 8.31

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20646)

- Contrary to sequential approach. Sites should also be reviewed to assess whether they are genuinely brownfield

Paragraph 8.33

RN156 BSF Planning Consultant (1859)

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (408)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1599)

- The Housing Land Study and Urban Housing Capacity Study have not demonstrated that sufficient housing has been identified to meet the Kent Structure Plan requirements
- The use of Compulsory Purchase Order powers is inappropriate
- There is an overestimation of what the Urban Housing Capacity Study can achieve

Re: A8/017 – Amended paragraph 8.33

RD095 House Builders Federation (20232)

- Unacceptable to leave issue of underperformance of housing sites to the review of the plan. Introducing new allocations by means of SPG is contrary to paras 3.15-3.18 of PPG12

Paragraph 8.36 – Reusing Urban Land Buildings

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1598)

- The percentage of brownfield development has been overestimated

Paragraph 8.38 - Monitoring

RN186 Strutt & Parker (180)

- An annual monitoring review of housing is unrealistic, as windfall sites may be prevented from coming forward as a potential means of satisfying local need during the first phasing period

Paragraph 8.42

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1509)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1597)

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (409)

- Add bullet point to give priority to brownfield land in Regeneration Zones/Study Area, and bring it forward as soon as possible
- The overestimation of the Urban Housing Capacity Study will result in a serious shortfall in the housing provision in the Plan period
- Future Housing Land Studies should also distinguish whether sites are greenfield or brownfield, whether they are for affordable housing and whether they are windfalls

Re: A8/020 – New Paragraph 8.42a

RD095 House Builders Federation (20240)

RD137 MHP Partnership resented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20647)

- Given CCC's confidence in its ability to deliver on brownfield housing we would propose target be 100% excluding sites with existing planning permissions. If planning permission for development of greenfield site lapses it should not be renewed if a brownfield alternative exists
- Housing monitoring indicator is not 5,000 dwellings. Should reflect the residual housing. Should have annual monitoring targets

Reasoning and Conclusions

9.7 The majority of these comments are expressions of varying disbelief about the Council's stance that previously developed land within the urban areas can accommodate the entire Structure Plan housing requirement. Other specific matters, like disquiet that the

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment may not have been available in time, have been answered positively. I consider that only relatively modest alterations are necessary to the Revised Deposit Draft text in this section. In the light of my findings on the Council's draft housing allocations, the wording in paragraphs 8.21, 8.31 and 8.33, and perhaps elsewhere, will need some re-drafting; perhaps by the Council stating the opinion that the great majority of the District's housing targets are capable of being met within the urban areas, and predominantly on previously developed land (rather than "brownfield", which is not a term employed in PPG3). Paragraph 8.27 will need rewording concerning the present status of EU Directive 2001/42/EC. Since it is unlikely that the Local Plan will be adopted until late 2005 at the earliest, the Council will presumably be reconsidering the 2006 review date for the UHCS, and the residual housing requirement set out in paragraph 8.31.

Recommendation

9.8 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 9.7 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections

APPENDIX 2: VEHICLE AND CYCLE PARKING STANDARDS

Objections and Key Issues

RN118 Dept of Health represented by Inventures (500)

- Determine Parking standards for hospitals, nursing homes and clinics on a case by case basis, based on need and existence of Travel Plans. Rigid standards for hospitals are wrong

Re: Aa2/001 – Vehicle and Cycle Parking Standards

RD037 Peacock & Smith (20195)

RD128 Unite represented by Turley Associates (20355)

- Objects to min cycle parking standard for developments up to 5000 m²; this is unnecessarily high & inefficient use of land. Suggests alternative for greater flexibility
- Cycle parking standards are based on car parking provision; not enough distinction made between sustainable cycle travel and unsustainable private vehicle travel. Make distinction between single unit provision and communal dwelling provision

Reasoning and Conclusions

9.9 The Council has put forward Proposed Change PCa2/001 which changes the list of minimum cycle parking provision, to correct a printing error. The Council marches in step with County Council parking standards and, in the present official climate, it seems that these are quite likely to be reviewed downwards over time to allow fewer motor vehicles on to development sites. The Council's position is entirely logical, and it will be necessary for a particular scheme to be very persuasively argued on its planning merits for the Council to countenance a more generous parking provision. Conversely, the cycle standards now require more provision, but that again is in accord with County Council standards.

Recommendation

9.10 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PCa2/001, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.
