

Canterbury District Local Plan

Preferred Option Consultation Draft 2013

Schedule of Consultation Responses

Part 1



December 2013

Comments Summary:

**Local Plan Foreword;
Vision and Strategy;
Plan Objectives.**



Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Local Plan Foreword	775890	Mr John Alterskye		624	Objecting	Considers that the Draft Local Plan does not reflect the views of residents. Questions the Council's motives after releasing the plan after the results of the local elections and believes only the developers stand to benefit from the proposals. Suspicious of the Council's positive spin through the webpage where several arguments defy logic. The Plan as proposed will have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of Canterbury residents.	
Local Plan Foreword	776757	Mr Adrian Fox	Policy and Projects Manager Dover District Council	740	Objecting	It would also be helpful to the reader if the document clearly set out the policies in your Adopted Local Plan would be deleted/replaced. We suggest that you included a table similar to our Adopted Core Strategy €" see the Table underneath paragraph 1.84 on page 124.	It would also be helpful to the reader if the document clearly set out the policies in your Adopted Local Plan would be deleted/replaced. We suggest that you included a table similar to our Adopted Core Strategy - see the Table underneath paragraph 1.84 on page 124.
Local Plan Foreword	776757	Mr Adrian Fox	Policy and Projects Manager Dover District Council	741	Objecting	Our overall comment is that before the Submission stage you carefully review and establish the need for all of the policies (152). As part of this process you will also need to carefully consider how you are going to effectively monitor this number of policies in your Annual Monitorin	Our overall comment is that before the Submission stage you carefully review and establish the need for all of the policies (152). As part of this process you will also need to carefully consider how you are going to effectively monitor this number of policies in your Annual Monitoring Report.
Local Plan Foreword	366511	Mr Tony Couperthwaite		799	Objecting	I don't agree it is a 'local' plan as residents have input meaningfully into it. The Plan is a joint effort between Council and Developers with little regard to what the people of Canterbury want. The intention is to push the Plan through regardless of objections. It was released the day after elections, the consultation has been shortened, Council has stated only serious alternatives will be considered and it has been scheduled through the holiday break. Rubber stamp exercise. Favours developers.	
Local Plan Foreword	777424	Mrs & Mrs Edmed		830	Objecting	Objects to the draft Local Plan being released after local Council elections and that independent research by MORI on greenfield sites has been ignored. Questions who, why and how residents were selected to participate in the workshops; and the ability of the Council to budget for the proposed scale of development. States that the Plan is ill advised, precarious, oversized and will cause irreversible damage.	
Local Plan Foreword	778463	Mr Richard Marti		1180	Objecting	We live in Nackington, and our route into Canterbury is along Nackington Road. From the proposed development map, it would appear that the Council is proposing to develop up to 4000 houses, which will have access to Canterbury via a single link into Nackington Road. This will be highly problematic. The volume of traffic down a single lane access to the City will cause major traffic chaos, not just at rush hour. I appreciate that there is a proposed link to the A2 to London. This will prevent r	The Council needs to think through the road access to the City for the new residents, so that existing "pinch points" that are already experienced are not made completely impractical (traffic lights at end of Nackington Road into Old Dover Road, for example: also the traffic lights along Old Dover Road into Canterbury, and the roundabout near the Police Station are good examples of where traffic already moves very slowly, and which would be made far worse if the access is not properly considered and implemented as part of these development plans.

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Local Plan Foreword	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1461	Objecting	CCC's Local Plan leaflet (Have your say on the future of your district) identifies seven strategic sites only in contradiction to the on-line and hard copy versions which show eight (the site at Greenhill which proposes 600 dwellings being omitted). WPC therefore suggest that the consultation process is flawed as this is the document most people are examining in order to form an opinion and to comment.	
Local Plan Foreword	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1470	Objecting	It will not always be practical or desirable for Infrastructure to be "provided in parallel with development" - sometimes it will have to come first.	Infrastructure such as roads, water and sewage treatment facilities cannot be provided incrementally - they need to be provided in anticipation of demand.
Local Plan Foreword	779009	Dr Claire Butler		1558	Objecting	The most powerful arguments continue to be: 1. The disproportionate size of the housing expansions proposed, larger than required by central government targets for the area and out of all proportion to the size and infrastructure of the City. 2. The lack of adequate infrastructure planning to support the developments and in particular, the lack of capacity for the enormous increase in cross town traffic.	The whole plan needs revision on the basis of honest and open consultation with the public and clearly agreed priorities determined by the people of the area.
Local Plan Foreword	779020	Mrs Janet Little		1570	Objecting	CCC officers in 2010 declared in the Sustainability Appraisals that Duncan Down site should be avoided yet in 2013 those same CCC officers endorse the site for house building despite the site being on Grade 3b Agriculture crop yielding land, that the Government Practise Guidelines state should not be used unless there is no alternative sites. There is a site opposite the site SHLAA 135 NOT crop yielding land. The site Duncan Down is a Nature site, and has four Village Greens, and AOANB.	
Local Plan Foreword	779020	Mrs Janet Little		1571	Objecting	The judgements above stated "it was not easy to discern how the council had answered the essential factual contention of the claimant namely that the outline reasons for the selection of alternatives at any particular stage had not been given clearly". CCC will not answer our many issues particularly their SA's that are flawed. There are other cases Thetford APP Shadwell Estate Co Ltd v Breckland D Council. Burgfield Common Ltd v West Berkshire D Council also say the SA's failed alternatives	
Local Plan Foreword	779020	Mrs Janet Little		1572	Objecting	The Sustainability Appraisal in Section 3 of the Report was carried out by Entec/AMEC. We bring your attention to section 2.7.1 of their report which highlights that the lack of detail. The full details of these assumptions are not available to the general public, this makes it unconstitutional, and difficult to challenge those assumptions. This suggest that the SA were not carried out to a "reasonable" level. We know Entec/AMEC did not undertake any veracity test of CCC SA's of SHLAA sites.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Local Plan Foreword	779020	Mrs Janet Little		1573	Objecting	CCC officers and Members are in breach of HRA screening OS6, EMP 13. HRA EMP 12. CCC officers have ignored Government Practice Guidelines. There are a number of Legal Precedents recently that show that CCC are exposed to a legal challenge on their poor adopted process, flawed SA's, lack of detail, "evidence" to support their preferred options, total lack of transparency and complete apathy in regard to openness.	
Local Plan Foreword	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1574	Objecting	I believe the process by which the document was drawn was not inclusive. Many stakeholders were not included by accident or design. The documentation needed to fully consider the implications of the plan is not fully available..i.e. traffic modelling. How can I gauge what the effect of housing will be without it? I also do not believe the evidence refereed to here, the NLP report and IPSOS MORI poll, actually do support the councils strategy as set out in this plan.	Listen to residents and reflect their opinions.
Local Plan Foreword	779152	Mr Leslie Hartop		1685	Objecting	The plan gives me no confidence about what will be built in the new strategic housing areas : neither density nor appearance. The plan aims to provide a canvas for developers and market forces to decide what Canterbury will look like in the future, but this is not enough. Many of the facilities that you would expect to find in other European cities, even those in much poorer countries, are simply absent. Facilities for young people with little purchasing power and civic events are non-existent.	The plan needs to be much clearer about the appearance and density of the new housing developments, before anyone can say that they will enhance the city. People have spoken about the new housing areas being 'garden cities'..... but of course they will not have their own cathedrals and they are likely to have very small (if any) gardens and very few green features in the streets and public areas. Canterbury needs the confidence to believe in itself and demand better from developers. We also need to make a few significant changes to the centre of the city, to really make the most of the historic features we have and ensure that visiting Canterbury is always a special experience. One of these changes would be to restructure Long Market into a low level café\relaxing area, making it the 'hub' of the city and uncovering the spectacular side-long view of the cathedral.
Local Plan Foreword	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1711	Objecting	We support the 3rd bullet point of the 2nd paragraph which sets out an aim to 'Protect sensitive landscape and wildlife areas.....the AONB.....' However the terminology used in Law and National Guidance relating to the AONBs is 'conserve and enhance' We would suggest that you add 'conserve and enhance' after 'Protect'. 'Conserve and enhance' implies a much more proactive approach and includes an element of acceptability to change.	We would suggest that you add 'conserve and enhance' after 'Protect'. 'Conserve and enhance' implies a much more proactive approach and includes an element of acceptability to change.

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Local Plan Foreword	779216	Mr Brian Macdowall		1719	Objecting	Regarding Herne Bay The proposals for Herne bay Hillborough Herne bay golf club Strode farm and Greenhill will add an unsustainable number of houses to existing developments the extra traffic this will generate is unworkable as are your unspecified proposals to limit car use and discourage private vehicle use. cars are used for 84% of all journeys and this is unlikely to change in the future	Road infrastructure improvements need to come first Number of houses must be drastically reduced Need more land given over to businesses schools and open space
Local Plan Foreword	778586	mrs joanne linnane		1837	Objecting	I do not believe the DLP as it stands truly reflects the desires of the residents of Canterbury. The scale of housing proposed will negatively affect the quality of life for people, especially in the south of the city. It will lead to increased congestion, and pollution. The loss of farmland may cause more food poverty in the future. Please follow council policies more closely. These are often admirable and should not be sacrificed for short term gain. Please listen to the residents.	Reduce the stated housing requirement of 15600 and revert to a more sustainable rate which will remove the need for 4000 houses in South Canterbury.
Local Plan Foreword	779381	Mr Tony Barnes		2165	Objecting	Question the terms and ideals behind the introduction titled 'What are we trying to achieve?' 1. Due to the increase in UK population, is a 20 year plan too far ahead? 2. The term 'local people' for housing is open to manipulation. 3. Disagree with term and policy of 'growth' of universities and colleges. 4. Question the 'Public opinion research' which indicates local support for the view that development is needed, as opinion polls can be can be highly manipulative.	I feel my comments above explain my views. Sadly - I acknowledge my own fault - I did not respond to the Local Consultation Draft earlier so now struggle 10 minutes before closing time!
Local Plan Foreword	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2391	Objecting	Additionally, Spokes would like to see a commitment to the effect that the needs and wishes of the people of the district will not be confounded by party political differences within the City Council, nor will the Council allow itself to be over-ridden by politically-motivated interference from Kent County Council such as transpired over the recent Westgate Towers debacle.	
Local Plan Foreword	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2392	Objecting	Furthermore, developments should proceed along conventional, democratic debate pathways, and not be dictated to or influenced by campaigns waged in the press, mounted by single-issue partisan groups or by groups with development interests such as Canterbury 4 Business.	
Local Plan Foreword	778861	David & Teresa Kemsley		2512	Objecting	There was no engagement with the public before the launch of the plan. Clearly Localism hasn't yet reached Canterbury.	
Local Plan Foreword	778861	David & Teresa Kemsley		2514	Objecting	The objectives of the DLP as described by councillors appeared to change midway through the consultation from economic regeneration/genuine housing need to pulling in as much cash as possible to balance the books. We suggest that if you had been clearer about the latter from the outset you would have attracted a wider range of responses given CCC profligacy in a number of areas e.g PR , Marlowe subsidy, Westgate Towers traffic scheme , museum management overheads for starters.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Local Plan Foreword	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2731	Objecting	Object to the statementt that CCC have consulted with Parish COuncils as co-operation has been nonexistent. The leaflet only lists 7 sites but there were 8 sites, 600 houses at Greenhill were omitted. Concerned that resients have not that all the relevant information.	
Local Plan Foreword	779556	Mr Jon Linnane		2901	Objecting	I wish to add this submission to my on line comments on the Draft Local Plan. Firstly in relation to the input of comments I found the system to be difficult to use. It also was overly proscriptive in its format and it required editing by the user to be put in short form for the councils purpose. The log in requirement seemed also to be designed to put off would be commentators because of the way it was designed. It was also too large a task for one individual to respond comprehensively. Th	
Local Plan Foreword	414960	Cllr Alex Perkins	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3156	Objecting	The premise and process employed in compiling the draft Local Plan is flawed, leading it to incorrectly reach some quite baffling conclusions. The plan should have been resident-led; not developer-led through the SHLAA process. Object to the very principles upon which the draft Local Plan is based. The wrong methodology has been applied, to incorrect data, gathered from the wrong people.	Start the process again.
Local Plan Foreword	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3231	Objecting	We particularly welcome the Appropriate Assessment ('AA') screening which has been undertaken as part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment ('HRA') process. However we recommend that a full AA is carried out on both the Preferred Options document and Submission stage document before these are put out for public consultation. Further AA may be needed if changes are made to the plan. We would greatly welcome the opportunity to comment on the full AA at the earliest stage possible.	
Local Plan Foreword	776051	Mr Rick Strange		3270	Objecting	The Conservative Manifesto and the Conservative Party Green paper on Open Source Planning, give us, the local people, the right to decide how and what happens in our own area. CCC (and Central Government) have absolutely no mandate to cover our A1 agricultural land in housing estates. The new occupants will be unable to contribute to our local economy because of the lack of job opportunities and will become a long term drain on our resources.	If the Local Plan is what the Conservative members at the CCC want to do, then as none of these matters were mentioned in their Election speeches or Manifesto, they are morally required to resign their seats and stand for re-election so that they obtain a mandate from the electorate for this significantly changed programme, as their new platform.
Local Plan Foreword	779360	Ms Alison Grubb		3331	Objecting	Having attended a public meeting at Spires Academy, read various leaflets, newspaper articles and attempted unsuccessfully to view the Local Plan on line at www.canterbury.gov.uk/localplan I write to express my concern about the lack of planned infrastructure to meet the demands of the developments planned.	
Local Plan Foreword	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3564	Objecting	Despite the huge developments planned in the north of the district, the City Council has not organised a public meeting, for the residents most affected to ask questions and express concerns.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Local Plan Foreword	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3617	Objecting	Add additional points to section 1 and 2 of the foreword, relating to the NPPF and localism act, defending the city against loss of character, intensive development etc, recognising and not repeating mistakes, ensuring infrastructure is in place, protecting landscape and wildlife, improving facilities, outline survey results.	Add to why have a local plan: "Comply with the provisions of the Localism Act and the NPPF" "To represent and defend the City against loss of character, distinctiveness, and adverse effects upon its historic and cultural uniqueness as the Head of the Anglican Church in Britain, the seat of the English Language and Legal System and its large World Heritage Site, Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings Conservation Areas and Historic Setting. The Council is concerned that intensive development in and around the City already has caused, and would continue to cause, adverse effects upon the items listed above, and will refuse applications for development that would cause such effects." Add to What are we trying to achieve?: "Recognise mistakes made during the existing Local Plan period and aim not to duplicate them" Second point - delete "is" and replace with "are", and after "enough" add "jobs and" Third point - after "protect" insert "and enhance". Add at end "and High Value Landscape areas, and Natural Wildlife areas. Fourth point - Alter to read "Ensure that infrastructure such as transport, schools, health facilities and so on is available for the increase in population that development will bring" Sixth point - alter to read "Support the educational core policies of the Universities and Colleges, but discourage the use of their sites for non-educational/commercial purposes"
							Seventh point - Alter to read "Improve existing cultural and leisure facilities, and provide enough informal and also amenity open spaces to foster good health and social well-being" Amend the second sentence of the penultimate paragraph on page 3 to read: "Public opinion research suggests that numbers of local people believe some new housing may be needed (with an emphasis on affordable housing), and that business development and the provision of employment is needed, but they are also concerned about transport issues, air pollution, loss of greenfield land, increased cost of imported foods and the proposed use of productive agricultural land for non-agricultural uses. They are further concerned at the shortage of urban open space, over-intensive housing in urban areas, and pressures upon existing local services and facilities. The Council is keen to produce a plan supporting the community's needs and wishes and alleviating its concerns, and now wishes to consult on the following proposals"

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Local Plan Foreword	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3849	Objecting	I do feel that the Council has failed to publicise the Local Plan effectively. There has been no public meetings, very little in local papers from the Council, the leaflets were available in very limited venues - in the Herne Bay District Office all that was on display was an expensive 6' vertical banner and a few leaflets on a window sill - hardly a promotion of such an important issue. The web site was difficult to negotiate and certainly put me off spending much time searching it.	
Local Plan Foreword	780975	Mr Frederic Stansfield		4217	Objecting	Whilst I appreciate the need to prepare for the future, I think that the aspiration to produce a Local Plan lasting until 2031 is unrealistic at the present time.	
Local Plan Foreword	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4346	Objecting	The Local Plan proposes to 'Create well-designed new communities, with good access to jobs and services' and to 'Protect and strengthen town and village centres'. The proposed development of greenfield sites into housing estates does not, de facto, create a community but tends to establish a marginalised group of residents with little in common other than a shared outlook of largely post modern dwellings that have, over the years, reduced in size to accommodate 'economic use' of land.	
Local Plan Foreword	779662	Mr Graham Kenmir		4462	Objecting	Although the City council may have fulfilled its legal obligations to consult with parish councils and others on the progress of the plan there is little evidence that they have been proactive in ensuring that local people have been empowered. There has been no great effort to encourage, facilitate or monitor the preparation of neighbourhood plans (NPPF Para 183-185).	
Local Plan Foreword	781255	Robert & Sandra Shine		4499	Objecting	The Plan purports to be a vision for Canterbury's future until 2031 as if town planning was about producing a single grandiose scheme and implementing it regardless of changing circumstances. Planning is a constant process that needs to be guided by sound principles of sustainable development that have broad consensus amongst the people who live and work in the area.	
Local Plan Foreword	781348	Mr David Greenway		4540	Objecting	The usual evidence of devious tricks in the preparation and provision of this proposal on your part is all too risky. Given the record of devious activities by politicians (at all levels), the police and the press in very recent years you are asking too much for the public to put up with any suggestion of "dirty tricks" please don't make us out as fools and to try this in an area full of academics and professionals is very brave of you.	
Local Plan Foreword	782031	Dr P W L Clough		4963	Objecting	I have carefully read the draft Local Plan and while I have some sympathy for the Council in the difficulties it faces to balance the needs of the local economy, our environment and our infrastructure, I have to say that I found the overall strategy shallow, bland and lacking in conviction. I have the strong impression that, in contrast to other historic cities in England such as Winchester, Cambridge and York, Canterbury is not well served by its planning authorities.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Local Plan Foreword	780277	Yvonne & Mark Culverhouse & Ford		5063	Objecting	THE LOCALISM ACT. In the bill introduced in November 2011, much reference is given to local community and parish councils. Our community has fallen victim to a situation where it would appear residents have not had an opportunity to express their views until now. We were not given that opportunity.	
Local Plan Foreword	13812	Mr N J Blake		5170	Objecting	The Draft Local Plan (DLP) is advanced as a Vision, but it appears to have been the result of unresolved or even ignored constraints which are set out in part below. Having studied both the document itself, the leaflets supplied by the City Council at the recent public meetings(PML) and the comments of other groups and Parish Councils, the plan seems to be an uneasy dialogue	
Local Plan Foreword	414112	C E Arter		5270	Objecting	Residents should have been asked what they wanted before being presented with a developer-led plan.	
Local Plan Foreword	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5420	Objecting	The plan fails to admit constraints and determining factors, including the pressure from government and other political considerations and especially the pursuit of the government's New Homes Bonus which has obviously been a main driving force behind the high housing target figure.It would be right to acknowledge the constraints and complexities that the planners have faced.The relentless pressure for yet more housing land to be identified.	
Local Plan Foreword	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5459	Objecting	I am concerned about the imposing and cavalier manner in which Plan is presented as the only reasonable option by some very senior officers and politicians who have framed policies and proposals in a fashion that is remote or at odds from the populace they serve.I certainly have serious concerns and misgivings about the over-reliance on the ancillary reports produced and testing of possible scenarios. Plus too much weighting is given to these reports over and against the views of local residents	
Local Plan Foreword	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5461	Objecting	There are too many ancillary reports to wade through to understand how the LP policies and proposals have evolved. Perhaps even too many for planners to process coherently? The greater involvement of the Council's own professional planners might well have come up with more incisive diagnoses and more coherent proposals without that additional expense! Councillors come across as being bamboozled by the sheer volume and dense verbiage of the ancillary material!	
Local Plan Foreword	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5463	Objecting	The argument put forward that the failure to push ahead with this particular plan as quickly as possible to avoid a development free-for-all is open to debate as: 1) the current Local Plan still constitutes a good planning framework 2) there is a proven adequate supply of housing land for the next 5 years; 3) the Council has defensible policies in place 4) sustainability arguments and adherence to key principles in the NPPF could be mustered in any appeals.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Local Plan Foreword	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5489	Objecting	The consultation portal represents an overly regimented, restrictive, tedious and laborious method of responding to the DLP. It is biased towards encouraging narrow paragraph-by-paragraph representations rather than facilitating and encouraging more general and strategic observations which are absolutely crucial at this stage in the consultation process.	
Local Plan Foreword	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5647	Supporting	Positive aspects of draft local plan: Amount of time and effort invested in the Plan-making exercise	
Local Plan Foreword	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5665	Objecting	The document is poor quality. Punctuation is flawed, quantities can be wrong; and meanings indecipherable. It is a disjointed set of statements, the links of which are rarely spelt out. The DLP is structurally unbalanced with little space given to key proposals. Presentations gave more coherent expositions of the Preferred Option, often containing evidence and arguments left out of the written document. All this means the DLP is less transparent, coherent and convincing than it could have been.	The existing text needs to be thoroughly edited, reconsidered and revised in line with missing elements and what was said in oral presentations. One persons should be in charge of this.
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5863	Objecting	The extension of the Public Consultation period from 6-10 weeks has been very much appreciated, however, the content and scope of this document is not easily digested, particularly as it lacks any reference index to locate matters relating to a particular site or topic and this is also true for all the supporting material.	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5865	Objecting	The Council's web pages has lacked links, or had links which failed, with the site itself undergoing major changes at unfortunate times.	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5867	Objecting	Contents: A thought: Could there be a paragraph to explain how this document is set out? There is not a clear approach. Certain of the strategies mentioned in Chapter 1 go on to have their own individual chapter, eg 'Traffic' and 'Open Space', but others do not: eg 'Housing' and 'Environment' and are covered by several. As a result there is a lot of overlapping, which is not always cross referenced.	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5872	Objecting	As a document the logic behind the 'flow' is not apparent: 'Design and the Built Environment' is some distance from 'Housing Development' 'Economic Development and Employment' is separated from the 'Tourism and Visitor Economy' by 'Town Centres and Leisure' The two Chapters which could be seen to be particularly related to an 'Environment Strategy' are Chapters 7 and 10. 'Historic Environment' just sits awkwardly	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5877	Objecting	What are we trying to achieve? All commendable aspirations, but does this Plan bear out these aims, prove they are realistic and will be delivered? Are they borne out for the District? Are they are borne out for the Parish of Sturry? How will 'new communities' be created in Sturry? Will the village centre of Sturry be protected and strengthened? Policies and buildings do not create 'new community', jobs depend on outside forces and services are not in the Council remit.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Local Plan Foreword	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5883	Objecting	The consultation does not include sight of the Habitat Regulations Assessment of the Plan, though the Habitat Regulations Assessment Report to Inform Screening for Appropriate Assessment is referred to in the Sustainability Appraisal, which reports that an Appropriate Assessment is required, though policy wording amendment recommendations are given to avoid a likely significant effect.	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6250	Objecting	*The Council's Cultural & Enterprise Local Economy Policy (2011-2016) * The East Kent Local Investment Plan (2010) * The East Kent Growth Plan (2012) As at 04.08.13 the 3.21, 3.24 & 3.25 documents did not appear to be listed on the website under documents supporting the Plan	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6846	Objecting	Aim point 1. 'Create well-designed new communities' - The Plan has this intention, but policies & buildings alone do not create a good old or 'new community'. ...'with good access to jobs' - the jobs will depend on outside forces. 'and services' - These are not in the Council's remit. The increased population could not be supported by the District's services (water, health, sewage etc) without major investment, which, again, is outside the Council's control. Not deliverable for Sturry.	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6847	Objecting	Aims point 2. The scale of development has not been justified beyond all reasonable doubt. There are just too any uncertainties. The Plan suggests there would be different types of housing, but the detail is not actually in the Plan. 'Local people' do not have a requirement for 15,000 houses! So who are the 'local people'? According to the Plan 15,000 houses are only likely to create 6,500 jobs. There is a glaring difference. Desire of major businesses to locate here long term is not a given	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6848	Supporting	Aims Point 3 - Landscape and wildlife - Quite right. This is the Council's responsibility. The Plan would seem to fulfil this aim, assuming appropriate funds available.	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6849	Supporting	Aims Point 3 - Landscape and wildlife - Quite right. This is the Council's responsibility. The Plan would seem to fulfil this aim, assuming appropriate funds available.	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6850	Supporting	Aims Point 4 - Transport - will developers contributions cover the costs? Will funding be upfront? Roads are needed now. Schools, health facilities and so on - These are outside the Council's remit. How the Council would 'make certain' that the actual provision of all the other factors is 'in parallel' has not been proved in the Plan.	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6851	Supporting	Aims Point 5 - 'Protect and strengthen town and village centres' With the exception of Sturry, then the plan would achieve this.	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6852	Supporting	Aims Point 6 - 'Support the growth of the Universities and Colleges' Apart from labelling Canterbury as 'Knowledge City' as far as the Plan is concerned the support is almost by default, and does not appear to address this issue directly.	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6853	Supporting	Aims Point 6 - 'Support development of new and improved cultural and leisure facilities' The Plan does allocate some land but beyond that, it is dependent upon the decisions, and money of others.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6854	Objecting	The aims of the Local Plan (page 3) are not all borne out, nor are they likely to be delivered.	
Local Plan Foreword	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6899	Objecting	Consultation with residents in the Parish of Strurry was disappointing, to say the least. Here residents have had much to absorb about the implication of the Council's Draft local Plan and there was not even a schedule of meetings for each strategic site announced with the Plan's release. Sturry residents would like to think we may now have an additional opportunity for improved communication. .	
Vision and Strategy	767062	Mr Peter Maxwell		29	Objecting	The objection I would like to raise, is the siting of the local NHS GP Surgery in Island Road and the nearest Dispensing Pharmacy in the village High Street. These are sited on opposite sides of the railway line. If the Level Crossing is permanently closed, and taking into consideration the age group of residents of this area, be it the South or North side of the railway line, how does the Plan expect to consider this situation, taking into account that not ALL these residents are mobile.	I do believe that a by-pass is long overdue, but residents of the community should still have access across the railway line, be it single track road controlled by traffic lights.
Vision and Strategy	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		64	Supporting	Policy to be formulated by intelligent, focussed debate involving the public, and not to be high-jacked by either intra-council party political arguments, nor by ditto between district and county councils, nor by populist press campaigns.	
Vision and Strategy	399017	Mr Andrew Hall		98	Objecting	Fine rhetoric but rather meaningless!	Can we please have a clear and ambitious vision?
Vision and Strategy	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1097	Supporting	Waltham Parish Council ('WPC') supports the principal objectives that are embodied in the vision statement set out at the start of Chapter 1 of the draft Canterbury District Local Plan (2011-2031) ('the Plan'), that are intended to create desirable conditions for business, visitors and residents to secure the prosperity of the District as summarised in section 1.6.	
Vision and Strategy	778975	Professor Clive Church	Cjairman Alliance of Canterbury Residents' Associations	1547	Objecting	The proposals for large scale housing development, mainly in Canterbury, are completely unacceptable. These would impose unsustainable burdens on infrastructure and transport.	
Vision and Strategy	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1712	Objecting	This vision omits any mention of conservation and enhancement of the natural, heritage and built environment - Canterbury's assets - which are fundamentally important to the wellbeing of residents and the well planned growth of the economy. Further statements in the Local Plan support the natural and built environment but this should be fundamental to, and stated in, the vision for the district.	Add a sentence which reflects the value of the natural, heritage and built environment of the District, (the Kent Downs AONB, Canterbury's heritage etc) which reflects the importance of their conservation and enhancement to provide for the well being of residents, and the basis for a well planned and environmentally sound economy. An attractive environment for people to live in and for new economic development.
Vision and Strategy	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1852	Objecting	There is a comment on political statements that if the opposite of it was and it made no sense then the initial statement is of little value. The statement is bland.	To help with the vision thing - canvassing and allowing each community in the area to work up their own aspirations would be a place to start

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Vision and Strategy	779381	Mr Tony Barnes		2167	Objecting	I fail to grasp how one can use the phrase 'environmentally sustainable' when one is discussing large areas of new development to receive new local residents. The term may be trendy and brownie points some may give, but it is simply a trendy phrase which in this text is contradictory. Remove it!	
Vision and Strategy	778861	David & Teresa Kemsley		2515	Supporting	Regarding the content , we do of course support the need to provide additional housing to meet the needs of a rising population and economic regeneration that moves us away from overreliance on tourism and education. It is vitally important that young people growing up here can feel secure in the knowledge that they can if they wish continue to live in the area with diverse and rewarding job opportunities.	
Vision and Strategy	779274	Mr Graham Duplock	Parish Councillor Parish Councillor Beskesbourne	2816	Objecting	Although aim of 'promoting economic development' is important to the district the main problem for Canterbury itself is 'traffic congestion'. The proposed plan does very little to address this issue which has been shown to be top of residents' concerns.	
Vision and Strategy	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2912	Supporting	Kitewood generally supports the vision and strategy for Canterbury set out in Chapter 1	
Vision and Strategy	778384	Nicholas and Deborah Wells		3001	Supporting	We have no problem with the Council's general vision as summarised in Chapter	
Vision and Strategy	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3011	Objecting	At present the vision does not refer to the protection of the natural environment or biodiversity Sustainable development has three strands economic, social and environmental. To ensure the protection, enhancement, connection and management of the natural environment and biodiversity in conformity with sustainable principals we recommend that the vision is strengthened to include specific mention of the preservation of the natural environment. We have suggested additional wording below.	The Council's vision for the district is that "through focused, well-planned and environmentally sustainable growth, by 2030 the Canterbury District will be defined by a dynamic strong economy , and distinctive cultural and visitor experience and biodiverse natural environment from which our communities will prosper.....
Vision and Strategy	414960	Cllr Alex Perkins	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3157	Objecting	The draft local plan lacks any coherent vision. (Other than maximising profits for wealthy landowners and corporate property developers)	
Vision and Strategy	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3620	Objecting	Add the following to the end of the vision: ', but we will ensure that our rural and historic environments are protected and that our valuable agricultural land is retained in productive use, and we will ensure that we continue to have viable and thriving local communities.'	Add to the end of the vision: ", but we will ensure that our rural and historic environments are protected and that our valuable agricultural land is retained in productive use, and we will ensure that we continue to have viable and thriving local communities."
Vision and Strategy	779662	Mr Graham Kenmir		4464	Objecting	There appears to be little sense of a vision for Canterbury District other than economic development. There is little evidence of the starting point having been a vision for enhanced lives for the residents in the District or that the plan has been prepared to meet development needs which arise from any agreed vision.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Vision and Strategy	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5423	Objecting	The DLP fails to take into account the NPPF and particularly the emphasis on the LP being the community's vision: no reference whatsoever to the community's agreed vision! The DLP represents a vision reflecting mainly the outlook of the Council Leader and chief officers rather than the community's vision and priorities. The plan does not represent what the community wants and the Council's community consultation approach was not updated to reflect the NPPF. Vision and sustainability are both uns	The Mori Poll and the Stakeholder seminars held do not equal the identification of a collective community vision called for in the NPPF. In terms of a sustainable vision, the Council should build on the excellent work carried out by the Canterbury Society in order to elicit and forge the District-wide vision needed to produce a cohesive Local Plan enjoying cross-Party and cross-community support. The local plan needs to be community divided and community led.
Vision and Strategy	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5424	Objecting	The failure to properly take into account the findings of the Mori Ipsos Poll and the failure to present alternatives or seriously consider other options at this stage and the rush to produce the Plan all represents a riding roughshod over public opinion. The Mori Poll and the Stakeholder seminars held do not equal the identification of a collective community vision called for in the NPPF.	
Vision and Strategy	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5725	Objecting	It is unclear what line of argument the DLP is trying to take because of its structural imbalances and lack of detail on the main proposals. The 'Vision' does not make clear how the District in 2030 would differ from that of today; it rather veers off to list specific aims and objectives which are not coordinated. The DLP then goes into disparate discussions of various strategies, reports and studies; any attempt at delineating the future vanishes with this.	
Vision and Strategy	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6834	Objecting	Aspiration and Consultation. We question below not only the fundamental approach taken by CCC in setting out its vision and the parameters adopted, but also the interpretations of recent development history, which together force the scenario formulations undertaken into specific directions. This is acknowledged by NLP "...It would also require an increased rate of development in the District from that achieved in the past."	
Vision and Strategy	13835	Mr Michael Steed		6957	Objecting	Canterbury's population has expanded, infrastructure hasn't, causing congestion and pollution. Growth in housing proposed in the plan reflects realities. Development next to existing public transport encourages use and improvement. Start plan with development at sustainable transport links. But Council asked developers what sites they wanted and started there. Funding from contributions is the driver. Need a different approach tested against sustainability criteria. Objects to plan start again.	The strategy should therefore start with an analysis of where the existing transport infrastructure favours sustainable development, together with a plan for a much improved transport infrastructure. This would identify potential development sites from this analysis and that plan. I therefore object to the way this plan has been conceived and designed and call for the CCC to go back to the drawing board
Plan Objectives	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	208	Supporting	The Plan is to be commended for its detailed research and wide-ranging discussion. The Plan is a thorough and well-presented document in a readable format. From the Parish Council's point of view, it will provide a valuable source of reference, especially in relation to planning issues. Due respect given to the unique nature of the rural environment and the protection of its character, including villages and, especially, sensitive, significant or historic sites.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Plan Objectives	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	256	Objecting	City Council is bound by external factors such as Government housing targets, the need to regenerate local commerce and industry after several high-profile closures and the prevailing climate of "presumption in favour of sustainable development". The Parish Council further recognises that significant housing and commercial development will take place in the area over the next 20 years. Concerns over proposals for new infrastructure to support the	
Plan Objectives	369937	Mr John Storrs		276	Objecting	I am against the Local Plan on the basis of there being an inadequate infrastructure relating to schools, roads, hospitals and police. The impact on the environment would be huge whether it be desecration of prime land or increased demand on utility services especially water. Employment prospects relating to the provision of 4000 new homes has not be thought through.The argument that people could find work outside Canterbury by utilising the HST would cause a morning and evening gridlock.	
Plan Objectives	775857	Mr John Astin		322	Objecting	The Plan, at least as described in the leaflet, shows insufficient attention to the likely activities of the large numbers of new residents in South Canterbury. It also skims far too lightly over the transport infrastructure changes which will be needed if Canterbury is not to become a permanent traffic jam. In particular it makes no reference to the growing importance of the fast London rail link and the siting of Canterbury West station.	I would like to see better research on the topics I have mentioned.
Plan Objectives	776234	Miss J Bell		597	Objecting	Opposes Local Plan as it is not in the interest of Canterbury at all.The Council and developers will have short-term financial gain.	
Plan Objectives	777408	Miss Linda Hill		725	Objecting	We do not want the proposed developments on Strode Park or the Golf Course. We want to be a rural community. These developments will be the tip of the iceberg next the council will be planning on developing the woodlands along the Ridgeway, at this rate Herne will be merged with Herne Bay and Sturry.	Do not allow the proposed developments Herne go ahead
Plan Objectives	777302	Ms Sheila Chesney		744	Supporting	I have read the local plan and have attended an information meeting which I found very useful. I have no adverse comments on the plan as I accept that the council will have used tried and tested formula to evidence the link between housing, employment, education needs etc.	
Plan Objectives	777173	Mr Tim Timpson		747	Objecting	East Kent should be hub and spokes. Ashford the main hub centre to gain economies of scale and the surrounding towns spokes providing labour and support. Instead of piecemeal growth all over Kent an overview approach should be made. Efforts should be made to see if Ashford will take some of Canterbury's development proposals.	
Plan Objectives	13680	Ms Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust	959	Objecting	The document is too long with overlapping policies and repetition. It is not clear and succinct. The same topics are dealt with under different headings.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Plan Objectives	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1260	Objecting	The objectives themselves, taken in isolation, are laudable, but the objective to protect the natural environment would seem to be at variance with the other objective to build the houses to promote economic growth and the number of houses proposed is more than is necessary to achieve this objective.	The wording should be changed to show the plan is seeking to balance the need for development without losing any of the city's natural, agricultural or cultural assets.
Plan Objectives	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1467	Objecting	Weak wording of objective 4: it should NOT read "and seek to ensure", it should read "to ensure".	Weak wording of objective 4: it should NOT read "and seek to ensure", it should read "to ensure".
Plan Objectives	777305	Mr Jason Hobbs	Area Manager Homes and Communities Agency	1590	Supporting	The Plan plays a crucial role in the Council's intentions to promote positive sustainable growth and sustainable development objectives set out in the NPPF. The Plan meets the HCA's desire to assist in the delivery of Housing, Economic Regeneration and infrastructure to meet sustainable growth.	
Plan Objectives	779053		Brett Group	1650	Objecting	Adequate land for Sport and recreation should be identified and allocated according to known needs and suitably located having regard to spatial distribution and access on foot or by conveniently situated public transport facilities	Allocation of land for Public Open Space to include formal sports pitches Specifically at Folly Farm, off Kemsing Gardens as previously identified in the adopted 2006 Local Plan (See detailed comments and plan later in this Chapter)
Plan Objectives	778739	Mr A Salvatori		1656	Supporting	We wish to highlight and support the importance of meeting local housing needs and consider that this should be given great weight in the decision making process. There is a local housing need in the parish of Harbledown and Rough Common which is not met by the draft plan allocations. A detailed has been submitted separately to the Council on this matter.	The designation of additional land for housing is required at Rough Common to meet the need
Plan Objectives	778740		Stour Valley Estates Ltd	1672	Supporting	We support the objective of providing sufficient housing and employment to meet local needs and consider that additional weight be given to this criterion in decision making Where policies are not identified it should be assumed that the client supports the aims of those policies.	Plan should highlight the weight given to these criteria
Plan Objectives	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	1681	Supporting	Support is given to the criterion which seeks to provide sufficient housing to meet local housing need and support economic growth. However there is some concern that the housing need based on population based projections and household formation rates is being constrained by the adopted strategy It should be stated at the outset that the client is in overall support of the aims and objectives of the local plan strategy but considers a number of key issues should be addressed	
Plan Objectives	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1714	Objecting	3rd bullet point: Add 'conserve and enhance' to be in line with the CROW Act 2000 and NPPF. 'Protect' implies no improvement or change, conserve and enhance is more proactive and allows for improvements and environmentally sustainable change.	Add 'conserve and enhance' after the word 'protect' in the 3rd bullet point.
Plan Objectives	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1838	Supporting	These objectives are consistent with national guidance and it is particularly important that the housing need that has been identified by the clear background demographic evidence is met.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Plan Objectives	778733		The John Graham Centre	1848	Supporting	The John Graham Centre supports the objective of providing sufficient housing to meet local needs as it gives support to the provision of supported living at the Centre (see later comments). The Centre believes this should be given significant weight in the decision making process. support policies not objected to.	The plan should explicitly lay out the weight given to meeting local housing need in decision making
Plan Objectives	778738		ARJO Wiggins	1873	Supporting	We give support to meeting the local housing needs and recommend that weight is allocated to this criterion in decision making It should first be stated that the client is in overall support of the aims and objectives of the local plan strategy	The plan should explicitly state that weight is given to meeting local housing needs in the decision making process.
Plan Objectives	778391	Mr Robert Brown		2003	Objecting	The Local Plan is confusing, inaccurate statements have been made to fit proposals, a new plan is needed.	a whole new plan is needed
Plan Objectives	778403	Mrs Christobel Seath		2081	Objecting	While I accept that there are some admirable proposals within the CDLP, I do not want to respond to the Plan on line because I find that the method does not allow me to comment on the thinking and process behind the Plan itself, which in some cases is, in my opinion, flawed.	
Plan Objectives	405580	Mr Graham Robin		2223	Objecting	It is disappointing that the Council does not give a 'Vision' for the future of the City. The draft plans are only about piecemeal proposals driven by developers. Where does the city see itself in 10, 15 or 20 years?	
Plan Objectives	777655	Ms Emily Shirley	Director Kent Environment & Community Network	2225	Objecting	I am writing on behalf of KECN to object to the entirety of the Draft Local Plan. It fails to address avoiding dangerous climate change, putting future resident of the District at immediate danger from increased flooding, drought, air pollution and the other multitude of problems that are well understood and predicted to arise such as food security and civil war, if we do not bring our carbon levels, back to 350ppm. The Local Plan must make avoiding dangerous climate change top priority.	The Draft Local Plan must be redrafted to make all its policies consistent with the goal of bringing carbon levels back to 350ppm in order to achieve climate recovery. Climate recovery requires a reduction of carbon consumption by 6%+ each year from the adoption of and throughout the life of the Plan. In addition to this, extensive woodland planting has to occur.
Plan Objectives	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2239	Supporting	The stated plan objectives include the need 'to provide sufficient housing to meet local housing need and support economic growth'. This objective is broadly supported by the company. It is considered that the scale of provision must be directly related to the twin requirements of housing need and economic performance.	
Plan Objectives	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2424	Objecting	The chapter on climate change in the Draft Local Plan is hopeless. Mitigation and adaption to climate change needs to be threaded through the whole plan and inform all policy content. It should be the key strategy. The existing climate change policies only address new development proposals, how developments are to be constructed and in some instances where they are to be located. The full climate change impacts of existing developments and behaviour patterns are not even considered.	Therefore, a district wide climate recovery plan must be made part of the Local Plan. This will require a 6%+ reduction of carbon each year with massive tree planting across the district. This is the prescription set out by a leading climatologist Dr. Hansen and his team of experts. To this end, the districts carbon footprint must be calculated (if not done already), and then across all policy areas a 6%+ annual carbon reduction must be made mandatory (with incentives provided if necessary) with comprehensive tree planting actions.

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Plan Objectives	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2723	Objecting	Parish Council is extremely concerned with the amount of development proposed, whether it is sustainable and in accord with the NPPF. They are unhappy about the development proposed in and around Herne and Broomfield, it exceeds need. They have raised a large number of points/concerned which are detailed independently with respect to: housing numbers, locations, and affordability; village status; climate change, flooding, water supplies; transport, new roads; Heritage; open space and green gaps.	
Plan Objectives	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2911	Supporting	Kitewood is generally supportive of the Preferred Option document, in particular the strategic allocation of land South of Hillborough (Site 3) for mixed use development.	
Plan Objectives	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3012	Objecting	In relation to the plan objectives we welcome the commitment to protect the natural environment however the ambitions of the policies within the Local Plan go much further than this. Therefore to ensure conformity throughout the plan and to ensure that ecology is not only conserved but enhanced we recommend that the following additional working be added to the Plan Objectives.	To protect the built and protect, enhance, connect and manage the natural environment
Plan Objectives	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3204	Objecting	Ask that notice is taken of residents and that the revised document reflects public opinion. The DLP does not meet the Council's own policies and objectives. Canterbury is a religious, cultural, educational and tourist hub. These drive the city and risk being affected by scale of development proposed. Council should galvanise residents and business in an equal partnership and develop a truly representative and visionary plan that values and protects the city.	
Plan Objectives	780449	Daniel & Elizabeth Rikh		3334	Objecting	We recognise that traffic congestion and pollution is already a problem. This plan will only make this worse.	
Plan Objectives	121820	Mrs IVD Baker		3448	Objecting	Objects to failure of the plan to protect the best agricultural land from development, because; NPPF requires its protection (P.112); the Council has committed to an environmental policy; non inclusion of Policies CP6 & 7 from core strategy; goes against policies SP4 and EMP12 in LP; plan is unsound because it is inconsistent with NPPF in proposing unsustainable developments on grade 1 agricultural land; only develop on grade 2 and below land.	Please delete all proposed significant developments on grade 1 agricultural land, and redirect any necessary developments to land of grades 2 and below as advised by the NPPF.
Plan Objectives	780828	Mr Jeremy D I Baker		3453	Objecting	Objects to failure of the plan to protect the best agricultural land from development, because; NPPF requires its protection (P.112); the Council has committed to an environmental policy; non inclusion of Policies CP6 & 7 from core strategy; goes against policies SP4 and EMP12 in LP; plan is unsound because it is inconsistent with NPPF in proposing unsustainable developments on grade 1 agricultural land; only develop on grade 2 and below land.	Please delete all proposed significant developments on grade 1 agricultural land, and redirect any necessary developments to land of grades 2 and below as advised by the NPPF.

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Plan Objectives	780827	Mr M P J Baker		3455	Objecting	Objects to failure of the plan to protect the best agricultural land from development, because; NPPF requires its protection (P.112); the Council has committed to an environmental policy; non inclusion of Policies CP6 & 7 from core strategy; goes against policies SP4 and EMP12 in LP; plan is unsound because it is inconsistent with NPPF in proposing unsustainable developments on grade 1 agricultural land; only develop on grade 2 and below land.	Please delete all proposed significant developments on grade 1 agricultural land, and redirect any necessary developments to land of grades 2 and below as advised by the NPPF.
Plan Objectives	121830	Mr MJR Baker		3457	Objecting	Objects to failure of the plan to protect the best agricultural land from development, because; NPPF requires its protection (P.112); the Council has committed to an environmental policy; non inclusion of Policies CP6 & 7 from core strategy; goes against policies SP4 and EMP12 in LP; plan is unsound because it is inconsistent with NPPF in proposing unsustainable developments on grade 1 agricultural land; only develop on grade 2 and below land.	Please delete all proposed significant developments on grade 1 agricultural land, and redirect any necessary developments to land of grades 2 and below as advised by the NPPF.
Plan Objectives	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3622	Objecting	First objective - add: "by means other than encouraging increased housing provision". Second objective - delete the words "and support economic growth" and add at the end "with the emphasis on affordable housing". Third objective should be re-worded: "To protect, enhance and improve the built and natural environment". Add a fifth objective: "To foster social well-being with the provision of adequate informal and amenity open spaces, especially in urban areas."	First objective - add: "by means other than encouraging increased housing provision". Second objective - delete the words "and support economic growth" and add at the end "with the emphasis on affordable housing". Third objective should be re-worded: "To protect, enhance and improve the built and natural environment". Add a fifth objective: "To foster social well-being with the provision of adequate informal and amenity open spaces, especially in urban areas."
Plan Objectives	780273	A D Linfoot		3845	Supporting	The draft Local Plan contains a lot of material, notably on environmental matters, which should be supported. These comments, which relate to housing development, should be seen in that context	
Plan Objectives	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4348	Objecting	Meeting housing need and support economic growth. Laudable objective, but the hypothesis is wrong. The economy has stalled and building a shell in the hope that a factory will occupy it is not a good economic model. Unemployment is just 2.1%, and there has been a decrease in business deaths. Large commuter population has little benefit for local communities. Creating employment for new residents is speculation rather than hard facts. Smaller student nos may slow down knowledge industry growth.	
Plan Objectives	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4385	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. They have fundamental concerns with respect to the amount of development proposed, the spatial strategy and site allocations for housing and employment. Concerned that plan is based on the need for road infrastructure and needs of rural communities have been ignored. The plan is not sustainable and therefore not sound, because it relies on greenfield land and on new road infrastructure, it does not address housing market need.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Plan Objectives	779662	Mr Graham Kenmir		4463	Objecting	If the preferred option in its current form becomes the submission which is made to the independent Planning Inspector I believe it should be rejected as unsound. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out 12 Core Planning Principles. In my view the Draft plan fails to meet many of these.	
Plan Objectives	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4498	Objecting	An appropriate strategy for the plan would see development in the lower mid range equating to scenario B (600 houses/yr, 12000 across the life of the plan) creating 2500-3500 new jobs in total. This will have less environmental impact and be more sustainable as set out in NPPF. The sequential approach should be applied but with some changes as detailed. Rural allocations should accord with the settlement hierarchy. They have presented their calculations and proposed allocations.	Change whole plan strategy to scenario B - 600 housing units/yr.
Plan Objectives	781348	Mr David Greenway		4537	Objecting	I have read, and re read several times, the objection sent to you by the Langton and Nackington Residents Association (LANRA) and agree with all that is in that document and rather than waste your time by asking you to read large portions of that again please assume that all that is written in that statement I agree with wholeheartedly.	
Plan Objectives	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4628	Objecting	The comments of the Canterbury Society are attached.	See attached submission.
Plan Objectives	780842	Revd & Mrs Clive & Helen Barlow		4727	Objecting	I am advised that the 'Draft' Local Plan as presently conceived and presented to the public is factually inaccurate in places. If this is so, it needs to be corrected.	Correct factual inaccuracies.
Plan Objectives	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4729	Objecting	Consideration should be given to changing the wording of the third objective to 'protect and enhance'	Change the wording of the third objective to 'protect and enhance'.
Plan Objectives	782052	Ms Gina Wordsworth		5068	Objecting	I am in total agreement with the objections and proposals made by Laura Jowers of Tyler Close Canterbury and add my concerns for the future of this very precious corner of England.	
Plan Objectives	406381	Ms Julia Gavriel		5210	Objecting	The plan is unimaginative and developer led.	
Plan Objectives	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5314	Objecting	Sustainability is about living within our environmental limits now and meeting the needs of existing and future generations. CAST believes that the concept of Economic Growth in the local plan should be replaced with the concept of 'Steady State Economy' where physical capital is only consumed at the rate of the regenerative capacity of the Earth's ecological systems. This requires adjusting our patterns of consumption.	
Plan Objectives	255372	Miss Jennifer Wilson	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	5343	Supporting	Overall we are very pleased to see issues of interest to us have been identified and addressed within your draft Local Plan and support those policies within our remit. In our opinion we would consider this document 'Sound' subject to some minor amendments for clarification purposes.	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Plan Objectives	781622	Mr T Whiting		5403	Objecting	I went to school in Canterbury when the Simon Langton was in the town and have lived here since, I consider it a beautiful city, I have to say that for the first time irrespective of politics, our current council members are ignoring public opinion and from my viewpoint ruining the city for future generations.	
Plan Objectives	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5417	Objecting	The DLP fails to set out predicaments facing the District and gives inadequate attention to the land resource issues in the District and the traffic congestion problems. This is despite NPPF insistence that plans must factor in local issues: uniqueness and distinctiveness of Canterbury; narrow road corridors; protect WHS; constraints of Thames estuary and Downland; woodland, agricultural land; landscape; ecology; historic environment; congestion; air quality and the need for sensitive development	
Plan Objectives	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5464	Objecting	Concerned about the disconnection between the evidence gathered and the proposals contained in the Local Plan. The Mori Poll says 'don't use greenfield sites'. Supporting studies highlight congestion and the urgent need to surmount gridlock in Canterbury yet the DLP proposes a 4000 homes that will inevitably add to traffic flows. There are striking contradictions and inconsistencies. Currently the plan fails to deliver on key objectives in the Futures Study and in the Core Strategy.	
Plan Objectives	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5492	Objecting	Highly questionable whether the Plan Objectives as set out have been met!	
Plan Objectives	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5617	Supporting	Support principles of the plan. Support housing figures of 780 pa it is in the range we identified as generating significant economic growth while not impacting negatively on the natural environment, or quality of life. Support the focus on employment, growth and development of a business base.	
Plan Objectives	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5621	Objecting	The DLP fails to give proper attention to the need for co-ordinated, dedicated and distinct policies for Whitstable. The town deserves a separate chapter. It is lumped together with Herne Bay under 'the coastal towns' label on too many occasions or appear to be an after-thought. It can be quite difficult to work out the implications for Whitstable. The applicability of design guidelines and design briefs to protect the character of the town could be further addressed as could a residents vision.	The big issues and difficulties facing Whitstable need to be more clearly identified and addressed in a focussed and determined manner. A proper recognition of the past level of growth here and an acknowledgement of the sustainability constraints on further growth must inform future plans for the town.
Plan Objectives	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5645	Objecting	There is a paucity of references and little concern for Chestfield in the DLP €“ surely some planning statements regarding Chestfield would be appropriate?	
Plan Objectives	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5648	Supporting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:- Aspirations in Vision and Strategy Chapter	
Plan Objectives	782050	Jo James	Chief Executive Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce	5777	Supporting	I write to confirm that the Chamber fully endorses the views put forward by C4B	

Summary: Local Plan Foreword, Vision and Strategy, Plan Objectives

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Plan Objectives	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5880	Supporting	Plan Objectives €€ To provide sufficient housing to meet local housing need and support economic growth 'Sufficient' housing to meet 'local housing need', so not excess housing. Excellent. This clearly implies that London overspill is not the reason for the scale of proposed development. If deliverable, it is greatly appreciated.	What steps will the Council take to ensure this Plan Objective is met and land allocated for local need housing is not purloined by other Local Authorities? Where are these found in the plan.
Plan Objectives	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5882	Supporting	Plan Objectives - ...seek to ensure ...community facilities Canterbury District residents are relying on the Council ensuring these are provided.	
Plan Objectives	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6013	Objecting	Sustainability is about living within our environmental limits now and meeting the needs of existing and future generations. The concept of 'Economic Growth' should be replaced with the concept of 'Steady State Economy'. 'Steady State Economy' means that physical capital is only consumed at the rate of the regenerative capacity of the Earth's ecological systems.	Replaced the concept of 'Economic Growth' with that of 'Steady State Economy'
Plan Objectives	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6243	Supporting	Para 3.16 - The district is a greatly attractive place to live € .All the factors which make this the case, both at district and every sub-district level must be protected and nurtured. They are vulnerable and irreplaceable.	
Plan Objectives	778739	Mr A Salvatori		6660	Supporting	It should first be stated that the client is in overall support of the aims and objectives of the local plan strategy. Where policies are not identified it should be assumed that the client supports the aims of those policies.	
Plan Objectives	476233	Mrs Catherine Cantwell		6718	Objecting	The local plan draft appears to be fundamentally contradictory. It states the need to protect the environment, including green space, the need to avoid residential intensification, the need to reduce traffic and to promote home-working and non-polluting transportation, as well as the need to reduce the likelihood of flooding and to avoid development on land likely to flood. Yet at the same time, it proposes inappropriate economic expansion, coupled with housing developments and new road building	
Plan Objectives	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6805	Objecting	Our principal areas of concern are: · Numbers of new housing units proposed, Critical Mass · Location of housing units · Growth of Canterbury's economy. Four key background papers figure constantly in the DLP, as the CCC evidence base: · CCC Corporate vision document · Experian Study - Canterbury At A Crossroads · NLP Report : Canterbury Development Requirements (Final Report January 2012) ISOS MORI Canterbury Future Development - Research Report for CCC (30 April 2012).	

Comments Summary:

Chapter 1: Strategy

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.1	778627	mr robert thomas		1354	Objecting	You did not contact our parish council. If 50% of the inhabitants of Canterbury are students, then the survey can never reflect the wishes of the rate payers. The world has changed since the survey, CCC will never be able to afford to carry out support for culture & leisure: strenghtening villages ; or protecting the countryside	Drop the whole scheme
1.1	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1853	Objecting	Much of the research undertaken was highly Canterbury-centric with the Coastal towns only mentioned as an after thought.	perhaps gaining insights from the local community's would be a cheap way to go to moderate the research undertaken
1.1	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	1682	Supporting	We are pleased to support the long adopted strategy of growth at Canterbury set out in the Futures report	
1.1	780986	Mr Peter Taylor-Gooby		4297	Objecting	I am concerned at the use made of the 2006 Experian study. The latter rests on participatory workshops, but no information is given on who was included so that it is simply impossible to know what to make of it. It should not be represented as a source for public opinion, which it is not, and should be discounted.	
1.1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5493	Objecting	The discussion in this section which deals with the overall vision for the future should have referred to the all-important housing target and the Council Executive's unyielding determination to impose development Scenario E of the Experian Futures Studies. The overall scenario as set out here does not require the very high housing target figure. Scenario E will conflict with the 'strong commitment to environmental standards' and with 'the protection of the environment, which is a key asset'.	
1.1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5901	Objecting	LOCAL' need means different things to different people. To the Council it probably always means the District of Canterbury, to a 'local' resident it means their immediate neighbourhood/community. Was this differentiation made clear to people responding to the IPSOS MORI poll?	Chapter 1 - open with a clear explanation of how the word 'local' is used in the Local Plan.
1.2	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5888	Supporting	Intervention in three key areas €" experience economy (visitor and retail), knowledge economy (knowledge / skills based businesses) and green economy. Land to be made available for starting up, attracting and retaining new business; encouraging visitors; improve quality of life for residents	
1.3	778135	Mr Harry Blows		1638	Objecting	There is no recognition in this paragraph of the need to support and enhance rural communities and the rural economy, in conjunction with the 'Canterbury experience'.	Broaden objectives to include explicit reference to enhancement of rural communities.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.3	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1858	Objecting	Change the veiw point of research and thought from a Canterbury-centric approach to a District approach - making a composite offer using all the strengths of the area. It is difficult to work to the areas strengths if 2/3 of its best parts are ignored and cultural assest like museums are facing closure.	Keep Museums open with a veiw that they are not 'nice to have' but 'good to use' to promote community involvement and promote the areas culture Put in support for Herne Bay Retail which is about to fall off a cliff with a loss of quality and invasion of Charity shops - Coastal Community Funds could be leveraged in to do this. A wider retail strategy for the district were each town develops a different character and mix of retail to encourage a movement of purchase between the towns communities. Eg development of the Coastal Towns for Furniture and Collectables and Herne Bay as a communtiy market town concentrating on the Mortimer Street Area. The tourist trap should also be avoided. No area heavily reliant on tourism has successful job prospects for it's talented youth and only low level seasonal jobs to offer.
1.3	13719	Mr Steve Moore	Thanet District Council	4111	Supporting	Thanet District Council generally supports the strategic approach as expressed in the preferred Option consultation document: in particular the philosophy of building on Canterbury District's existing strengths focusing on its existing roles and the knowledge economy.	
1.3	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5889	Supporting	Intervention in three key areas €“ experience economy (visitor and retail), knowledge economy (knowledge / skills based businesses) and green economy. Land to be made available for starting up, attracting and retaining new business; encouraging visitors; improve quality of life for residents	
1.3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5913	Objecting	'Canterbury Experience'- The assumption that this is and will continue to be strong is not sound. The 'visitor economy' and 'Strong mix Retail' is not creating high worth permanent, full-time employment. What is the strong evidence that 'culture' has a potential for growth.This is not an agument for having large scale housing development . Despite having some 1,800 more houses, the visitor and culture economies are hardly likely to create jobs actually in the Parish of Sturry.	
1.4	778045	Councillor Simon Cook	Canterbury City Council	1196	Objecting	I am not overly convinced by some of the expert reports. The Experian report - Review of Canterbury Futures - seems somewhat overly pessimistic on the Higher Education sector in Canterbury. Given that it was written in 2010, and in the last 3 years I do not think we have seen anything like the collapse in student numbers that they seem to suggest, it might be worth questioning whether what they have written on this sector has merit.	
1.4	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1266	Objecting	This is a misrepresentation of the NLP report which stated that the present rate of house building would result in modest growth and up to 3.500 new jobs.	I should like the wording to change so that it represents what NLP said.

Summary Chapter 1 - Strategy

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.5	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		414	Supporting	We support the Councils objectives and vision for the District Plan. These objectives have arisen through a strong extensive and up to date evidence base and therefore form a sound basis to form a sustainable strategy for the District over the plan period.	
1.5	778627	mr robert thomas		1355	Objecting	CCC has proved that on a very limited budget it is only capable of managing basic core service	
1.5	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1839	Supporting	These objectives which form the basis of the plan strategy are fully supported. The evidence base deriving from the Experian and Future Study over a 6 year period is a robust and reliable platform for plan making.	
1.5	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3623	Objecting	Delete "more sustained effort" and "high paid jobs" in second sentence and add at end "The Vision recognises that small or locally based businesses are more likely to enhance visitor experience as well as providing more choice for both residents and visitors."	Delete "more sustained effort" and "high paid jobs" in second sentence and add at end "The Vision recognises that small or locally based businesses are more likely to enhance visitor experience as well as providing more choice for both residents and visitors."
1.5	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5494	Objecting	Prior to issuing this consultative DLP, Council officials have admitted that "The vision did raise issues, yet these are not spelt out here. The Experian Report pointed out the difficulty in getting a single vision BUT everyone consulted identified transport/ infrastructure as a critical and negative factor whatever their vision! It also stressed that there were mixed views about the desirability or otherwise of actively encouraging population growth in the District beyond current forecasts.	
1.6	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	2155	Objecting	1.6 gives an absurd emphasis to tourism which has no logic in planning / economics... but may reveal subconscious bias to the City of Canterbury to which this unconditional objective should be restricted if retained. By comparison, education probably generates more jobs and is non-seasonal; and yet it is not given special mention and actually is structurally complimentary in terms of roofs over head to the hospitality sector. These three do not match the Corporate Plan below.	Have a sensible split and if one is critical to only one part of the District, then say so even in the summary. For this point and elsewhere in the draft plan there need to be special policy sections for Whitstable rather than forcing a common policy for the District of gfor the coastal towns when it does not make planning sense(ie because the differences are too large) and worse stating a policy written for the City with perverse effects in Whitstable when applied as the situation is so different. The whole draft needs to be reviewed to eliminate these errors of approach. The town should have a separate chapter as it is unique in the majority of aspects that affect planning.
1.6	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1099	Supporting	Waltham Parish Council ("WPC") supports the principal objectives that are embodied in the vision statement set out at the start of Chapter 1 of the draft Canterbury District Local Plan (2011-2031) ("the Plan"), that are intended to create desirable conditions for business, visitors and residents to secure the prosperity of the District as summarised in section 1.6.	
1.6	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1263	Supporting	The appreciation that the protection of the natural environment is essential is praiseworthy. It is to be hoped that job creation schemes will be inclusive.	The wording should include efforts to create lower paid work as well.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.6	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1471	Objecting	Residents should come first.	Residents should come first in ANY list of priorities. Also, the phrase "to improve quality of life whilst retaining our heritage and natural assets" might suggest a conflict between quality of life and retention of heritage and natural assets. There is no such conflict. It should read "to improve quality of life and retain our heritage and natural assets"
1.6	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3624	Objecting	Delete "necessary" and substitute "any", and after "development" insert "deemed necessary" in first sentence. Add to first point "particularly small local businesses" After "life" in third point re-word to read "and social well-being whilst retaining, enhancing and protecting our heritage, natural assets, character and distinctiveness"	Delete "necessary" and substitute "any", and after "development" insert "deemed necessary" in first sentence. Add to first point "particularly small local businesses" After "life" in third point re-word to read "and social well-being whilst retaining, enhancing and protecting our heritage, natural assets, character and distinctiveness"
1.6	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5890	Supporting	Intervention in three key areas €“ experience economy (visitor and retail), knowledge economy (knowledge / skills based businesses) and green economy. Land to be made available for starting up, attracting and retaining new business; encouraging visitors; improve quality of life for residents	
1.6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5920	Objecting	Create the right conditions:€€ for business €€ for visitors €€ for residents. An interesting and contrasting order of priority at odds with the cover of the plan: People Places Prosperity	
1.8	665473	Dr Richard Norman		1279	Objecting	I object to this paragraph because it is a half-truth. It is true that the South-East Plan has been revoked, but as the Leader of the Council has said, "The government is being quite clever because it's not giving councils a target, but is forcing them economically into building homes." He is referring here to the massive cuts in funding for local authorities, together with the introduction of the New Homes Bonus.	It would be better to increase the level of Council Tax, rather than seek to make up for lost funding by means of the New Homes Bonus. This would be feasible and affordable, and it would be in the long-term interests of local people.
1.8	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4947	Objecting	We understand that the Council has not yet completed the work on sustainability which will be needed to support their decisions on housing allocations. We are concerned about this because it leaves the Council open to the criticism that they have made their decisions first and will then retrofit sustainability to the decisions they have already made. This would lead to poor outcomes and may cause the plan to be considered unsound when subject to an EIP.	We would urge CCC to ensure that any proposed allocations are subject to sustainability testing before any final decisions were made and that this work is made public.
1.9	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3625	Objecting	After "(NPPF)" in second sentence insert "and Localism Act" In third sentence alter "preferred scenarios" to read "stakeholders outcomes". Also replace "for foster" with "to ensure"	After "(NPPF)" in second sentence insert "and Localism Act" In third sentence alter "preferred scenarios" to read "stakeholders outcomes". Also replace "for foster" with "to ensure"
1.10	117585	Cllr Nick Eden-Green		139	Objecting	We should have done neighbourhood plans like Torbay. It would have been more democratic and involved local people.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.10	778403	Mrs Christobel Seath		2084	Objecting	I should also say from the outset that it is very disappointing that the City Council did not consult parish councils, local groups and other stakeholders while the CDLP was in preparation. Had it done so I believe a much better document would have emerged, which may have had more local support. Once the CDLP was made public, the attitude of the City Council has been that this document is the Plan and if stakeholders do not like it they must put forward alternatives.	
1.10	778403	Mrs Christobel Seath		2104	Objecting	Concerned about elements of the consultation process, particularly that local people and parish councils were not consulted prior to this formal consultation.	
1.10	778403	Mrs Christobel Seath		2105	Objecting	While it is clear that the city council needs a Plan, I would suggest that it does not need this one. What it does need is a plan that has been thoroughly researched and over which proper robust consultation has taken place with local people, parish councils, voluntary groups and other interested stakeholders before it is produced.	
1.10	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2877	Objecting	There are inaccuracies in the document. The leaflets supplied don't include Greenhill. The Memorandum of understanding doesn't exist. The document is difficult to access online and responding is laborious. Hope CCC will consider another full consultation before plan is finalised. So decision can be made on facts.	
1.10	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3034	Objecting	remain consistent in their objection to South Canterbury. Are not NIMBY's. Reject the key element of the plan. More weight is given to stakeholders and developers views than theirs. Concerned about the process of plan development as groups were excluded from consultation, there are mistakes and missing information. The need to get money from government via house building undermines the credibility of the process.	
1.10	755187	Mrs M E Pottinger		3550	Objecting	The Local Plan was not fairly advertised. Only heard of the developments at the Parish Council meeting. A survey of 1000 people does not give an accurate picture of local feeling. If you take into account the populations of the district, your survey only takes account of less than one per cent of those who will be affected by the local plan.	
1.10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3626	Objecting	In second sentence after "of" insert "a few" In last sentence after "Study" insert "(both obtained by pre-set questions but not by public debate)"	In second sentence after "of" insert "a few" In last sentence after "Study" insert "(both obtained by pre-set questions but not by public debate)"
1.10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4407	Objecting	In preparing the Plan, the Council has failed to adequately engage with local communities as required NPPF. Parish Council's, consider that other than during consultations there has been limited engagement with them. The Council needs to rectify this deficiency before the Plan is finalised and subject to Reg 19 consultation. the Plan does not have community endorsement. Change substantially and reconsult under Reg 18.	Undertake another round of Regulation 18 consultation.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.10	780277	Yvonne & Mark Culverhouse & Ford		5055	Objecting	It has clearly not sough the views of not the people who will be hit the hardest through this development. Site 8 is not only an imposition to our property and environment but to our lives and well being. I understand there are rights for protected species and plants. Have we lost our human right to work hard, pay tax and choose a particular environment in which to live? Then the very system to which we pay tax robs us of our chosen life.	
1.10	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5437	Objecting	As far as the underpinning studies are concerned the methodologies employed are open to debate, the conclusions reached and the manipulation of those findings by the Council and their interpretation is very questionable. The interpretative slant towards the higher housing target figure. The evidence-base is weak and does not require or commend the interpretation being advanced in the Plan. This draft LP does not pass its own tests of 'soundness' and NPPF and Core Strategy are not being fulfilled	
1.10	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5620	Objecting	Community consultation was largely absent. The community was not kept informed of the timetable or means of participatation; as well as not being provided with the full documentation i.e. The Employment Land Review. Moreover, their views have been misconstrued. The timing of the DLP was delayed several times without explanation; consultation sessions were few in number, involved untransparently chosen 'stakeholders' and were deliberately structured to encourage acceptance of the Council's view.	The missing elements should be made available at once and publicised.
1.10	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6857	Objecting	Our initial conclusion is that CCC has adopted a crude competitive commercial attitude to the East Kent sub-region and Canterbury's place in it, and seeks to consolidate the perceived recent dominance of Canterbury over Ashford, Thanet, Thames Gateway etc, as destinations of choice for growth.	
1.11	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		415	Supporting	We support the Councils new Corporate Plan which was adopted in 2011 which is broadly supported by a wide range of local people and stakeholder groups.	
1.11	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	1683	Supporting	Particular support is given to the first two criteria namely: support the growth of our economy and the number of people in work plan for the right type and number of homes in the right place to create sustainable communities in the future and we highlight the importance of the findings of the East Kent Strategic Housing Market Assessment in setting out the level of growth required to meet the needs	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.11	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2240	Objecting	It is noted that the Council has pledged to 'support the growth of the economy and the number of people in work' and to 'plan for the right type and number of homes in the right place to create sustainable communities in the future'. The company considers these pledges are broadly consistent with the plan objectives but that they need to be translated into spatial policy, in order to promote the local economy primarily at Canterbury and to ensure that housing needs across the district are met.	
1.11	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		3258	Objecting	There appears to be no realism behind the job creation hope of the plan.	
1.11	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5495	Objecting	Is the Council really meeting these Corporate Plan goals and taking the professed required actions? What about aims of reducing traffic congestion, pursuing environmentally-friendly policies and going for development in the right place? They are not met in this DLP!	
1.11	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5649	Supporting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:- Corporate Plan Strategy, Pledges and Key Actions	
1.11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5927	Objecting	Corporate Plan: Pledges - Make the district cleaner and greener. Unlike the development at Bridge, for the Sturry Parish sites and the others ecomeasures are not given the same emphasis. Canterbury's Air Quality Management areas remain vulnerable. Some ideas are in the plan, but these need to be robust enough to make a real difference soon. There is no certainty of delivery.	
1.11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5923	Objecting	Corporate Plan: Pledges - Improvements to tackle traffic congestion. On this point the situation worsens for the residents of living along the A28 from the Sturry Park and Ride through into the City for the life of this Plan and until the Chaucer Road link and/or the 'eastern by-pass' is open.	
1.11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5924	Objecting	Corporate Plan:Pledges - Tackle disadvantage.Sturry North ward is third in the District's deprivation list. It is hard to see what is in the plan which will change the deprivation here. It is likely to worsen. Statistics revealing the extent of deprivation at Hersden are not available in the same way. With only 6,500 jobs thought to be created from 15,000 houses. Disadvantage is likely to increase.	
1.11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5921	Objecting	Corporate Plan:Pledges - right type and number of homes sustainable communities in the future. Admirable aims, but they are not borne out in the Plan's detail. For Sturry Parish: Insufficient new employment opportunities in close proximity to new housing. A new sustainable community is not proposed. The existing communities are not strengthened.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.11	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6855	Objecting	The CCC corporate plan had a public consultation, which CCC say supported it, but what validity did this had. Were the physical and spatial implications of the pledges illustrated? What % of the population was consulted? The influential Experian Report (2006) does not set out who the workshop groups were, or who voted for the preferred scenarios. Without this information no assessment can be made of the influence of vested interests. Ipsos Mori consultations do not support Scenario E	
1.12	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		470	Supporting	I wish to support the vision to "support improvements to tackle traffic congestion" but see little evidence that this has been carried forward into the draft plan.	The proposals on location of housing need to be conditional on receiving approval and funding for improvements to the infrastructure serving the area, e.g. increased hosubg at Hersden should only be made conditional on agreement for the funding of a Sturry bypass.
1.12	775862	Mr Clive Flisher		331	Supporting	These are objectives few can argue with. However, taking grade1 agricultural land out of production does not fit with "leading by example on environmental issues.	
1.12	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1116	Supporting	Concerned about the development at south Canterbury and welcomes the assurance that: "our plans and activities give sufficient protection to heritage sites and the built and natural environment". Concerned about traffic congestion at Nackington and Old Dover Road and welcome the assurance that: "new building development occurs in the right places to support broader travel options and promoting alternatives to reduce traffic across the district€".	
1.12	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1840	Supporting	The objectives are collectively supported particularly that housing must meet the recognised need. It is noteworthy that the housebuilding industry itself is an important economic driver creating significant job opportunities in the construction and material supply chain.	
1.12	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2736	Objecting	Not all of the sites previously allocated have been used and houses and business premises are empty	
1.12	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5496	Objecting	Is the Council really meeting these Corporate Plan goals and taking the professed required actions? What about aims of reducing traffic congestion, pursuing environmentally-friendly policies and going for development in the right place? They are not met in this DLP!	
1.12	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5891	Supporting	Key Actions €" 8 of these which include (specific to P&IS): supporting H&FE and to help create jobs for graduates; make best of use of existing land and identify new to enable businesses to stay & expand	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.12	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5928	Objecting	With 1800 homes planned in Sturry Parish increasing the population by some 4,500 there are no matching job opportunities locally, so travel to work will be inevitable. At the moment Sturry is a very well served transport hub. This will change. Bus stops will be relocated and bus frequency from this central point will disappear. The future of a local train service is uncertain. Can sustainability be ensured? Is the premise that Sturry will continue to be 'a rural service centre' sound?	
1.13	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	742	Objecting	Statement in the Canterbury Development Requirements Study relating to the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities has a bearing on the housing requirement. This is the position in Jan 2012 and Canterbury will need to update its evidence base in light of the emerging requirements of these authorities. Secondly the statement relates only to addressing DCLG projections which is not the same as evidence of need identified by a SHMA - Canterbury would be failing to meet these objective needs in full.	
1.13	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2730	Objecting	Did CCC take the housing needs survey into account? Does the local Plan meet the requirements for affordable housing? The spatial strategy does not meet the needs of the HMA through use of the SHLAA, as the proposals are based on a district wide target distributed arbitrarily on greenfield land and new road infrastructure.	
1.13	780273	A D Linfoot		3855	Objecting	Objects to scenario E as already been adopted by CCC and more credible case can be made for one of the substantially lower annual rates of housing starts. True implications of NLP report are hard to follow as it does not analyse the marked differences within 15-19 age group - students or in-migration? Changing relationship between working and retired age groups is a national not specifically a local phenomenon.	
1.13	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4390	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. They have fundamental concerns with respect to the amount of development proposed and the fact that is based on NLP's scenario E. They dispute the SA and its findings. They object to the use of Scenario E to set the levels of development. Housing target unachievable. Not sustainable. Not in accord with NPPF. Use scenario B instead.	Based plan strategy and development amounts on scenario B of NLP report.
1.13	127115	B.J. Gore		5288	Objecting	How is it that Canterbury's future can be determined upon reliance from large out-of-town consultants who would seem to have little real local knowledge or experience of day-to-day life in the District. Their reports, complete with inaccuracies and inconsistencies, much have cost very many Thousands of Pounds. Reports should be prepared by our experienced officers, whose salaries we all pay, since they are much more aware of what happens locally, and can engage with every councillor and public.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.13	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5497	Objecting	The Development Requirements Study is not as conclusive or prescriptive as the Council claims! The NLP study's contribution was a limited one and it clearly stated that the Council had scope to make a choice regarding the various development scenarios on offer based on the weighting given to other significant factors. It commended housing in the 600 -700 range and noted that any optimal level of development req. further investigation. Points related to congestion and transport ignored by the LP.	
1.13	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5813	Objecting	Many more houses are proposed than would be needed to produce the expected number of jobs. The NLP report makes it clear that 500 new houses a year would create some 3,500 new jobs. However, the Council seems to be saying that 3 houses will be needed to create one job.	
1.13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5956	Objecting	Is the Council placing too much trust in the NLP study? Is this justified? The scale of development in the District is not guaranteed by the NLP report. There are too many uncertainties, infrastructure timing and delivery being two major ones.	
1.13	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6876	Objecting	PopGroup assumptions and migration are complex and should be far better explained, and the numerical assumptions declared to allow public debate. A baseline projection should be prepared making it clear at what rate the % of economically active population shrinks, and the margins of statistical error. Experian 'travel for work' (NLP Scenario F) was voted down and largely discounted by Experian as creating many problems. However HS1 resulted in changing commuting patterns City in reach of London.	
1.14	117585	Cllr Nick Eden-Green		140	Objecting	NLP fails to prove the link between houses and economic development. We have always built higher than SE average and it has failed to bring prosperity. Other factors drive economic growth. Other cities have protected their historic centres. Building at 50% higher rate risks damaging the attractiveness and desirability of Canterbury.	Built a lower rate of housing.
1.14	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		416	Supporting	We support the conclusions of the Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners study on the Development Requirements for the Plan area and support its conclusion from the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scenario E which offers the greatest potential to achieve the appropriate balance to optimise growth and minimise an environmental impact within the District.	
1.14	665473	Dr Richard Norman		511	Objecting	This is misleading and ambiguous. Obviously new jobs require housing for the people who do the jobs, but there is no evidence that building more houses will itself do anything to CREATE more jobs long-term. The claim that development targets need to be higher than those in the South-East Plan is therefore unsubstantiated.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.14	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		887	Objecting	Paragraph 1.14: This paragraph states that the main conclusion of the Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (NLP) study was that "adhering to the South East Plan housing figures would lead to virtually no net increase in jobs over the Local Plan period" This is a grave distortion of waht the NLP study states.The study states that, for the Band 2 scenario (the band that equates to the South East Plan), there would be "modest growth in employment of up to 3,500 jobs".	
1.14	776051	Mr Rick Strange		860	Objecting	Mr. Carmichael (Canterbury City Council Chief Executive) said "Because of all the new houses, New Business would come to the Canterbury Area". New Business will not come to the Canterbury area unless there is the required number of experienced and qualified people to do the work and the buildings in which to house their business. Experienced and qualified people will not come to Canterbury unless there is work for them to do.	
1.14	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1439	Objecting	In terms of the quality of life, most current residents would probably fare better if there was little or no absolute growth in total employment but a rebalancing aimed at improving the average quality of jobs on offer. Such an approach would also probably be better attuned to the local economic outlook.	
1.14	772683	Mr Bruce Woodcock		1311	Objecting	Increases in housing stock do not create jobs, they create higher unemployment unless jobs are created for the people living in these new dwellings. Jobs are instead created by attracting businesses to the Canterbury area and this should be the focus rather than increased housing.	Greatly reduce the amount of new housing specified in the plan.
1.14	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1575	Objecting	This interpretation does not actually reflect the outcome of the NLP report. There would be 3500 jobs created. Not as stated "virtually no net increase in jobs over the Local Plan period.."	Actually reflect what the report says.
1.14	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1841	Supporting	The findings of the NLP report with respect to the economic and demographic evidence which support the strategy is fully supported.	
1.14	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2281	Objecting	The Council has not followed the general direction of the advice that NLP gives. While the Council calls for nearly 800 houses on average a year to be built, NLP produces a strikingly different figure. NLP says "a building requirement sitting broadly between €; 600 and 700 dwellings per annum.....". In our view no convincing reason has been given for the Council's rejection of this advice.	
1.14	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2295	Objecting	Council spokesmen have defended the proposed figure for house building on the grounds that it will provide a basis for a significant stimulus to the District's economy and a basis for an expansion of employment. However, no convincing account of why this expansion would occur nor what the nature of the expansion might be has ever been provided.	
1.14	778861	David & Teresa Kemsley		2523	Objecting	There is no explanation of how additional housing stimulates long term economic growth and what the skill mix requirements will be of the new businesses we are trying to attract.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.14	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3036	Objecting	The NLP study has been deliberately misinterpreted to provide credibility to the plan. Council says that maintaining exsiting building levels will lead to virtually no net increase in jobs but NLP report says that up to 3500 jobs will be created over plan period.	
1.14	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3593	Objecting	We question the idea (1.15) that 'a significant level of housing would be required to support an increase (sic) local labour supply.' If it were true that jobs follow housing, rather than the other way round, then they would be being created in the existing industrialised cities of the North and the Midlands.	
1.14	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3627	Objecting	In last sentence delete "would likely need to virtually no" and substitute "might not provide a"	In last sentence delete "would likely need to virtually no" and substitute "might not provide a"
1.14	408497	Mr C Mills		3737	Objecting	Para 1.14 and the NLP study. The Council maintains that adhering to the existing building levels' would likely lead to virtually no net increase in jobs over the Local Plan period' These have been misinterpreted.	
1.14	780273	A D Linfoot		3870	Objecting	It is claimed that additional housing brings additional jobs with it. There is no evidence that the mere availability of houses (or rather, strictly speaking, of land allocated for housing) of itself creates employment. The Local Plan notes the extent to which the existing surplus of housed population has failed to create jobs. No evidence that a shortage of housing is inhibiting the development of additional employment. Already a substantial backlog of unimplemented consents for housing.	
1.14	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3763	Objecting	I do not accept the concept that by building houses will increase employment.	
1.14	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4349	Objecting	The economy has stalled and building a shell in the hope that a factory will occupy it is not a good economic model. Unemployment is just 2.1%, and there has been a decrease in business deaths. Large commuter population has little benefit for local communities. Creating employment for new residents is speculation rather than hard facts. Smaller student nos may slow down knowledge industry growth. Plan is leading towards an economy of ghost businesses in empty warehouse shells and unsold houses.	
1.14	780986	Mr Peter Taylor-Gooby		4292	Objecting	The projections of housing contained in the plan are wildly optimistic. It is not clear of how many extra commuters to high value jobs can be included on the high-speed line. The proportion of high value jobs in Canterbury may well not grow in the future and may even fall. The areas only major science employer has been lost. Other major employers are suffering constraint. Expansion will be in lower value jobs and these will not sustain house prices at the level necessary to finance infrastructure	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.14	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4391	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. They have fundamental concerns with respect to the amount of development proposed and the fact that is based on NLP's scenario E. They dispute the SA and its findings. They object to the use of Scenario E to set the levels of development. Housing target unachievable. Not sustainable. Not in accord with NPPF. Use scenario B instead.	Based plan strategy and development amounts on scenario B of NLP report.
1.14	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4833	Objecting	To successfully expand our local economy there must be suitable homes available for the employees of potential new business in the District. Chapter Three sets out a well argued case for Economic Development, but in very general terms. What is not available is a more detailed direction of how this vision of housing numbers linked to economic growth may be delivered.	
1.14	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5229	Objecting	The plan is based on the wrong economic premise €“ namely, that increased housing numbers will bring increased job opportunities. This may be the case during construction of new houses, but this type of employment is unlikely to be sustained in the long term. The Council should provide the economic rationale on which this presumption is based.	
1.14	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5467	Objecting	The direct link between the provision of homes and growth in jobs is simply unproven and the ill-thought-out pursuit of this strategy will damage the valued character of the District.	
1.14	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5757	Objecting	In terms of economic growth, the aim is to attract young people and keep graduates in the District. A lack of homes and employment space is seen as holding business back. Although stress is placed on the relationship between house availability and job creation, there is no real evidence to substantiate this. Equally, the case that a lack of houses can hold back growth is not explored.	
1.14	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5957	Objecting	The correlation between housing, job creation and economic growth is not guaranteed. It only "generally becomes evident " and "does not automatically lead to the creation of all the jobs ..." In the prevailing economic situation, housing/job creation/economic growth relationship must be even less certain. The figure of 6,500 has been mentioned as result of building 15,000 houses. Even with only 1 person per house that would still leave at least an extra 8,500 people commuting / unemployed etc.	
1.14	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6870	Objecting	Para 1.14 advise that NLP main conclusion was that a significant level of housing would be required to support an increase in local labour supply and encourage new job creation. NLP were of the opinion that adhering to the South East Plan housing figures (510 dwellings pa) would lead to no increase in jobs over the Plan period. This is a gross misrepresentation of the NLP comments. It was their view that between 5-600 dwellings pa would see modest growth of 3,500 jobs only bottom of band = zero	Paragraph 1.14 be rewritten to correct gross misrepresentation. The Housing Requirements Strategy should be changed to deliver a different scenario of between 500-600 dwellings pa as set out in option B, which we would support

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.15	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		897	Objecting	CCC is planning for 4167 homes for Herne Bay. Those homes are multi-bedroomed homes and will bring something like 12000 to 15000 people to the town. CCC is hoping that for 1440 new jobs for Herne Bay. This suggests that the Plan will increase unemployment significantly in this town.	Fewer houses. More employment land. A properly articulated strategy to attract employers.
1.15	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1262	Objecting	We are told that high targets for housing are necessary in order to encourage new job creation. Building new houses in itself will not guarantee jobs for the people who live in them.	
1.15	778135	Mr Harry Blows		1640	Objecting	The SA appears to give undue weight to the sustainability of development within 5km of urban centres in preference to rural communities.	Reconsider the criteria used in the SA.
1.15	779265	Mr Timothy Chancellor		2063	Objecting	Is there really a simple relationship between an increase in the labour force and the creation of new jobs in our area, and will house building stimulate economic growth in the absence of other strategic measures such as skills enhancement?	Before accepting the NLP recommendations on housing development a critical analysis is needed of the evidence that supports them.
1.15	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4392	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. They have fundamental concerns with respect to the amount of development proposed and the fact that is based on NLP's scenario E. They dispute the SA and its findings. They object to the use of Scenario E to set the levels of development. Housing target unachievable. Not sustainable. Not in accord with NPPF. Use scenario B instead.	Based plan strategy and development amounts on scenario B of NLP report.
1.15	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5491	Objecting	'Sustainability' is an extremely slippery concept and experts point out that it is almost impossible to measure. I believe the argument that policies and scenarios are sustainable is too readily used by the Council as a catch-all justification. Such claims require very careful scrutiny and often a deeper analysis has demonstrated that these claims are not justified and has exposed prior weightings which are not fully sustainable or which have not been community-tested.	
1.15	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5500	Objecting	Sustainability is an over-used justification in the DLP and is a fraught and immeasurable concept that must be handled carefully. The conclusion that the scenario E is the most sustainable option is highly questionable! The environmental disadvantages of developing in South Canterbury as proposed do overwhelmingly negate any sustainability advantages. The traffic implications are far from sustainable!	
1.15	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6412	Objecting	The Plan quotes as the main conclusion of Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (NLP) study, "Crucially € € ..adhering to the South East Plan housing figures would lead to virtually no net increase in jobs over the Local Plan period€². This is a misrepresentation. The study actually shows that there would be "modest growth in employment of up to 3,500 jobs"for Band 2 which equates to the South East plan. This is important as major argument of the Plan is more house building is needed to support economy.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.15	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6562	Objecting	NLP Scenario E provides a balance approach to accommodating the majority of needs but the plan doesn't address the consequences of reducing population led housing needs targets. Support general levels of growth. Concerned that any reduction in housing numbers (as proposed by other submitters) would not meet housing needs, nor comply with NPPF, reduce economic growth and impact on infrastructure/services provision.	
1.15	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6858	Objecting	NLP refers to a rise in employment rates by 4.75% over the next 25 years (para 3.41) without implementing Scenario E. However, dwelling targets in DTZ report are replaced at a stroke by NLP report. CCC has a history of belatedly reversing established patterns of settlement and employment eg Whitefriars, out of town retail at Sturry and Thanington. Further expansion will undermine sustainability. CCC has naive optimism that unbalanced growth can provide high value jobs for enlarged population.	
1.15	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6889	Objecting	Para 1.14 advise that NLP main conclusion was that a significant level of housing would be required to support an increase in local labour supply and encourage new job creation. NLP were of the opinion that adhering to the South East Plan housing figures (510 dwellings pa) would lead to no increase in jobs over the Plan period. This is a gross misrepresentation of the NLP comments. It was their view that between 5-600 dwellings pa would see modest growth of 3,500 jobs only bottom of band = zero	Paragraph 1.14 be rewritten to correct gross misrepresentation. The Housing Requirements Strategy should be changed to deliver a different scenario of between 500-600 dwellings pa as set out in option B, which we would support
1.16	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1715	Objecting	Landscape designations should be acknowledged. 'Landscape designations', and the setting of nationally designated protected landscapes - in this case the Kent Downs AONB - should be mentioned.	Insert as highlighted in bold:- '.... (and adverse effects on) sensitive sites (such as SSSIs, nationally designated AONBs and its setting , or heritage designations).....'
1.16	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1864	Supporting	How can the over development of Housing in the Herne Bay Environs conform to this aspiration? There will be a huge increase in working family occupation without local business or schooling to cater for the increased need. This will create the increased need for commuting to work and school which will increase the community resource use and create further pollution and congestion.	
1.16	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4393	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. They have fundamental concerns with respect to the amount of development proposed and the fact that is based on NLP's scenario E. They dispute the SA and its findings. They object to the use of Scenario E to set the levels of development. Housing target unachievable. Not sustainable. Not in accord with NPPF. Use scenario B instead.	Based plan strategy and development amounts on scenario B of NLP report.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.16	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6890	Objecting	Para 1.14 advise that NLP main conclusion was that a significant level of housing would be required to support an increase in local labour supply and encourage new job creation. NLP were of the opinion that adhering to the South East Plan housing figures (510 dwellings pa) would lead to no increase in jobs over the Plan period. This is a gross misrepresentation of the NLP comments. It was their view that between 5-600 dwellings pa would see modest growth of 3,500 jobs only bottom of band = zero	Paragraph 1.14 be rewritten to correct gross misrepresentation. The Housing Requirements Strategy should be changed to deliver a different scenario of between 500-600 dwellings pa as set out in option B, which we would support
1.17	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1506	Objecting	MORI sampled 1,000 people, not 900 as stated. 902 residents and 100 students.	MORI sampled 1,000 people, not 900 as stated. 902 residents and 100 students.
1.17	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2734	Objecting	Raised concerns about the MORI report only canvassed 0.9% of the population who while they did support new development not at the numbers proposed.	
1.17	779159	Mr & Mrs Ken & Pauline Finch		2931	Objecting	Ipsos MORI's public opinion survey was too small to reliably measure the views of the population. With an estimated population of 150,600 the sample would have needed to be 2,952. A one off sample is not a reliable measure and thus should have been repeated using a different sample group.	
1.17	779159	Mr & Mrs Ken & Pauline Finch		2932	Objecting	Employment opportunity: Herne Bay already has a significant number of people claiming job seekers allowance. Increasing the population by such a considerable number can only add to this issue particularly as there is no clear plan as to how potential employers are to be attracted. Creating a pool of potential employees won't necessarily create employment.	
1.17	779290	Mr John Christian		3306	Objecting	The Mori report draws its' conclusions from a sample of less than 1000, many of whom are students. This is about 0.7% of the 148,000 residents - a very small sample on which to be base some very big decisions.	
1.17	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4394	Objecting	Question the validity of Ipsos Mori survey due to low number of people canvassed (0.6% of population). Council has been selective in the parts of the survey it has used to support the use of scenario E. There is no significant public support.	
1.17	127115	B.J. Gore		5289	Objecting	I do hope that every representation made to the draft Plan will be read carefully, and that an analysis will be prepared (accurately please, and not doctored) to see what people's priorities and wishes really are. The Ipsos Mori so-called public opinion report relies on the view of only 900 people out of a population of over 150000. How can this be truly representative against a background of very limited contact between the Council and its electorate?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.17	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6891	Objecting	Public Opinion Research was undertaken by Ipsos MORI who surveyed the views of 900 local population out of 147,700. It suggested that the research showed that 71% of respondents supported the SE Plan level of 510 dwellings pa and above. We would contend that this is not strictly accurate, as only 32% were in favour of 550 and 31% supported 700 dwellings pa. The 71% is only achieved if the 8% who wanted 1,140 dwellings pa are included. In addition no ref to 165 who only wanted 150 dwgs/pa.	That the paragraphs be rewritten to present the research finding accurately. In addition the stakeholder groups findings in the Experian report should also be given.
1.18	665473	Dr Richard Norman		513	Objecting	It is not true that the Ipsos-Mori survey showed a significant level of public support for the level of development proposed in the draft Plan. It showed that only 39% would support development at the level proposed in the Plan, whereas 48% would prefer development at a level of 550 new dwellings a year or fewer.	
1.18	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		892	Objecting	Public Opinion Research, paragraphs 1.18 and 1.19: These paragraphs on housing levels are very misleading. The claim 'that there is a significant level of public support for the scale of development set out in this draft Local Plan' (840 units pa from 2016 to 2031), when the majority of local people (some 61% of respondents) support the South East Plan level (510 dwellings pa) or below, is frankly disingenuous.	
1.18	366511	Mr Tony Couperthwaite		802	Objecting	The MORI poll results have not been accurately represented and have been skewed to support the City Councils aims.	
1.18	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1267	Objecting	This is a gross misrepresentation of the findings, which recorded that most of the residents favour the present or a slower rate of house building.	The wording should be changed to reflect accurately the findings of the poll.
1.18	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1742	Objecting	"This work demonstrates that there is a significant level of public support for the scale of development set out in this draft Local Plan." No it doesn't! 39% want about the same, 18% a little less, 9% a lot less = 66% wanting the same level of development or less. Two-thirds of those asked do not want the (increased) level of development proposed.	Stop lying with statistics.
1.18	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1579	Objecting	The MORI poll does not show support on the scale proposed. It has been misinterpreted by the council. I believe the consultation process also used this misrepresentation to skew answers by consultees.	Review and actually reflect what the MORI poll says.
1.18	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1842	Supporting	Hillreed Homes (part of the Persimmon Group) held a public consultation at Hersden during the formative stages of the local plan and the feedback from the community at this Exhibition was largely positive and supportive of the most comprehensive of the growth options presented by Hillreed to the community (which is numerically... 800 in number... similar to the quantum of housing now set out in the local plan for the strategic allocation at Hersden). It is noteworthy that the	
1.18	778403	Mrs Christobel Seath		2092	Objecting	In addition the results of the MORI poll seem to have been very selectively interpreted and the City Council has claimed far more support for its proposals than the actual data suggests.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.18	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2282	Objecting	The result of the Mori opinion poll shows clearly that the majority of residents who have an opinion about the appropriate level of level of house building feel that the historic level of 550 or less per year is appropriate..... In our view, the Council, in the way it reports the result of the poll, significantly distorts the size of the population that supports a higher level of building.	
1.18	778304	O W Presland		2601	Supporting	The selection of a strategy that promotes jobs and associated housing following the Mori Report of 2012 is to be supported.	
1.18	778861	David & Teresa Kemsley		2513	Objecting	You seriously misrepresented the results of the IPSOS/MORI survey of public opinion in relation to the scale of opposition to building on greenfield land and the high rate of additional housing proposed.	
1.18	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3038	Objecting	IPSOS MORI has been misrepresented in para 1.18 as it does not reflect the conditional nature of support for development and does not reflect actual output from the poll. People prefer lower building rates and oppose development on greenfield land.	
1.18	780449	Daniel & Elizabeth Rikh		3335	Objecting	We know that Herne Bay, Hersden and Whitstable are preferred locations as stated by councillors, stakeholders and the public, and as confirmed by the council's own MORI poll.	
1.18	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3595	Objecting	Increase the level of housing to support the local economy' (1.19) gets things exactly the wrong way round - need first to enlarge the local economy to sustain the current level of population and increase at roughly current levels. NLP argument cannot sustain the proposals, they skew rest of Plan. The popular support cited in paras 1.18, 1.19 and 1.21 is for general aspirations, rather than for numbers. Not aware of consultation with residents' assoc. Weight should be given to concerns in 1.20.	
1.18	408497	Mr C Mills		3738	Objecting	I believe a misrepresentation occurs in presentation of the overview of the IPSOS MORI polling. Ref paras 1.18 and 1.19 Whilst 1.19 does reference the conditional nature of support for development para 1.18 does not fully reflect this and the actual output from the poll.	
1.18	780986	Mr Peter Taylor-Gooby		4296	Objecting	I am concerned at the misleading picture of the IPSOS/Mori report presented. It shows a majority against building significant numbers of new homes if this means using Greenfield sites. This is exactly what the plan proposes. The survey shows that the majority oppose the plan and it should not be used as if it were evidence of the reverse.	
1.18	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4395	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. Question the validity of Ipsos Mori survey due to low number of people canvassed (0.6% of population). Council has been selective in the parts of the survey it has used to support the use of scenario E. There is no significant public support.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.18	780277	Yvonne & Mark Culverhouse & Ford		5056	Objecting	This speaks of the Mori report which has not been a thorough representation of local people. However when I read that report I read loss of greenfield land was the biggest concern. Canterbury Council speaks of "local people expressed concern about the loss of greenfield land, traffic congestion and the impact on public services€². Site 8 development will hit all these concerns severely. It will see concerns become reality.	
1.18	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5441	Objecting	It is hard to avoid the disturbing conclusion that there is a misrepresentation of the Ipsos Mori findings. There is a failure to report the findings in a balanced way giving proper weighting to the reservations consistently mentioned by residents i.e. the need to avoid using greenfield sites or adding to traffic congestion. Also, only a minority supported the idea of development at the level the Council are recommending in the DLP, most wanted it at a significantly lower level.	
1.18	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5501	Objecting	What is really crucial about the Mori research is that most people want house building at the same or at a slower pace. Only a minority want the higher level (780 houses per year) i.e. scenario E on which the whole Plan is premised. Hence the CCC claim that the DLP is broadly in line with this Mori poll is a gross misrepresentation and is certainly not valid! Is the Plan preventing the loss of green field land? Quite the contrary! Is it really tackling the affordable housing shortfall? Slightly	
1.18	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5902	Objecting	This confirms public support for development at the larger, better served, villages, but the draft strategy does not aim to deliver this.	
1.18	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5958	Supporting	73% in favour if it meant that enough affordable homes were provided for local residents. Note: LOCAL is the crucial word.	
1.18	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6414	Objecting	Again, and here at the outset of the Plan, there is another serious misinterpretation. The 2011 MORI poll concluded that the majority of local respondents, about 61%, support the South East Plan annual level of 510 dwellings or below. Despite this, CCC would have us believe "that there is a significant level of public support for the scale of development set out in this draft Local Plan"namely 840 units pa from 2016-2031.	
1.18	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6892	Objecting	Public Opinion Research was undertaken by Ipsos MORI who surveyed the views of 900 local population out of 147,700. It suggested that the research showed that 71% of respondents supported the SE Plan level of 510 dwellings pa and above. We would contend that this is not strictly accurate, as only 32% were in favour of 550 and 31% supported 700 dwellings pa. The 71% is only achieved if the 8% who wanted 1,140 dwellings pa are included. In addition no ref to 165 who only wanted 150 dwgs/pa.	That the paragraphs be rewritten to present the research finding accurately. In addition the stakeholder groups findings in the Experian report should also be given.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.18	13835	Mr Michael Steed		6968	Objecting	Plan states there is a significant level of public support for the scale of development (840 units pa). The majority of people (61%) support the SE Plan level (510 pa). This claim is disingenuous, or rather dishonest. It is also tactically stupid to make ill-founded claims. There is a case for raising the housing numbers but local people need to be persuaded, not assert support they do not have. If the CCC does not realise this need to persuade, it will fail.	
1.19	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		65	Supporting	I absolutely endorse the view that considerations of potential loss of green open space, effects on vehicular traffic congestion and provision of local services MUST come in right at the start of such planning.	
1.19	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		66	Supporting	I absolutely endorse the view that considerations of potential loss of green open space, effects on vehicular traffic congestion and provision of local services MUST come in right at the start of such planning.	
1.19	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		893	Objecting	Public Opinion Research, paragraphs 1.18 and 1.19: These paragraphs on housing levels are very misleading. The claim 'that there is a significant level of public support for the scale of development set out in this draft Local Plan' (840 units pa from 2016 to 2031), when the majority of local people (some 61% of respondents) support the South East Plan level (510 dwellings pa) or below, is frankly disingenuous.	
1.19	777408	Miss Linda Hill		726	Supporting	The research indicated support for development but less support for Whitstable and smaller villages; Herne is a small village, leave it that way and do not develop it!	Don't change anything leave Herne as it is
1.19	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1264	Objecting	The Ipsos-Mori survey commissioned by the council as background to this plan showed only 39% would favour a housing target at the level proposed in the draft plan, whereas 48% favoured a target of 550 a year or lower. Comments sought from residents in St Stephens area support future building at 500 - 600 per year.	
1.19	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1265	Objecting	The Ipsos-Mori survey commissioned by the council as background to this plan showed only 39% would favour a housing target at the level proposed in the draft plan, whereas 48% favoured a target of 550 a year or lower. Comments sought from residents in St Stephens area support future building at 500 - 600 per year.	
1.19	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1269	Objecting	This statement reduces the strong local antipathy to building on greenfield sites to a few qualms. This is another gross representation of the findings.	The wording should be changed to reflect the strong local antipathy to building on greenfield sites.
1.19	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1577	Supporting	The plan must act on this desire by the residents. Do not build on greenfield increase traffic and pollution.	Listen to the people. Change para 1.18.
1.19	779265	Mr Timothy Chancellor		2065	Objecting	A substantial number of people interviewed in the MORI poll did not support the scale of development set out in the draft Local Plan.	Review the findings from the MORI poll and present them accurately and objectively.
1.19	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2393	Objecting	Spokes endorses the view that considerations of potential loss of green open space, effects on vehicular traffic congestion and provision of local services MUST come in right at the start of such planning.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.19	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2738	Objecting	proposal would strongly affect the residents of our parish.	
1.19	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3597	Objecting	Increase the level of housing to support the local economy' (1.19) gets things exactly the wrong way round - need first to enlarge the local economy to sustain the current level of population and increase at roughly current levels. NLP argument cannot sustain the proposals, they skew rest of Plan. The popular support cited in paras 1.18, 1.19 and 1.21 is for general aspirations, rather than for numbers. Not aware of consultation with residents' assoc. Weight should be given to concerns in 1.20.	
1.19	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3628	Objecting	After first sentence insert a new sentence "There is local concern that further expansion of Canterbury would have adverse effects upon the City's cultural, historic and architectural heritage, hence reducing its attraction to visitors both national and international, and risking a downturn in finance from those sources. Local residents believe that Canterbury should be accepted as being 'full up'."	After first sentence insert a new sentence "There is local concern that further expansion of Canterbury would have adverse effects upon the City's cultural, historic and architectural heritage, hence reducing its attraction to visitors both national and international, and risking a downturn in finance from those sources. Local residents believe that Canterbury should be accepted as being 'full up'."
1.19	408497	Mr C Mills		3739	Objecting	I believe a misrepresentation occurs in presentation of the overview of the IPSOS MORI polling. Ref paras 1.18 and 1.19 Whilst 1.19 does reference the conditional nature of support for development para 1.18 does not fully reflect this and the actual output from the poll.	
1.19	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5503	Objecting	What is really crucial about the Mori research is that most people want house building at the same or at a slower pace. Only a minority want the higher level (780 houses per year) Hence the CCC claim that the DLP is broadly in line with this Mori poll is a gross misrepresentation! Is the Plan preventing the loss of green field land? Quite the contrary! Is it really tackling the affordable housing shortfall? Only slightly. Why? Was the reference to affordable housing later regarded as expendable?	
1.19	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5959	Objecting	Public support is conditional. Local people expressed concerns ... An understatement: 70% AGAINST if it meant building on Greenfield sites. 65% AGAINST if it meant increase in traffic and congestion. All the development sites are Greenfield Traffic is bound to increase from the population living in 15,000 new houses. Unless ALL infrastructure is in place before house building starts, congestion will increase.	
1.19	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6416	Objecting	Again, and here at the outset of the Plan, there is another serious misinterpretation. The 2011 MORI poll concluded that the majority of local respondents, about 61%, support the South East Plan annual level of 510 dwellings or below. Despite this, CCC would have us believe "that there is a significant level of public support for the scale of development set out in this draft Local Plan"namely 840 units pa from 2016-2031.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.19	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6893	Objecting	Public Opinion Research was undertaken by Ipsos MORI who surveyed the views of 900 local population out of 147,700. It suggested that the research showed that 71% of respondents supported the SE Plan level of 510 dwellings pa and above. We would contend that this is not strictly accurate, as only 32% were in favour of 550 and 31% supported 700 dwellings pa. The 71% is only achieved if the 8% who wanted 1,140 dwellings pa are included. In addition no ref to 165 who only wanted 150 dwgs/pa.	That the paragraphs be rewritten to present the research finding accurately. In addition the stakeholder groups findings in the Experian report should also be given.
1.20	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		900	Objecting	In the MORI poll in 2011 39% supported building more than 510 dwellings p.a.; 32% supported building at around 510 dwellings p.a.; and 29% went for building fewer than that each year. Despite the fact that the majority want a building rate of 510 or below, the LP aims to build at a rate of 780 new homes p.a.	Build at a rate of 510 homes a year or less.
1.20	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		903	Objecting	Of the 115 people at the June 2012 "stakeholders'" meeting, 35 were unnamed Council officers. Just one attendee represented a Herne Bay organisation - the Chamber of Commerce. In fact, there were more people in the meeting representing Dover than there were representing Herne Bay. Also at that meeting was a representative of a company that folded in 2009, owing the Council over £14,000. There were also attendees who had been councillors... but who were no longer councillors by the time of the me	Proper consultation with local residents and a chance for people to shape the plan rather than be told after the event that Council officers, developers and other public bodies are going to determine what will happen in our town.
1.20	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1270	Objecting	The policy of inviting for consultation stakeholders whose identity needs to be kept secret rather than the locals most affected is a poor one, alienating the representatives from the represented.	In future, consultation on local developments should seek to involve locals more.
1.20	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1554	Objecting	The councillor briefing was poorly attended - about 80%. The results from the stakeholder briefing cannot be relied on - more than a third of the "stakeholders" were CCC employees and councillors (some double-counted from the councillor briefing), including 3 under false pretences. The same weight CANNOT be attached to these briefings as to the Ipsos/MORI survey of 1,000 people.	When analysing the preferences for development sites, the two briefings and the MORI survey MUST be presented as aggregated figures. To do otherwise would be to misrepresent the facts.
1.20	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1865	Supporting	Where can these reports be veiwed?	
1.20	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3039	Objecting	LANRA was not included in the initial round of "stakeholder"workshops. As 4270 homes are proposed in this area they believe they are a stakeholder. They question that the Council fully consulted. LANRA's position on development is widely known within the Council and LANRA should have been included.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.20	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3599	Objecting	Increase the level of housing to support the local economy' (1.19) gets things exactly the wrong way round - need first to enlarge the local economy to sustain the current level of population and increase at roughly current levels. NLP argument cannot sustain the proposals, they skew rest of Plan. The popular support cited in paras 1.18, 1.19 and 1.21 is for general aspirations, rather than for numbers. Not aware of consultation with residents' assoc. Weight should be given to concerns in 1.20.	
1.20	408497	Mr C Mills		3740	Objecting	We would question the statement in Para 1.20 that the Council fully consulted 'and another (workshop was held) for a wide range of local stakeholders'. I's position on development in this quadrant of the city is widely known within the Council and I should have been included in any consultation from the outset.	
1.20	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		3782	Objecting	In preparing the Draft Local Plan, the City Council has failed to comply with paragraph 160 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Engagement with the private sector has been very limited and as a result the emerging plan has failed to properly address viability issues. This has, inter alia, resulted in undeliverable housing allocations eg South Canterbury.	
1.20	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5507	Objecting	There are highly questionable and possibly erroneous statements here re-Member and Stakeholder workshops.	
1.21	665473	Dr Richard Norman		515	Objecting	This is disingenuous. I attended the workshop for local stakeholders. We were required to vote on the level of development after hearing only the case for the proposed level, from Council officers and a representative of Nathaniel Lichfield, without any discussion and without any opportunity to hear contrary views.	
1.21	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3598	Objecting	Increase the level of housing to support the local economy' (1.19) gets things exactly the wrong way round - need first to enlarge the local economy to sustain the current level of population and increase at roughly current levels. NLP argument cannot sustain the proposals, they skew rest of Plan. The popular support cited in paras 1.18, 1.19 and 1.21 is for general aspirations, rather than for numbers. Not aware of consultation with residents' assoc. Weight should be given to concerns in 1.20.	
1.21	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5434	Objecting	In terms of the evidence the Council have derived from the commissioned reports, the interpretation of the results of that data comes across as highly controlled by the presumption in favour of a policy of providing housing at around 50% above the former SE Plan level and the desire to justify that scenario and an associated fixed development blueprint. The data does not warrant this interpretation, scenario or pattern of development - quite the reverse!	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.21	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5643	Objecting	The Council's reading of popular feelings is selective and self interested. It misrepresents both the MORI & NLP findings and makes them out to be more supportive of the preferred option than, in the view of many outside observers, is actually the case. Public support for development was very conditional with polled opinion much less keen on large scale development on greenfield sites than is claimed by the Council.	
1.22	771779	Mrs Patricia Kane		393	Objecting	This statement is controversial. Residents of Canterbury City itself do not support this higher level of development and the responses to the MORI poll about the level of development are ambiguous. Most people welcome building on brownfield sites but do not want to lose beautiful countryside, fine views or rich agricultural land.	I would like the well argued views expressed by the Canterbury Society in the Vision for Canterbury document to be taken into account.
1.22	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		908	Objecting	There is not strong support for building on greenfield land. However, the plan for Herne Bay is to build five housing estates - 3000 homes - on greenfield land.	Prioritise brownfiled development rather than allowing developers to drive where development will take place.
1.22	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5508	Objecting	More needs to be done to really respond to the concerns in the community, inc. the reactions of residents' associations to the DLP	
1.22	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6418	Objecting	There were highly structured meetings in which "partners"and unidentified "stakeholders"were being steered towards acceptance of the Council's view. It was clear that the development of S Canterbury was in the Council's sights. Plan missed its publication date, during consultation those of us who printed it out were frustrated when the Council then made many changes to the numbering/text, causing confusion and wasting time. Several crucial documents were missing, felt pressured to accept Plan	
1.23	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		417	Supporting	Public opinion, workshops and links with the Community Strategy and Partner Strategies is supported in general by both local people and local partner organisations consistant with the duty to cooperate set out in the NPPF. This forms a sound basis for engagement within this District Plan process.	
1.23	777707	Mr Paul Waller		1072	Objecting	Local people do not support this plan. The Council is simply ignoring the strength of local feeling. Council representatives have also been sadly lacking from local meetings, presumably because they know how unpopular this plan is. Failure to attend meetings demonstrates a lack of desire to enter a meaningful consultation.	The Council needs to engage in a meaningful local consultation with the communities affected by the proposals, rather than people paid to produce a report to support what they want to do - ie gather genuine local evidence, rather than 'bought' evidence. A new plan should then be built around those concerns. I believe that the Council would be pleasantly surprised by the support for development that builds and develops the communities, rather than is easy to deliver and qualifies for a Government grant. The 'official' objectives of this plan are laudible - the proposed delivery of those objectives is insensitive and inappropriate.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.23	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1872	Objecting	In the case for Herne Bay Partner Organisations are merely 'fig leaves' and arguably Council Quangos. Therefore this statement is relatively lame and does in no way prove any wide popular support for the Councils Actions or the Corporate Plan.	A real fostering of public community organisations is required as they gain the trust, support and involvement of the wider community then this collected strenght and talent could provide real partners for the Council
1.23	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6420	Objecting	There were highly structured meetings in which "partners"and unidentified "stakeholders"were being steered towards acceptance of the Council's view. It was clear that the development of S Canterbury was in the Council's sights. Plan missed its publication date, during consultation those of us who printed it out were frustrated when the Council then made many changes to the numbering/text, causing confusion and wasting time. Several crucial documents were missing, felt pressured to accept Plan	
1.24	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		418	Supporting	The Council has complied with its "duty to cooperate" with particular attention for the need for "positive growth" where " Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area,and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth".(Para 17 NPPF). The Council through the publication of Open for Growth: The East Kent Growth Plan; Expansion East Kent (ExEK); "Grow for it", etc, illustrate a genuine process of cooperation.	
1.24	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	631	Objecting	Unclear how the Council is to account for cross-boundary planning challenges. This section does not go into much detail into strategic housing supply issues, including impact of what neighbouring authorities are planning. Swale for example is not proposing to meet need identified in SHMA. Identified requirements should be met within that Housing Market Area so as not to displace demand. The req'mt set by Canterbury cannot be assumed to suffice when the SHMA 2009 indicates greater need.	Canterbury will have to review the situation with its neighbours, and apply pressure on authorities like Swale to ensure they plan for more. SHMA 2009 is indicating a greater level of need than proposed - Canterbury should reconsider its position.
1.24	778073	Ms Claire Dethier		1533	Objecting	Poor evidence has been provided by the City Council of how they have undertaken duty to cooperate with nearby Councils.	
1.24	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1718	Objecting	The KDAONB is in a position to provide co-operation between LPAs on environmental matters, which show a consistency of approach for conservation and enhancement of the AONB. The AONB guidance further this aim. These are approved by the constituent LPAs through the JAC, and in some cases adopted as SPG or material considerations by some Local Authorities. Acknowledgement of this role would be helpful and help to provide evidence of Duty to Co-operate for Canterbury CC.	Insert a new paragraph under 'Duty to Co-operate that acknowledges the useful role of the Kent Downs AONB Unit.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.24	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1876	Supporting	Shared services cause pain for the council employees but is necessary to create stronger and more efficient outcomes. Why do the shared services not continue higher up with shared Chief Executives - the creation of a East Kent Authority should be discussed to create a stronger organisation able to compete in the harsh world of big contractual arrangements. The democratic deficit should be balanced with creation of Town and Parish level representation.	Creation of an East Kent Authority and Town Councils
1.24	779286	Mr Mark Aplin	Planning Policy Team Leader Shepway District Council	2064	Supporting	The Council has engaged with its partner planning authorities, particularly in relation to evidence sharing. Shepway looks forward to the Plan evolving to reflect the Duty to Cooperate and strategic/sub-regional context. The alignment of plan periods for adjoining districts was considered by the PI as appropriate for the long term planning of development and infrastructure. Further joint working is required on the introduction of CIL Charging Schedules and management of cross boundary impacts.	
1.24	778333	Mr Ian Gregory		2597	Objecting	The plan makes no reference to the proposed provision of neighbouring authorities, and whether the Council has been in discussions with any of them about how requirements will be met. The City Council does not appear to have concerned itself about the possible under provision in Swale and Ashford in particular. Canterbury and its adjoining authorities are simply intent upon deciding on what each will provide in terms of housing and proceeding with plans that address those particular provisions.	
1.24	407886	Mr J and P Booth		3533	Objecting	There does not appear to have been the level of coordination with statutory bodies that would be required to make the plan work even if it were acceptable, which it is not.	
1.24	13719	Mr Steve Moore	Thanet District Council	4116	Supporting	The scale of growth and economic development to be planned for in the districts of East Kent is a complex issue and naturally a matter of concern and significance for Thanet's growth and regeneration agenda. In embracing the Duty to Cooperate TDC intends to engage with neighbouring district planning authorities including CCC in the preparation of a joint statement for the sub region. In this respect we shall be seeking a symbiotic and synergistic relationship and shall continue to engage .	
1.24	780965	Mrs D Jeffers		4329	Objecting	There is a lack of evidence from the City Council to show how they have undertaken the duty to cooperate with nearby Councils. Evidence base report CDRSFR explains that both Ashford and Dover are providing more housing than required to meet their need and may be able to accommodate some displaced growth if they maintain their existing approach. Where is the evidence to show that this option has been fully considered and then discounted?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.24	782439	Mr Alan Holden	Chairman Broad Oak Preservation Society	5067	Objecting	We think it is regrettable that there is no consideration of regional trends in housing need and employment opportunities within the draft plan. Canterbury district is not economically or socially isolated. It is a dynamic part of East Kent. Predicting economic and housing growth in the district cannot be undertaken without taking account of this wider perspective.	
1.24	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5490	Objecting	The consultation with neighbouring authorities needs to be shared more openly €“ providing information relating to discussions on the development scenarios and housing target figures being pursued by the different Councils and not just a list of when planning officers met and the general subject areas.	
1.24	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5509	Objecting	This 'Duty to Co-operate' section should have included a brief summary of the housing target strategy being pursued by neighbouring authorities.	
1.24	406391	Mr Alan Best	Swale Borough Council	5505	Supporting	We both share a common issue in terms of the motorway junctions on the M2/A2, and a number of environmental designations across our borders. We hope that we can approach the issues in a consistent fashion. No doubt the M2/A2 will be an important 'Duty to Co-operate' matter for us both as we move forward.	
1.24	406848	Mr Graham Norton	Land and Planning Director Strategic Land Kent	5563	Objecting	We are not convinced that the guidance in the NPPF, with respect to duty to cooperate, has been met. The document is not clear as to the level of communication with adjacent Councils and how the overall housing numbers relate to adjacent areas. This issue has brought into disrepute many Local Plans across the country and this must not occur in Canterbury.	
1.24	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5763	Objecting	Business is unaware of administrative boundaries, the East Kent economy is more integrated than the 5 Local Authorities. While we support the principles and proposals of the Local Plan, we need to understand how it links to and complements what is proposed and developed beyond our District. An economic overview is vital to review this and ensure that what is planned here is not in conflict with what is planned elsewhere. Amend our Plan to accommodate what is happening elsewhere.	Amend our Plan to accommodate what is happening elsewhere to the benefit of all.
1.24	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6421	Objecting	There is reference to consultation with other authorities on a number of issues. But this is vague. It seems not to include the crucial ones we would expect to see, such as actual strategies or numbers of dwellings.	
1.24	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6759	Objecting	We are concerned that the co-operative strategy reported in the draft Local Plan at paragraph 1.24 onwards pays insufficient regard to the strategy for growth adopted by other authorities surrounding Canterbury and the reported findings of housing needs in the East Kent Strategic Housing Market Assessment produced in 2009. The plan needs to respond to these and explain Canterbury's position to comply with NPPF.	
1.25	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1271	Supporting	It is pleasing to hear that all the councils of East Kent are co-ordinating a development plan, which appears to centre on the economic growth of the city of Canterbury.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.25	778073	Ms Claire Dethier		1535	Objecting	Insignificant research has been carried out in the County/ South East/ Country to assess the cumulative impact of increasing housing numbers from the SEP figures. Growth at Canterbury, in combination with significant growth around the County could have a substantial impact on infrastructure. Transport modelling of the County must be a priority and without it the plan is not sustainable. Impact of development of this size cannot be determined without these results in terms of sustainability.	
1.25	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2241	Objecting	Whilst it is recognised that co-operation has been achieved between the East Kent districts in the past most notably in the South East Plan process (para 1.25) there is a continuing need to provide for this in the NPPF. This is a fundamental test of soundness.in the event that the local economies elsewhere in the sub-region do not perform as expected, there may be a need to compensate through increases in employment and housing provision in the Canterbury district.	
1.25	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5664	Objecting	Although there is mention of consultation with other local authorities on a number of issues, this does not seem to have extended to discussion of housing numbers and strategies in any meaningful way.	
1.25	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6188	Objecting	Lower level cooperation absent	Ask for detailed comment from neighbouring authorities on the draft plan and publish comments.
1.27	422109	Ms Ann Parkin		190	Objecting	I would also be interested to know how the Canterbury Draft Local plan fits in with the Development plans in East Kent. Dover District is embarking on a major housing building programme as is Shepway and Ashford. All this in an area of high unemployment where job opportunities are limited.	
1.28	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2242	Objecting	It is confirmed that the Canterbury economy is an integral part of the East Kent Growth Plan and whilst this also includes Ashford it is evident that the Canterbury economy will be a main driver for employment in East Kent. This issue will be a signif influence on the scale of devlopmt needed at Canterbury and in the event that the local economies elsewhere in the sub-region do not perform as expected, there may be a need to increase employment and housing provision in the Canterbury District.	
1.28	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2369	Objecting	Open For Growth: The East Kent Growth Plan -When the draft plan was published this Plan did not exist nor had it been adopted. Therefore all reference to this supposed document needs to be removed.	
1.28	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4946	Objecting	Whilst the Local Plan May 2103 refers to a number of high level discussion forums of which the Council is aware, there is no evidence that it has consulted with other neighbouring authorities specifically on housing numbers and locations.At the moment we have seen no evidence that such strategic cooperation has taken place, which could have the effect of reducing the pressure of numbers on the Canterbury Distinct.	It is essential therefore that proper cross boundary strategic planning is undertaken before decisions on final numbers for Canterbury are made.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.31	778073	Ms Claire Dethier		1503	Objecting	The Development Requirements study makes clear that some of the data may be inaccurate due to the special circumstances that Canterbury experience in terms of in and out migration of students, who often fail to deregister from services making it difficult to assess when they have left the area. The need for housing may be quite significantly overestimated. Also, the need for housing takes into account the student population, yet student housing does not count towards meeting housing need.	Surely this means that the need is being overestimated and ought to be reduced to take this imbalance into consideration?
1.35	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		419	Supporting	The Councils Housing Strategy seeks to meet the housing needs of local people and support the economic aspirations of the area which would help meet the objectives and vision of this District plan.	
1.35	777408	Miss Linda Hill		727	Supporting	Build student accommodation on campus - give family homes back to people who care about their properties and area	Build student accommodation on campus - give family homes back to people who care about their properties and area
1.35	777707	Mr Paul Waller		1077	Objecting	Evidence proves that new housing is not required at the levels suggested in the draft plan. There are unused, previously identified sites, that further reduce the need for greenfield development, along with new brown field sites and student accommodation potential. Government financial support should not determine levels of new housing - genuine need should.	Base the housing requirement on the evidence - take previously identified sites into account, explore the new brown field sites (Howe Barracks, Peugeot garage etc.), look at helping the Universities provide more student accommodation, and then see how many Greenfield houses are really needed. Do not be driven by what Government wants to encourage with the New Homes Bonus, and what developers might fund out of their profits. Look at what the communities want and need. The Council represents/ works for us, not the Government or developers. This is a huge issue -ignoring the local people now will be remembered at the next election.
1.35	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1199	Supporting	We support the general principles of the housing strategy. We agree that the priorities are for additional affordable housing, for rented homes at rents that local people can afford, and for more low-cost market and shared ownership housing. We agree that there is a need to make better use of the existing housing stock, and this applies particularly to the large numbers of HMOs let to students.	
1.35	778387	Mr David Smith		1343	Supporting	I support the general principles, but I do not agree with high numbers of new houses allocated. I believe that there comes a time when a town or city has reached its maximum size, and I think that time has come for Canterbury. Better use should be made of the numerous derelict building and land within the city and also an audit of empty homes, both old and new should be made and included in the new housing allocations.	
1.35	778466	Mrs Barbara Hudgeell		1323	Supporting	I agree in particular that more affordable housing for buying and renting and for the vulnerable, single, family or multi- use occupancy is needed. Having more purpose built student accommodation would free up some of the existing housing.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.35	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1278	Supporting	It is good to hear that the council is making a positive effort to bring empty house back on to the market, improve existing housing stock and look to claim back HMOs from student accommodation. This policy should provide a good proportion of the extra housing needed.	
1.35	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1589	Objecting	The council approach to this does not take into account the empty homes in the district, the increase in city centre availability of homes as shops close because of changes in shopping habits. HMO's will also revert as more student houses are built in house.	Look to maximise the potential of existing buildings, empty propoerties and brownfield sites before building on greenfield.
1.35	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1885	Objecting	Housing strategy is not the correct term for the proposed Housing developments. Really it is simply a collection of what developers have said they will do - a 'developerocracy'.	Axe much of the over development in Herne Bay Environs
1.35	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	1684	Supporting	We support the criteria identified but would make the point that the text needs to highlight the weight given to the criteria in decision making	
1.35	778733		The John Graham Centre	1849	Supporting	The John Graham Centre supports the objective of providing sufficient housing for vulnerable people. However it sees no specific policy which guides the decision maker in reaching decisions on this matter.	This objective needs to be followed up with a supporting housing policy
1.35	778739	Mr A Salvatori		1659	Supporting	We support the need to provide a suitable range and mix of new homes with particular emphasis on the need for affordable, rented accommodation and consider that this needs to be afforded great weight in decision making	The text should highlight the importance of this criterion in decision making
1.35	778740		Stour Valley Estates Ltd	1673	Supporting	Support the criteria which forms part of the Council's housing strategy and consider that a development of land to the rear of the Royal Oak at Blean meets these objectives. Proposals meeting these objectives should be given weight in decision making, because a variety of new housing is necessary including more affordable, low cost market and shared ownership housing and student accomodation.	
1.35	779227	Mr Paul Uden		1750	Objecting	The long term annual allocation of housing within the plan is arbitrary, unrealistic and overly aggressive. Building on this scale will have a dramatic effect on the local community in South Canterbury. The disruption and uncertainty over the development will last for a generation. There is no justification for the Council's claim that an increased rate of house building (50% higher than the average for SE England) is necessary because the planning inspector will reject it as being too low.	
1.35	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1843	Supporting	These findings are consistent with Hillreed Homes own market research particularly the need to provide a greater choice.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.35	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1912	Supporting	Support the general principles of the housing strategy and that the priority should be for affordable and low-cost housing as well as making better use of existing housing stock i.e student HMO's. A positive strategy is needed to turn a substantial proportion of these HMO's back into family houses by increasing purpose-built student accommodation. However, the general principles do not justify the housing targets in SP2, or some sites identified in SP3, and could be met with lower overall numbers	
1.35	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2187	Supporting	We support the general principles of the housing strategy. However, we do not consider that these general principles justify the housing targets in SP2, or some of the sites identified in SP3.	
1.35	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2752	Objecting	How is this going to be delivered? Will it only be the properties that are needed, that are built? Lower cost homes generate less profit impacting on the contributions for infrastructure.	
1.35	779159	Mr & Mrs Ken & Pauline Finch		2933	Objecting	With house prices rising in the area it is unlikely that local residents will be able to afford the proposed new housing. Thus it is probable that a number will be bought as second homes or by those who are commuting to London. These type of residents do little to add to the economy of the area or life of the community as they are absent for long periods. The proposal for Herne/Herne Bay is unreasonable whilst certain areas of the district have been ignored.	
1.35	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3040	Objecting	They do not believe the there has been co-operation between neighbouring authorities, each authority is in competition for new housing.They believe that there are many thousands of empty homes in the district a more robust policy of bringing properties back into use would be sustainable and offset the need for new housing. Also the changes in shopping habits will mean more shops can be converted to housing.	
1.35	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3629	Objecting	Fourth point - alter beginning of second sentence to read "Reducing the amount of off-campus"..... Fifth point - delete "Seeking to" and alter "ensure" to "ensuring"Sixth point - after "occupation" re-word to read ", empty homes and HMO houses; and"	Fourth point - alter beginning of second sentence to read "Reducing the amount of off-campus"..... Fifth point - delete "Seeking to" and alter "ensure" to "ensuring" Sixth point - after "occupation" re-word to read ", empty homes and HMO houses; and"
1.35	408497	Mr C Mills		3741	Objecting	Close co operation with neighbouring authorities in respect of housing numbers should be paramount. We do not believe that this co ordination has happened and each authority is in close competition with respect to the demand for new housing. This should have an impact on proposed numbers or there will be over supply throughout the county.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.35	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4550	Objecting	Support principles of housing strategy, priorities for affordable houses, affordable rentals and low cost/shared ownership. There is a need to make better use of existing housing stock especially student housing which are occupied for 8/12 months/yr. Need a strategy to bring HMO's back to family housing and increase purpose built student accommodation. The principles do not justify the housing targets in SP2 and some sites in SP3	
1.35	781255	Robert & Sandra Shine		4505	Objecting	The Plan claims there is a need for small and medium size family housing but the creation of jobs in the area to generate such demand is just assumed.	
1.35	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	5989	Supporting	We support the general principles of the housing strategy. We agree that there is a need to make better use of the existing housing stock, and this applies particularly to the numbers of HMOs let to students. However there is no evidence that the increase in purpose built student accommodation has brought student HMOs back into family housing. However, we do not consider that these general principles justify the housing targets in SP2, or some of the sites identified in SP3.	
1.35	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5960	Objecting	The mix of housing needs as described should have been spread more widely throughout all communities in the District and not just concentrated in 8 locations.	
1.35	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6318	Supporting	I support the general principles of this paragraph. Comment: Given the shortage of affordable homes, there is an urgent need to convert a large proportion of HMOs back into family accommodation and a corresponding need to increase the amount of purpose-built student accommodation. Student numbers should be capped until these problems have been fully resolved.	
1.36	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		472	Supporting	I consider that the importance of Increasing the amount of purpose-built student accommodation has been under estimated and has the potential for achieving much of the required increase in housing.	
1.36	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1261	Supporting	We support the general principles of this housing strategy. The priority must be for additional affordable housing at rents that local people can afford. We particularly support the expansion of Housing Associations in both towns and villages.as well as shared ownership schemes. Greater efforts should be made to bring empty housing back into use, as well as to convert underused commercial/retail premissis into housing. There is an urgent need to address and reverse the practice of converting f	
1.36	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1887	Supporting	The visitor economy is a 'nice to have' but should not be a mainstay of the local economy. Culture and Tourist Attractions should be used to create big marketing and front of mind recollection for Canterbury District to help gain inward investment from Business. Most of this in the County goes to Tonbrige and Malling or Ashford and Canterbury should improve it's marketing to gain some of this.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.36	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6423	Objecting	It is a matter of regret that this strategy, essential to the consideration of the District Plan, is not yet in place	
1.37	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3630	Objecting	In point iv add at end "particularly those locally based"	In point iv add at end "particularly those locally based"
1.37	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6424	Objecting	It is a matter of regret that this strategy, essential to the consideration of the District Plan, is not yet in place	
1.38	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	225	Objecting	Economic strategy promotion: arguably a priority over housing.	
1.38	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		913	Objecting	It doesn't make sense to allocate land to housing hoping that employment will fllow and THEN develop an economic strategy.	Let's have a proper economic strategy for Herne Bay BEFORE using all our greenfield land for housing. CCC needs to decide what it wants Herne Bay to become. As currently laid out in the plan the town will be a dormitory town with less employment per household than it has now, sending residents out of the town/district seeking work.
1.38	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1564	Objecting	This undermines the consultation process. The economic strategy MUST be considered WITH the Local Plan in order for either of them to make sense. We residents must be able to read these documents together, to be reassured that the economic strategy would be effective in encouraging the private sector industries that are apparently being reiled upon to provide the jobs for the thousands of new residents.	It's hard to see how this fundamental error in planning and preparation can readily be remedied, other than re-starting the consultation when, and only when, ALL the necessary key elements are in place, e.g economic strategy and transport strategy.
1.38	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5456	Objecting	In view of the many missing studies the DLP is premature -we are still waiting for the crucial Economic Strategy. This has been only promised yet was actually desperately required to shape the Plan from its early stages. The findings of this study needed to be fully integrated into the Draft Local Plan. All of this contributes to legitimate doubts about the rigour of the whole Plan-making process!	
1.38	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5510	Objecting	Is it sensible to frame this DLP before the economic and transport strategies have been completed/ updated? No.	
1.38	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5903	Objecting	The economic and housing strategies should go hand in hand. The economic strategy should not be prepared after the housing strategy and the consultation on this draft plan. Similar considerations apply to the District Transport Strategy, which is also only in the course of PO preparation. The housing, economic infrastructure and transport policies must all be coordinated and finalised together.	The housing, economic infrastructure and transport policies must all be coordinated and finalised together.
1.38	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5961	Objecting	There is no certainty that the planned houses be in the right place, or be the right type mix to meet the requirements of the workforce of an unknown new business. The hoped for 'knowledge economy' may not emerge.	
1.38	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6425	Objecting	It is a matter of regret that this strategy, essential to the consideration of the District Plan, is not yet in place	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.39	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		67	Supporting	But I should like to know when the District Transport Strategy will be published - or is this it??	
1.39	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		323	Supporting	The emerging priorities of improving access to services, goods and opportunities can be interpreted in different ways. Does this mean, for example, the provision additional road infrastructure? (Which I would not necessarily agree with). Or, does this mean ensuring that transport options, in particular public and sustainable transport options, are more readily accessible to all people regardless of their social background (which I would support).	Clarification on exactly what is meant by "improve access to services, goods and opportunities".
1.39	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		894	Objecting	paragraphs 1.39-1.41: I do find it extraordinary that this plan has gone out for public consultation before detailed traffic modelling has been undertaken and before a District Transport Strategy has been prepared. The road network around Canterbury is already under huge strain (as noted in paragraph 1.40), and the proposed increases in housing numbers will almost certainly make matters considerably worse - even allowing for the planned infrastructure improvements. Ho	
1.39	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1291	Objecting	The Council's contention that it has a transport strategy appears still just a vague wish. Their inability to produce a transport modelling document shows they have no idea how to improve the present intolerable congestion on Nackington and Old Dover Roads.	We should like to see some council proposals how to deal with traffic flow into Canterbury city centre from South Canterbury.
1.39	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1567	Objecting	This undermines the consultation process. The transport strategy MUST be considered WITH the Local Plan in order for either of them to make sense. We residents must be able to read these documents together, to be reassured that the transport strategy adequately supports the proposed increase in population and resulting road use that would arise from the proposals in the Local Plan.	It's hard to see how this fundamental error in planning and preparation can readily be remedied, other than re-starting the consultation when, and only when, ALL the necessary key elements are in place, e.g economic strategy and transport strategy.
1.39	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1592	Supporting	In principle great aspiration. The plan will not deliver this without more work and resolve by the council. Public meetings did not allay my fear that this is a wish list.	
1.39	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1913	Supporting	Agree that congestion and delays are the main problem, and support the proposals for sustainable transport. Support the general principles set out but also consider that they need to be translated into practical concrete measures, and do not yet see evidence that this is happening.	
1.39	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2188	Supporting	We agree that congestion and delays are the main problems, and we support the proposals for sustainable transport. We support the general principles set out here but we also consider that they need to be translated into practical concrete measures, and we do not yet see evidence that this is happening.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.39	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2361	Objecting	It is surprising that the draft local plan has been published without the draft transport strategy being available as part of the consultation. It is common knowledge that in order to achieve sustainable development, the transport elements have to be agreed first (in order build in sustainable transport options). Apparently, the Draft Transport Strategy will not be available for consultation until October 2013. Despite this there are relief roads, slip roads and park and ride in the draft plan!	
1.39	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3045	Objecting	Do not believe detailed thought has been given to the effects of traffic on residents. Traffic modelling should be made available so residents can make informed decisions. The roads in the area are congested at peak times how will 4000+ vehicles be accommodated. Bus routes and cycle lanes will not fix this. Why is traffic modelling not in public domain what has the Council got to hide?	
1.39	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3607	Objecting	Residents are particularly concerned about traffic congestion. We are surprised that the District Transport Strategy says nothing about railways, which are already in place and under-used east of Canterbury. New housing should not increase car and bus traffic, but be sited close to railways especially at Hersden and, by agreement with Dover, Adisham and Aylesham, as well as on Canterbury brownfield sites at Wincheap, the Prison and Howe Barracks. That would yield enough for reasonable developmen	
1.39	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3631	Objecting	We fail to see how it is possible to prepare a local plan when the transport strategy that underpins it has not been finalised. This is an important part of the evidence base that should inform the strategy of the plan. Reword second sentence of the paragraph to include reducing traffic pollution; promoting sustainable transport; achieving reliable journey times, pulising public health issues, improving access.	The second sentence of the paragraph should be re-worded as follows: "The emerging priorities of the strategy are to reduce traffic pollution; promote sustainable modes of transport; refuse development that would increase traffic pollution; achieve reliable vehicle journey times; consider and publicise dangers to public health from traffic pollution; and to endeavour to improve access to services."
1.39	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3571	Objecting	District Transport Strategy - This should have been prepared in advance of publication of the draft plan.	
1.39	404737	Mr Richard Guest		3822	Objecting	I object to parts of the Draft Local Plan, as it stands for South Canterbury. I do not agree with building on the agricultural land and would prefer to see brownfield sites used. Paras 1.39-1.41: New and Old Dover Rd are extremely congested at peak times, this is environmentally damaging through air and noise pollution. How would extra traffic from 4000+ homes be accommodated on these roads.	
1.39	408497	Mr C Mills		3742	Objecting	District Transport Strategy - I do not believe that any detailed consideration has gone into the effects of any new development on local residents in respect of transport.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.39	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4636	Objecting	Supports the proposals for sustainable transport and the general principles laid out, But does not see evidence that they will be translated into concrete measures. Should use Lynn Slomans Sustainable Transport Blueprint as a starting point. Hold unbiased public consultation, with shared information. Focus on making homeworking viable by ensuring fast broadband.	Translate measures into concrete pratcial measures. Use Lynn Slomans reports as a starting point. Undertake public consultation
1.39	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5512	Objecting	Is it sensible to frame this DLP before the economic and transport strategies have been completed/ updated? No.	
1.39	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5904	Objecting	The economic and housing strategies should go hand in hand. The economic strategy should not be prepared after the housing strategy and the consultation on this draft plan. Similar considerations apply to the District Transport Strategy, which is also only in the course of PO preparation. The housing, economic infrastructure and transport policies must all be coordinated and finalised together.	The housing, economic infrastructure and transport policies must all be coordinated and finalised together.
1.39	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	5990	Supporting	We agree that congestion and delays are the main problems, and we support the proposals for sustainable transport. We support the general principles set out here but we also consider that they need to be translated into practical concrete measures. We commend Lynn Sloman's Sustainable Transport Blueprint for Canterbury as a good starting point on which to build. We believe that the principles in 1.41 should be applied firmly to proposals for new housing development.	
1.39	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5963	Objecting	The transport study should have been available for careful study before this consultation period.	
1.39	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6325	Supporting	I support these paragraphs with provisos. Comment: I support the proposals for promoting sustainable transport, in particular the emphasis on encouraging walking, cycling and public transport. Particular consideration should be given to promoting walkability as this is the most basic building block of a sustainable transport policy. Considerable investment in new pedestrian crossings is required to enable residents to cross major road arteries safely.	
1.39	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6427	Objecting	The delay in undertaking detailed traffic modelling and production of District Transport Strategy seriously undermines Plan. Its one of its main elements. All our local consultations reinforce the conclusion of Ipsos MORI 1.19 that the delays/frustration of our congested road network are of major local concern. We agree with Plan's general proposals for this but it lacks coherent, imaginative & detailed application of Cant Soc's Transport recommendations and Dr Lynn Slowman's study	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.39	13835	Mr Michael Steed		6981	Objecting	It is extraordinary that this plan has gone out for public consultation before a District Transport Strategy has been prepared. The proposed increases in housing numbers will put additional huge strain on the road network €“ even allowing for the planned infrastructure improvements around Canterbury. A major concern expressed by residents in the Ipsos MORI survey was traffic congestion (as quoted in paragraph 1.19). This order of consultation is an insult to local democracy.	
1.40	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		68	Supporting	I absolutely agree with these statements. In addition, I should like to see a statement committing to more "joined-up" sustainable transport, i.e., combinations of short-distance journeys with longer ones. For example - better safer cycling and walking routes to railway stations and bus stops; better cycle provision at railway stations; more negotiations with Southeastern Rail to improve their cycle carriage facilities etc.	
1.40	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		69	Supporting	I absolutely agree with these statements. In addition, I should like to see a statement committing to more "joined-up" sustainable transport, i.e., combinations of short-distance journeys with longer ones. For example - better safer cycling and walking routes to railway stations and bus stops; better cycle provision at railway stations; more negotiations with Southeastern Rail to improve their cycle carriage facilities etc.	
1.40	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		324	Supporting	I fully support the aims of supporting a modal shift towards more sustainable modes of transport.	
1.40	665473	Dr Richard Norman		517	Supporting	Support aim of rebalancing transport system to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	
1.40	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		895	Objecting	Paragraphs 1.39-1.41: I do find it extraordinary that this plan has gone out for public consultation before detailed traffic modelling has been undertaken and before a District Transport Strategy has been prepared. The road network around Canterbury is already under huge strain (as noted in paragraph 1.40), and the proposed increases in housing numbers will almost certainly make matters considerably worse - even allowing for the planned infrastructure improvements.	
1.40	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		916	Objecting	There must be a proper transport strategy before allocating land for housing. As currently envisaged, thousands of homes will be built on greenfield land outside the town of herne Bay. there is no transport strategy to get these people to work and to school. The Leader said in July that there was no plan to improve roads into the centre of Herne Bay because "people just had to get used to the idea of walking or cycling - they can't keep relying on their car." This is unrealistic in a town with n	transport strategy first, please.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.40	777707	Mr Paul Waller		1078	Objecting	Reduction of 2 routes from the east of the City to 1, will worsen congestion trying to get into the City and around the City to join the A2. This will be made worse by the additional housing in Sturry/Broad Oak, Herden, Herne and Herne Bay. Congestion at pinch point will be horrendous. Similar effect on South side. Shopping traffic will be deterred by high Park and Ride costs plus congestion, resulting in detrimental effects on traffic and retail economy - both contrary to Local plan objectives	Re-think traffic management in the plan and be realistic. Congestion around Canterbury is a huge problem. There is a lot of traffic that just needs to go around Canterbury to link up with A2 east and west bound, plus A28 to Ashford. Local journeys only make up a percentage of traffic. Park and Ride is too expensive. Cycle and walk ways are great for the physically able. Be realistic about peoples transport choices, and do not assume that you can change habits readily. That type of assumption will lead to detrimental impacts on the local economy, which should be totally contrary to the objectives of the plan. Traffic consultants are great at flows, but poor at assessing the financial and environmental impacts of their suggestions - we have local evidence of that. Traffic management in the plan needs to be re-considered. If developers are going to be asked to foot the bill, they need to be required to fund a project that will solve the issue, not make it worse. If they cannot afford to solve the problem - do not allow them to make the problem worse.
1.40	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1200	Supporting	We agree that congestion and delays are the main problems, and we support the proposals for sustainable transport. We support the general principles set out here but we also consider that they need to be translated into practical concrete measures, and we do not yet see evidence that this is happening. We commend Lynn Sloman's Sustainable Transport Blueprint for Canterbury as a good starting point on which to build.	
1.40	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1292	Objecting	The council will find that its desire for a fast park and ride bus route from South Canterbury is far more difficult to put into practice than it is to write a policy about.	We should like to see the final decision on the route for the park and ride scheme.
1.40	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1594	Objecting	This is a wish list with no cogent plan to make it a reality. I would support it in principle but this is ineffective and wishy washy.	Draw up a real plan that has objectives and specific measureables to know when you have achieved them. Keeping your fingers crossed will not make it happen. The council need to lead with a mixture of carrot and stick.
1.40	779227	Mr Paul Uden		1749	Objecting	The 4000 homes planned in South Canterbury have more to do with obtaining the housing levy to pay for new roads, than the planning requirements of the PI. New roads are being sold as a way of reducing traffic congestion in Canterbury. However, adding to road capacity is shown to increase traffic, pollution and congestion. Nackington, Old and New Dover Roads are ill-equipped to accommodate extra vehicles. Developers have admitted the Plan will do little to solve traffic problems.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.40	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2394	Objecting	We want to see a statement committing to more 'Joined-up' sustainable transport, ie, combinations of short-distance journeys with longer ones. For example - better safer cycling and walking routes to railway stations and bus stops; better cycle provision at railway stations; more negotiations with Southeastern Rail to improve their cycle carriage facilities etc.	
1.40	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2569	Objecting	New and Old Dover Roads and Nackington Road are extremely congested at peak times in the morning and evening rush hour. This is environmentally damaging through air and noise pollution. The council have no answer as to how the vehicles from 4000+ extra dwellings in the vicinity of these already clogged arterial roads would be accommodated	
1.40	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3638	Objecting	Does this just refer to traffic delays? Reduce congestion by reducing the need to travel through optimising the location of houses, open space, employment, schools, shops. Congestion also impacts on air quality, the public health danger should be referred to. Oppose park and ride because it increase vehicle miles.	We would suggest that after "Congestion" insert "air quality, danger to public health". It should also be recognised that it is not just travellers that are affected, but also residents, so before "travellers" insert "residents and"
1.40	408497	Mr C Mills		3747	Objecting	I do not believe that any detailed consideration has gone into the effects of any new development on local residents in respect of transport.	
1.40	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4639	Objecting	Supports the proposals for sustainable transport and the general principles laid out, But does not see evidence that they will be translated into concrete measures. Should use Lynn Slomans Sustainable Transport Blueprint as a starting point. Hold unbiased public consultation, with shared information. Focus on making homeworking viable by ensuring fast broadband.	Translate measures into concrete pratcial measures. Use Lynn Slomans reports as a starting point. Undertake public consultation
1.40	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5513	Objecting	Is the Plan really likely to reduce congestion and delays or will it actually exacerbate them? The latter is the most likely outcome.	
1.40	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6326	Supporting	I support these paragraphs with provisos. Comment: I support the proposals for promoting sustainable transport, in particular the emphasis on encouraging walking, cycling and public transport. Particular consideration should be given to promoting walkability as this is the most basic building block of a sustainable transport policy. Considerable investment in new pedestrian crossings is required to enable residents to cross major road arteries safely.	
1.40	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6428	Objecting	The delay in undertaking detailed traffic modelling and production of District Transport Strategy seriously undermines Plan. Its one of its main elements. All our local consultations reinforce the conclusion of Ipsos MORI 1.19 that the delays/frustration of our congested road network are of major local concern. We agree with Plan's general proposals for this but it lacks coherent, imaginative & detailed application of Cant Soc's Transport recommendations and Dr Lynn Slowman's study	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.40	13835	Mr Michael Steed		6986	Objecting	Words such as "rebalancing"(1.40) show how limited is the CCC's ambition and how shallow its thinking. An effective District Transport Strategy would lay down parameters for development, not seek to mitigate harm caused by development.	
1.41	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	2156	Supporting	Add fourth point. Locating housing land allocations near to where the jobs are / jobs growth is	Add fourth point. Locating housing land allocations near to where the jobs are / jobs growth is
1.41	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		70	Supporting	Not just "housing and employment", but all local services, e.g., doctor's surgery, small, non-chain shops, community centre, places of worship, etc.	
1.41	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		325	Supporting	I support these aims but the importance of sustainable transport options being more important to other transport options must be emphasised.	Reword "looking to locate development near existing transport hubs" to "looking to locate development near existing transport hubs with particular emphasis on placement which is supported by or further improves sustainable transport provision " (additional text in italic).
1.41	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	226	Objecting	The main determinant of public transport use is the cost: until this is significantly less than that of a car, car use will prevail.	
1.41	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		473	Objecting	I object to the assumption that reliable journey times are of more concern than short journey times. I object to the assumption that the answer does not include substantial improvements to the road (and rail) infrastructure.	Clear plans are needed to road (and rail - station at Hersden) improvements to be considered to support the increased housing
1.41	773146	Dr Peter Thomas		268	Objecting	I wish also to highlight a contradiction between the pattern of proposed housing development and the City Council's commitment to a sustainable transport policy, as set out in the Draft Local Plan. Thus, at paragraph 1.41 it is stated that the City Council will use the planning process "to locate development near existing transport hubs ..."	
1.41	665473	Dr Richard Norman		516	Supporting	Support prioritising of walking, cycling and public transport.	
1.41	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		896	Objecting	Paragraphs 1.39-1.41: I do find it extraordinary that this plan has gone out for public consultation before detailed traffic modelling has been undertaken and before a District Transport Strategy has been prepared. The road network around Canterbury is already under huge strain (as noted in paragraph 1.40), and the proposed increases in housing numbers will almost certainly make matters considerably worse - even allowing for the planned infrastructure improvements. H	
1.41	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		920	Objecting	The major development sites for HB will be dependent on car transport. There are no transport hubs nearby.	transport strategy first, please.
1.41	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1201	Supporting	We believe that the principles in 1.41 should be applied firmly to proposals for new housing development, and we consider that they are incompatible with the housing development numbers proposed in SP2 and some of the sites proposed in SP3, as these would inevitably add to traffic congestion.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.41	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1294	Objecting	A definition of sustainable transport would be helpful. The plan talks of putting developments near transport hubs, but proposes its biggest housing development well away from train stations, bus stations and major employers. The increase in the number of cars on the road will adversely affect cyclists and pedestrians.	The Council needs to clarify its reasoning behind placing its major housing development so far out of the city at the wrong end of a congested road system. An explanation of what it means by sustainable transport would be helpful.
1.41	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1597	Objecting	This is a driver for development near the existing / expanded south Canterbury Park and Ride. This facility is underused now. Why will that change? The public meetings revealed that the indicative maps showing business / retail in south Canterbury is a fig leaf to provide justification for the housing. It is not costed or agreed to be of interest to any developer. Why would it happen?	Remove the sites from the plan. Little Barton Farm, Nackington Rd and Simon Langtons Girls school. There is no need to build here if the council follow the NLP and MORI poll which do not want building at their inflated rate, higher then the SE average. Therefore no need for 4000+ houses.
1.41	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1881	Supporting	Over development in Herne Bay Environs makes a mockery of this aspiration.	
1.41	771556	Mr Phil Rose		2129	Objecting	The major development sites proposed for Herne Bay will be dependent on car transport €“ they are nowhere near "existing transport hubs".	Build transport hubs near the proposed new Herne Bay developments, or build the developments nearer the transport hubs.
1.41	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1914	Supporting	The principles in 1.41 should be applied firmly to proposals for new housing development, and consider that they are incompatible with the housing development numbers proposed in SP2 and some of the sites proposed in SP3, as these would inevitably add to traffic congestion.	
1.41	779265	Mr Timothy Chancellor		2070	Supporting	We need to do much more to encourage walking and cycling.	
1.41	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2395	Objecting	Not just 'housing and employment' should be covered but all local services, eg, doctor's surgery, small, non-chain shops, community centre, places of worship, etc. to facilitate the use of sustainable transport.	
1.41	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3632	Objecting	In first point: i, replace "near" with "by"i, insert "public" after "existing"i, delete "hubs" and insert "routes"Add a fourth point "requiring low polluting buses in towns and the City"Add a fifth point "Physically separating cycle routes from vehicular traffic in urban areas"	In first point: i, replace "near" with "by" i, insert "public" after "existing" i, delete "hubs" and insert "routes" Add a fourth point "requiring low polluting buses in towns and the City" Add a fifth point "Physically separating cycle routes from vehicular traffic in urban areas"
1.41	408497	Mr C Mills		3748	Objecting	I do not believe that any detailed consideration has gone into the effects of any new development on local residents in respect of transport.	
1.41	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4640	Objecting	Supports proposals for sustainable transport and the general principles laid out, But does not see evidence that they will be translated into concrete measures. 1.41 should be applied to proposals for new housing development, considers that they are incompatible with the housing numbers proposed in SP2 and some of the sites in SP3, as these will lead to traffic congestion. Make homeworking viable by providing fast broadband.	Apply priniciples to SP2 and SP3. Make home working a viable option by providing fast broadband.
1.41	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5315	Supporting	CAST fully supports the City Council's efforts to encourage a modal shift from private car towards more sustainable transport.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.41	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5514	Objecting	No mention of the rail network and the potential to harness that facility and encourage housing development along railway corridors and within reasonable proximity of railway stations.	
1.41	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5781	Supporting	The ideals of mixed use development and the benefits that such development can bring to local communities by reducing the need to travel are fully supported. It is indeed these very ideals which the masterplan proposals for South Hersden seek to develop.	
1.41	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5815	Supporting	The ideals of mixed use development and the benefits that such development can bring to local communities by reducing the need to travel are fully supported. It is indeed these very ideals which the masterplan proposals for South Hersden seek to develop.	
1.41	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5964	Objecting	The following points are a contradiction: €C 'Look to locate development near existing transport hubs' - this assumes that some of the increased population will travel to work. €C Ensuring mixed-use developments where housing and employment are in close proximity - This implies that sufficient employment opportunities will exist/be created close to housing. This is not the case for Sturry sites. Knowledge Economy Employment Opportunities will be to south and west of Canterbury.	
1.41	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6327	Supporting	I support these paragraphs with provisos. Comment: I support the proposals for promoting sustainable transport, in particular the emphasis on encouraging walking, cycling and public transport. Particular consideration should be given to promoting walkability as this is the most basic building block of a sustainable transport policy. Considerable investment in new pedestrian crossings is required to enable residents to cross major road arteries safely.	
1.41	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6429	Objecting	The delay in undertaking detailed traffic modelling and production of District Transport Strategy seriously undermines Plan. Local consultations reinforce the conclusion of Ipsos MORI 1.19 that a major local concern is the congested road network. Agree with Plan's general proposals but it lacks coherent, imaginative & detailed application of Cant Soc's Transport recommendations and Dr Lynn Slowman's study. CCC/KCC should take 1.41 seriously when locating new houses SP2/SP3 will add to congestion	
1.41	13835	Mr Michael Steed		6988	Objecting	Words such as "facilitate the use" (1.41) show how limited is the CCC's ambition and how shallow its thinking. An effective District Transport Strategy would lay down parameters for development, not seek to mitigate harm caused by development.	
1.42	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		898	Supporting	Environmental Strategy, paragraphs 1.42 to 1.44: I welcome this strategy, but should not the Environment Strategy be referred to in Policy SP1?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.42	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1295	Objecting	The Council's environmental strategy is at variance with the DLP's push to raise house building around the city to unprecedented levels.	I should like the house building rates advocated in the DLP to be reduced to a rate which would be commensurate with achieving the goals of the environmental strategy.
1.42	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1568	Objecting	This undermines the consultation process. The environment strategy MUST be considered WITH the Local Plan in order for either of them to make sense. We residents must be able to read these documents together, to be reassured that the environment strategy adequately protects our "non-built" environment, encourages wise use of resources, and manages the negative impacts of greater numbers of people and increased transport.	It's hard to see how this fundamental error in planning and preparation can readily be remedied, other than re-starting the consultation when, and only when, ALL the necessary key elements are in place, e.g economic, transport and environmental strategies.
1.42	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1720	Objecting	It is expected that the review will include the AONB Management Plan and its supporting guidance. The review needs to be completed before the final draft LP to inform the LP. The relationship between the revised Strategy and the LP should be clearer. The final sentence of para 1.43 is confusing.- 'finalise our plans to 2016' does this mean finalise the evidence base (the E S) for the draft final LP, or is it meant to read 'finalise our plans to 2031'?	Make the current Environment Strategy readily available on the Canterbury website and revise para 1.43 to clarify intent :- The review needs to be completed before the final draft Local Plan as it should inform the Local Plan. The relationship between the revised Environment Strategy and the Local plan should be clearer. The final sentence of para 1.43 is confusing.- 'finalise our plans to 2016' does this mean finalise the evidence base (the environment strategy) for the draft final Local Plan, or is it meant to read 'finalise our plans to 2031'?
1.42	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1879	Supporting	Unsupported development in Housing in the Herne Bay Environ will increase CO2 emissions due to the need to commute to work and school.	
1.42	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3051	Objecting	Welcome an environment strategy but questions how do proposals in the DLP square with the aims and objectives of the a strategy. The DLP negatively impacts on pollution; travel and transport; energy conservation; the natural and built environment and climate change. There is no coherent strategy.	
1.42	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3641	Objecting	As for the transport strategy, the up-dated environment strategy should have been finalised before the local plan was prepared as it should inform the local plan as part of evidence base. Amend to state that insufficient emphasis has made in connection with large scale applications, all applications will not be in breach of the strategy or any environmental policy, application for more than 10 units in Canterbury will be refused.	In paragraph 1.42 after "climate change" insert the following: "The Council acknowledges that insufficient emphasis on this Strategy has been placed in connection with large scale planning applications, and will require all such applications in future to demonstrate that development will not be in breach of the Strategy, nor of any review of it, nor of any Environment Policy/Strategy or review of that. The Council also recognises that air quality is a major problem in urban areas and that development adds to it. The council will protect the health of its residents by refusing applications in Canterbury for residential development in excess of 10 units."
1.42	408497	Mr C Mills		3749	Objecting	I question how the environment strategy proposals square with the aims and objectives of such a strategy. Specifically we note it includes 'environmental issues in the district. I contend that the DLP as it currently stands negatively impacts on all of these areas.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.42	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5515	Objecting	The review of the environmental strategy was surely needed before production of this DLP?	
1.42	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5973	Supporting	Environment Strategy - welcomed	
1.42	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6430	Objecting	It is a matter of regret that this strategy, essential to the consideration of the District Plan, is not yet in place	
1.43	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		899	Supporting	Environmental Strategy, paragraphs 1.42 to 1.44: I welcome this strategy, but should not the Environment Strategy be referred to in Policy SP1?	
1.43	408497	Mr C Mills		3750	Objecting	I question how the environment strategy proposals square with the aims and objectives of such a strategy. Specifically we note it includes 'environmental issues in the district. I contend that the DLP as it currently stands negatively impacts on all of these areas.	
1.43	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4020	Objecting	As for the transport strategy, the up-dated environment strategy should have been finalised before the local plan was prepared as it should inform the local plan as part of evidence base. Amend to state that insufficient emphasis has made in connection with large scale applications, all applications will not be in breach of the strategy or any environmental policy, application for more than 10 units in Canterbury will be refused.	In paragraph 1.42 after "climate change" insert the following: "The Council acknowledges that insufficient emphasis on this Strategy has been placed in connection with large scale planning applications, and will require all such applications in future to demonstrate that development will not be in breach of the Strategy, nor of any review of it, nor of any Environment Policy/Strategy or review of that. The Council also recognises that air quality is a major problem in urban areas and that development adds to it. The council will protect the health of its residents by refusing applications in Canterbury for residential development in excess of 10 units."
1.43	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5516	Objecting	The proposed public consultation on the draft environmental strategy should've been carried out before production of this DLP in order to inform and influence its provisions!	
1.43	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6431	Objecting	It is a matter of regret that this strategy, essential to the consideration of the District Plan, is not yet in place	
1.44	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		901	Supporting	Environmental Strategy, paragraphs 1.42 to 1.44: I welcome this strategy, but should not the Environment Strategy be referred to in Policy SP1?	
1.44	408497	Mr C Mills		3751	Objecting	I question how the environment strategy proposals square with the aims and objectives of such a strategy. Specifically we note it includes 'environmental issues in the district. I contend that the DLP as it currently stands negatively impacts on all of these areas.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.44	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4021	Objecting	As for the transport strategy, the up-dated environment strategy should have been finalised before the local plan was prepared as it should inform the local plan as part of evidence base. Amend to state that insufficient emphasis has made in connection with large scale applications, all applications will not be in breach of the strategy or any environmental policy, application for more than 10 units in Canterbury will be refused.	In paragraph 1.42 after "climate change" insert the following: "The Council acknowledges that insufficient emphasis on this Strategy has been placed in connection with large scale planning applications, and will require all such applications in future to demonstrate that development will not be in breach of the Strategy, nor of any review of it, nor of any Environment Policy/Strategy or review of that. The Council also recognises that air quality is a major problem in urban areas and that development adds to it. The council will protect the health of its residents by refusing applications in Canterbury for residential development in excess of 10 units."
1.44	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6432	Objecting	It is a matter of regret that this strategy, essential to the consideration of the District Plan, is not yet in place	
1.45	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		71	Supporting	Absolutely essential	
1.45	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		902	Supporting	Open Space Strategy, paragraphs 1.45 to 1.48: I welcome this strategy, but should not the Open Space Strategy be referred to in Policy SP1?	
1.45	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		957	Objecting	Paragraph 2.24: I object most strongly to Kingsmead Field, Canterbury being allocated for housing. This is should be retained as Open Space for recreational use in this deprived part of the city, and it goes against the approach outlined in paragraph 1.45 on Open Space Strategy. It is also a flood plain, and therefore should not be built upon, as it would contravene draft policy CC4.	
1.45	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1297	Objecting	South Canterbury has no park and very few play facilities for the children who already live there. Building 4,000 more houses would make the area even more claustrophobic and its children and pets even more deprived. The area desperately needs more open space, not 4,000 houses.	The Council needs to make the fields between Canterbury and Bridge a green belt and turn the field earmarked for a football pitch into a park for residents.
1.45	779262	Mr John Bailey		1949	Supporting	Open spaces are vital. Please protect the open spaces around the university of Kent, views from world heritage site and stour valley. Please make sure that the green gap between UKC and residences below, remains in place.	
1.45	778304	O W Presland		2606	Objecting	The analysis of the open spaces should be published in final form and all open spaces reviewed to ensure that they meet the determined objectives rather than simply representing local opposition to change. The concept of interconnected open spaces is sound but that concept needs to be applied case by case and the evidence base produced for it.	
1.45	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3052	Objecting	Welcome open space strategy but notes the lack of public open space provision in South Canterbury. Ironic providing "public" open space and allotments at the expense of concreting over Grade 1 Greenfield land. Ridlands farm should revert public open recreational space.	

Summary Chapter 1 - Strategy

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.45	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3633	Objecting	As for the transport strategy, the up-dated open space strategy should have been finalised before the consultation draft of local plan was prepared as it should inform the local plan as part of evidence base. In the first sentence, after "enhance" add "and provide"	In the first sentence, after "enhance" add "and provide"
1.45	408497	Mr C Mills		3752	Objecting	I welcome an open space strategy and notes the distinct lack of such public open space provision in South Canterbury.	
1.45	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6328	Supporting	I support these paragraphs and Chapter 11 in principle. Comment: While I support these paragraphs and the Chapter on Open Space in principle, I would like to point out that the decision to allocate Kingsmead Field for housing (see paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan) is in direct conflict with the Council's expressed commitment to protect and enhance open space within the district, particularly within the urban boundaries. For further discussion of this point, see section 6 below.	
1.46	777408	Miss Linda Hill		728	Objecting	How can you say you are enhancing open spaces for future generations when in Herne you want to build on the open spaces. Complete contradiction. I live in the country I have open spaces all around and want it to stay like that - not a local park or some other such ridiculous idea	Leave the open spaces where they are and don't build on them
1.46	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		905	Supporting	Open Space Strategy, paragraphs 1.45 to 1.48: I welcome this strategy, but should not the Open Space Strategy be referred to in Policy SP1?	
1.46	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1771	Supporting	It is very important that development is spread and not just crammed into existing areas. Green elements are an essential component of a healthy human habitat and have an intrinsic value which contributes positively to the economic, cultural and social wellbeing of human habitats.	
1.46	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3650	Objecting	After "life" add ",social well-being and health"	After "life" add ",social well-being and health"
1.46	408497	Mr C Mills		3753	Objecting	I welcome an open space strategy and notes the distinct lack of such public open space provision in South Canterbury.	
1.46	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5975	Objecting	The detailed plans of new provision for the Sturry/Broad Oak site have not yet been revealed. Are they guaranteed and will they be delivered?The Planner's definition of 'open space', as set out there is more complex than the average person's concept and an appreciation of this at an earlier point in the Plan would have been useful.	Suggested addition here: 'The open space provision for all new development sites, should include additional provision where there is an already an outstanding shortfall in the immediate area'. OPen space in the Park View Estate area should be reviewed in the light of the plan proposals.
1.46	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6330	Supporting	I support these paragraphs and Chapter 11 in principle. Comment: While I support these paragraphs and the Chapter on Open Space in principle, I would like to point out that the decision to allocate Kingsmead Field for housing (see paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan) is in direct conflict with the Council's expressed commitment to protect and enhance open space within the district, particularly within the urban boundaries. For further discussion of this point, see section 6 below.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.47	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		906	Supporting	Open Space Strategy, paragraphs 1.45 to 1.48: I welcome this strategy, but should not the Open Space Strategy be referred to in Policy SP1?	
1.47	778466	Mrs Barbara Hudgell		1368	Supporting	I agree with policy but just want to add the need to preserve Kingsmead Field because of its location as it is the only public green space left in the area.	
1.47	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1774	Objecting	It is imperative that the statement is made more robust to explicitly include the visual amenity contribution that green space makes even if it does not have public access. Unless this is done, ruthless developers will exploit this as a loophole and take it as a green light to build on any green space which although is making an important contribution as visual amenity, does not have public access.	Explicitly recognise and include green space that provide Visual amenity, but does not provide public access.
1.47	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3654	Objecting	At the end add "social well-being and health"	At the end add "social well-being and health"
1.47	408497	Mr C Mills		3754	Objecting	I welcome an open space strategy and notes the distinct lack of such public open space provision in South Canterbury.	
1.47	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6332	Supporting	I support these paragraphs and Chapter 11 in principle. Comment: While I support these paragraphs and the Chapter on Open Space in principle, I would like to point out that the decision to allocate Kingsmead Field for housing (see paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan) is in direct conflict with the Council's expressed commitment to protect and enhance open space within the district, particularly within the urban boundaries. For further discussion of this point, see section 6 below.	
1.48	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		420	Supporting	A significant level of open space is proposed to be delivered as part of the new strategic site allocations set out in this Plan which will improve the distribution, accessibility, quality and connectivity of open space. We support this objective through the allocation of the new strategic sites set out in this Plan e.g.including a significant level of open space that will be provided as part of Site 7: Thanet Way site, Whitstable..	
1.48	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		907	Supporting	Open Space Strategy, paragraphs 1.45 to 1.48: I welcome this strategy, but should not the Open Space Strategy be referred to in Policy SP1?	
1.48	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1698	Objecting	It is essential not to lose sight of the fact that "a significant level of open space" WILL BE BUILT OVER as a result of these proposals, a far greater area than is "proposed to be delivered as part of the new strategic sites set out in this Plan". This is because all the proposed major developments are on greenfield sites, contrary to the wishes of the residents as shown by the MORI survey. It is farcical to destroy large areas of open space and then trumpet the isolated scraps left behind.	There are brownfield sites and in-fill opportunities across the District that are being disregarded, not because they are inappropriate, but because the developers (who appear to be driving this exercise) view them as less profitable.
1.48	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1612	Objecting	It is ironic that the council vision seeks to provide public open space by destroying existing greenfield land which does have footpath access.	Do not build on greenfield in south Canterbury.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.48	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1776	Supporting	It is imperative that the statement is made more robust to explicitly include the visual amenity contribution that green space makes even if it does not have public access. Unless this is done, ruthless developers will exploit this as a loophole and take it as a green light to build on any green space which although is making an important contribution as visual amenity, does not have public access.	Explicitly recognise and include green space that provide Visual amenity, but does not provide public access.
1.48	779262	Mr John Bailey		1952	Supporting	Quality of open spaces needs to be improved on land below the UKC in land known as Chaucer field.	
1.48	779265	Mr Timothy Chancellor		2079	Supporting	High quality, well designed and managed open space does make a valuable contribution to quality of life. But there needs to be sufficient open space for people to make use of and it needs to be accessible.	
1.48	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2755	Objecting	The proposals will reduce open space in Herne and surrounds.	
1.48	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3655	Objecting	After "life" add "" add "social well-being and health"	After "life" add "" add "social well-being and health"
1.48	408497	Mr C Mills		3755	Objecting	I welcome an open space strategy and notes the distinct lack of such public open space provision in South Canterbury.	
1.48	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6333	Supporting	I support these paragraphs and Chapter 11 in principle. Comment: While I support these paragraphs and the Chapter on Open Space in principle, I would like to point out that the decision to allocate Kingsmead Field for housing (see paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan) is in direct conflict with the Council's expressed commitment to protect and enhance open space within the district, particularly within the urban boundaries. For further discussion of this point, see section 6 below.	
1.49	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		72	Supporting	"Accessible" is the key word here.	
1.49	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		326	Supporting	The NPPF's Core Planning Principles should also be emphasised.	Add an additional paragraph pointing out the NPPF's Core Planning Principles (see paragraph 17 on pages 5 & 6 of the NPPF)
1.49	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1298	Objecting	The Council's stated aim of using natural resources prudently cannot possibly be compatible with building houses on Grade 1 agricultural land.	The Council should leave the Grade 1 agricultural land alone to produce food and concentrate on building houses on the best placed brownfield sites around the District.
1.49	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1721	Objecting	3rd Bullet point. This omits reference to landscape. 'Conserve and enhance' is the terminology used in the NPPF with respect of landscape and other designations. If biodiversity is singled out so should designated landscapes. (NPPF 113,115,116)	Add words as highlighted bold below:- ' ...- contributing to protecting , conserving, and enhancing.....helping to improve biodiversity, conserve and enhance landscape , use natural.....
1.49	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2756	Objecting	No indication of when or how this will be delivered. There are serious concerns that the information regarding infrastructure is not available, how can it be said that it is deliverable?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.49	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3060	Objecting	LANRA made it clear that if any plan is to be fully sustainable it must not fail at the outset. To build housing, retail and business space on Grade 1 agricultural land fails sustainability tests. The land is part of the historic setting and provides food. A lack of reference to brownfield sites. Can't take Council seriously because they say Chislet Colliery is a greenfield site and refuse to include it and have down played Howe Barracks.	
1.49	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3657	Objecting	After the three bullet points add the following sentence: "However, a balance has to be struck between delivery and any adverse effects on existing open space, countryside and productive agricultural land."	After the three bullet points add the following sentence: "However, a balance has to be struck between delivery and any adverse effects on existing open space, countryside and productive agricultural land."
1.49	408497	Mr C Mills		3757	Objecting	If any plan is to be fully sustainable it must not fail at the outset. To build housing, retail and business space on Grade 1 agricultural land clearly fails any sustainability test at the first hurdle.	
1.49	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6019	Supporting	Natural and social capital should be considered equally in all discussions about development. Sustainability has three key strands: social ~ ensuring a strong, healthy and just society for existing and future communities; economic ~ where environmental and social costs fall on those who cause them, and resources are distributed fairly and efficiently; and environmental ~ respecting and protecting the limits of the planet's environment, resources and biodiversity.	
1.49	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5982	Supporting	A clear statement. Reference to Chapter 8?	
1.49	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5983	Objecting	Separate current statistics for each of the 3 separate communities which make up Sturry Parish simply do not exist. Proposals for development sites bringing an extra 1000 houses Sturry/Broad Oak and 800 in Hersden, which will demand integration with the existing communities, cannot be deemed 'sustainable' without current, comprehensive appraisals, relevant statistics and full understanding of what is already in existence.	
1.49	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6335	Objecting	I object to this definition of Sustainable Development as it is too narrow and fails to acknowledge the 'limits to growth'. These limits are both environmental (eg water availability) and man-made (eg congestion). Until these limits are addressed properly, any development on a large-scale is likely to be unsustainable. The proposed development in South Canterbury is an extreme example. My answer relates to all of the proposed Strategic Development Sites.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.49	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6881	Objecting	The increased emphasis in all planning frameworks on sustainability (e.g. the NPPF) should lead to a system of long-term review being applied to each local plan evolution. All that CCC has done is a narrow check on the impact on acknowledged special sites of environmental importance. The have not looked at the long-term impact of their policies on the three-fold measures highlighted by the NPPF €“ social, economic, and environmental.	
1.50	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		19	Objecting	Water Supply: It appears your proposals are not environmentally sustainable.	
1.50	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	2157	Objecting	Improper objective with regards to sustainability 'supporting the growth and diversification of the local economy' This is not a definition of sustainable development, local or otherwise. Indeed it can and often will be the contrary when resources/infrastructure are at their limit. In 1.49 it is correctly stated.	Remove. Detail aspects of growth that need to be targeted to make it sustainable, for growth of itself is by definition not automatically sustainable or conducive to sustainability .
1.50	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		327	Objecting	This paragraph doesn't recognise the importance of transport impact from the NPPF despite many preceding paragraphs demonstrating that transport is a key issue in Canterbury District.	In addition to the bullet points made in this paragraph the following point from the NPPF should also be listed as one of the key elements in the local definition of sustainable development: "actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable€“
1.50	778466	Mrs Barbara Hudgell		1371	Supporting	I support the need for sustainable development and hope that the planned building will concentrate on eco- friendly housing where ever possible including ways of saving energy and water and producing energy such as installing solar panels, etc.	
1.50	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1700	Objecting	A key element is "protecting the best of the district's heritage and landscape". There is no mention or indication of who decides (or how) which are the "best" bits. Such a decision cannot possibly be left to councillors alone.	The Council must publish details of the mechanism by which they will decide which are the "best" bits, and which parts of our heritage and landscape they will NOT protect.
1.50	778738		ARJO Wiggins	1875	Supporting	We give support to these objectives and consider they give support to the allocation of the sites at Chartham Papers for residential development	
1.50	778777	Mr Nick Waldron	The Waldron Family	2034	Supporting	CCC require significant housing and economic development for local people throughout the District over the plan period and a clear statement of intent is provided in this paragraph.	
1.50	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2390	Objecting	There is no such thing as a local definition of sustainable development. The definition needs to be changed to be in line with the NPPF and ultimately with UN Resolution 42/187. Without a proper understanding of what sustainable development actually means and how it ought to be applied means there is a fundamental flaw with the current Draft Local Plan.	Sustainable development needs to be properly defined and applied in order to create a local plan that can actually achieve sustainable development.
1.50	778304	O W Presland		2605	Supporting	The economic and social objectives in chapter 1 are supported.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.50	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2938	Objecting	The NPPF (NPPF paragraph 7) says that the environmental dimension of sustainable development includes protecting and enhancing natural environment and, as part of this, helping improve biodiversity. The Council's key element of "protecting national and international wildlife sites from inappropriate development" describes only part of the ecological aspect of sustainable development.	
1.50	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3659	Objecting	Delete so no definition of sustainable development needed in addition to NPPF. Will result in confusion and conflict with NPPF. Object to watering down of definition	Delete
1.50	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3578	Objecting	Paragraph 1.50 Add additional wording to bullet point 4 in include 'and adjacent developments'. Alter bullet point 4 to state : "Seek to reduce flooding to new and adjacent developments".	Add additional wording to bullet point 4 to state : "Seek to reduce flooding to new and adjacent developments".
1.50	408497	Mr C Mills		3758	Objecting	If any plan is to be fully sustainable it must not fail at the outset. To build housing, retail and business space on Grade 1 agricultural land clearly fails any sustainability test at the first hurdle.	
1.50	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4730	Objecting	Some reference to "protecting and enhancing" the habitat network would ensure that the plan responds to the NPPF	Change the wording to make some reference to "protecting and enhancing" the habitat network
1.50	380375	Wrentham Estates		5112	Objecting	We support the approach of the Preferred Options Consultation Draft Plan proposing that one of the key elements in a local definition of sustainable development is: "Meeting the housing needs of local people, and ensuring that there is sufficient housing to support economic growth and diversification in the area€².	
1.50	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5517	Objecting	Policies and efforts to tackle traffic congestion, transportation problems and air quality issues are not mentioned in this list of what CCC regard as the key elements in a local definition of sustainable development. Why not? They are of high importance to residents in the District.	
1.50	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5650	Supporting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:- Desire to forge a local definition of Sustainability	
1.50	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5782	Objecting	The respondents object to the proposed local definition of sustainable development. It is considered imperative that this definition explicitly includes an objective which seeks to prioritise development towards previously developed land.Given the above it is considered that the following additional bullet point should be added to the local definition of sustainable development: Seek to prioritise the location of development towards previously developed land, where available.	Given the above it is considered that the following additional bullet point should be added to the local definition of sustainable development: Seek to prioritise the location of development towards previously developed land, where available.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.50	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5816	Objecting	The respondents object to the proposed local definition of sustainable development. It is considered imperative that this definition explicitly includes an objective which seeks to prioritise development towards previously developed land. Given the above it is considered that the following additional bullet point should be added to the local definition of sustainable development: Seek to prioritise the location of development towards previously developed land, where available.	Given the above it is considered that the following additional bullet point should be added to the local definition of sustainable development: Seek to prioritise the location of development towards previously developed land, where available.
1.50	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5905	Objecting	The wording of 'housing to meet local needs and to support economic growth and diversification' as the local definition of sustainable development fails to reflect NPPF Paragraph 47, which requires that LPAs should ensure that their Local Plan: 'meets the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area'. Anything less than this is likely to result in the Plan being found to be unsound.	Comply with NPPF - 'meets the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area'
1.50	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6015	Objecting	The pursuit of sustainable development should take the 'Wild Law' perspective that infers equal rights to all life forms and the eco-cycles/systems on which they all depend. 'Wild Law' calls for the conservation and restoration of eco-cycles/systems; preservation of biodiversity; and careful farming of all sources of food.	
1.50	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6336	Objecting	I object to this definition of Sustainable Development as it is too narrow and fails to acknowledge the 'limits to growth'. These limits are both environmental (eg water availability) and man-made (eg congestion). Until these limits are addressed properly, any development on a large-scale is likely to be unsustainable. The proposed development in South Canterbury is an extreme example. My answer relates to all of the proposed Strategic Development Sites.	
1.51	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2357	Objecting	Without significant changes to the proposals in the draft local plan, car use and pollution will increase, health levels worsen and climate change will be exacerbated rather than mitigated across the district. In conclusion, the draft plan as it now stands is not fit for purpose, it is not sustainable and it therefore cannot be considered sound.	
1.51	408497	Mr C Mills		3759	Objecting	If any plan is to be fully sustainable it must not fail at the outset. To build housing, retail and business space on Grade 1 agricultural land clearly fails any sustainability test at the first hurdle.	
1.51	408497	Mr C Mills		3760	Objecting	If any plan is to be fully sustainable it must not fail at the outset. To build housing, retail and business space on Grade 1 agricultural land clearly fails any sustainability test at the first hurdle.	
1.51	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3662	Objecting	Delete so no definition of sustainable development needed in addition to NPPF. Will result in confusion and conflict with NPPF. Object to watering down of definition	Delete

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.51	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3847	Objecting	The Plan has be sustainable, but in it's present form I do not believe this is possible - it is too ambitious in the current financial situation, which even the Bank of England believe will not alter greatly for some time.	
1.51	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6338	Objecting	I object to this definition of Sustainable Development as it is too narrow and fails to acknowledge the 'limits to growth'. These limits are both environmental (eg water availability) and man-made (eg congestion). Until these limits are addressed properly, any development on a large-scale is likely to be unsustainable. The proposed development in South Canterbury is an extreme example. My answer relates to all of the proposed Strategic Development Sites.	
1.52	408497	Mr C Mills		3761	Objecting	If any plan is to be fully sustainable it must not fail at the outset. To build housing, retail and business space on Grade 1 agricultural land clearly fails any sustainability test at the first hurdle.	
1.52	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3663	Objecting	Delete so no definition of sustainable development needed in addition to NPPF. Will result in confusion and conflict with NPPF. Object to watering down of definition	Delete
1.52	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6340	Objecting	I object to this definition of Sustainable Development as it is too narrow and fails to acknowledge the 'limits to growth'. These limits are both environmental (eg water availability) and man-made (eg congestion). Until these limits are addressed properly, any development on a large-scale is likely to be unsustainable. The proposed development in South Canterbury is an extreme example. My answer relates to all of the proposed Strategic Development Sites.	
1.53	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		328	Objecting	This paragraph does not identify that the council will work with applicants to proactively achieve transport objectives.	Reword the first sentence of this policy to: "The Council will always work proactively with applicants to find solutions, which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves economic, social, environmental, and transport conditions in the area."
1.53	408497	Mr C Mills		3762	Objecting	If any plan is to be fully sustainable it must not fail at the outset. To build housing, retail and business space on Grade 1 agricultural land clearly fails any sustainability test at the first hurdle.	
1.53	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3664	Objecting	Delete so no definition of sustainable development needed in addition to NPPF. Will result in confusion and conflict with NPPF. Object to watering down of definition.	Delete
1.53	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6341	Objecting	I object to this definition of Sustainable Development as it is too narrow and fails to acknowledge the 'limits to growth'. These limits are both environmental (eg water availability) and man-made (eg congestion). Until these limits are addressed properly, any development on a large-scale is likely to be unsustainable. The proposed development in South Canterbury is an extreme example. My answer relates to all of the proposed Strategic Development Sites.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP1	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		421	Supporting	We support the presumption in favour of sustainable development which accords with the NPPF. It is also consistent with an up to date Plan-led approach where planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. (Sec 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).	
Policy SP1	777517	Mr Keith Groombridge	Barham Court Farms	1400	Objecting	There is inadequate justification for departing from the model policy.	Include the omitted text from the CLG Model Policy including a commitment to work proactively with applicants to find solutions and improve the economic social and environmental conditions in the area.
Policy SP1	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		909	Objecting	POLICY SP1: Sustainable Development - The previous local Plan placed huge emphasis on developing brownfield sites as opposed to green field sites. There is no reference at all in this plan to brownfield sites, not even one mention of the word 'brownfield'. There remain a number of brownfield sites in the District, including the former Chislet Colliery site at Hersden which is some 50 acres.	
Policy SP1	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1202	Supporting	We support this policy, provided that full and equal weight is given to the word 'sustainable' as well as 'development'. We agree that this approach should be applied to proposals for new development, and that such proposals should be rejected if they are inconsistent with the principles of sustainability in the plan, including the policies for transport and for the environment.	
Policy SP1	778387	Mr David Smith		1344	Supporting	I fully support the principle that planning decisions should only be made on the basis of the policies in force in the Local Plan.	
Policy SP1	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1722	Supporting	The KDAONB would like to draw the CCC attention to para 14 Footnotes 9 and 10 of the NPPF. Footnote 9 relates to the nationally designated AONBs and footnote 10 relates to material considerations. The Kent Downs AONB management plan is a material consideration. The KDAONB and others interpret the presumption in favour in the following way in relation to AONBs this is set out in our detailed comment.	
Policy SP1	13739	Mrs Christobel Seath	Clerk Bridge Parish Council	1911	Objecting	Bridge is developing its own Neighbourhood Plan and has been very disappointed by the lack of liaison and support it has received from the City Council so far. It is very regrettable that neither Bridge Parish Council nor the Neighbourhood Plan Committee were consulted during the preparation and drafting of the CDLP. It is hoped that in future both the CDLP and Bridge Neighbourhood Plan can be developed in co-operation with each other, as the Localism Act requires.	
Policy SP1	778738		ARJO Wiggins	1878	Supporting	We consider that the support for sustainable developments lends support to the allocation of these sites for residential development	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP1	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1844	Supporting	These objectives derive from the NPPF central to which is the recognition that economic considerations are also an important component of the "sustainability equation" and that it is important to increase the nations and individual districts competitive position. This has been reflected in the emerging Local Plan.	
Policy SP1	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1917	Supporting	Support this policy, provided that full and equal weight is given to the word 'sustainable' and 'development'. Agree that this approach should be applied to proposals for new development, and that such proposals should be rejected if they are inconsistent with the principles of sustainability, including the policies for transport and for the environment. Policies SP2, on new development, and SP3a, on the proposed site for new development in South Canterbury, should be rejected on these grounds.	
Policy SP1	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2189	Supporting	We support this policy, provided that full and equal weight is given to the word 'sustainable' as well as 'development'. We agree that this approach should be applied to proposals for new development, and that such proposals should be rejected if they are inconsistent with the principles of sustainability in the plan, including the policies for transport and for the environment.	
Policy SP1	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3013	Objecting	We welcome the criteria included within SP1 to ensure the proposals are acceptable in the light of any appropriate assessment required under the Habitats Directive and the clauses within paragraph 150 to protect landscapes and national and international sites.	However to ensure that development is truly sustainable in terms of the protection of the natural environment we recommend that the changes below are incorporated into the list contained within paragraph 150 protecting the best of the district's heritage, ecology and landscape; Protecting local national and international wildlife sites, and habitats of principal importance from inappropriate development.
Policy SP1	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2939	Objecting	Policy SP1 is internally inconsistent, referring in the first sentence to the NPPF presumption of sustainable development, but in the third sentence referring to the sustainable development strategy in the draft Local Plan. This does not give developers certainty as to the meaning of sustainable development.	
Policy SP1	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3061	Objecting	LANRA made it clear that if any plan is to be fully sustainable it must not fail at the outset. To build housing, retail and business space on Grade 1 agricultural land fails sustainability tests. The land is part of the historic setting and provides food. A lack of reference to brownfield sites. Can't take Council seriously because they say Chislet Colliery is a greenfield site and refuse to include it and have down played Howe Barracks.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP1	780486	Commerical Land		3361	Objecting	We agree with the Council's inclusion of a policy that supports development proposals where these will meet the requirements of sustainable development. However, we would suggest that Draft Policy SP1 is amended to include a fuller description of the three dimensions of sustainable development as set out at Paragraph 7 of the NPPF.	We would suggest that Draft Policy SP1 is amended to include a fuller description of the three dimensions of sustainable development as set out at Paragraph 7 of the NPPF. This will ensure greater clarity in the requirement to balance a consideration of economic, social and environmental factors when pursuing sustainable development.
Policy SP1	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3237	Objecting	In the NPPF 2012 the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' specifically excludes sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives, SSSIs where "specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted" (NPPF 2012, para 14, and footnote 9). Therefore to bring the policy in line with the NPPF 2012 and the Habitats Regulations 2010 we recommend the following text is added to the policy:	"Development proposals on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments) will only be permitted where the benefits of the development, at this site, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest. - Development proposals on land where a project has a likely significant effect on a European site (alone or in combination), will only be permitted where appropriate assessment concludes that the project will not adversely affect the integrity of the European site, or where no less ecologically damaging alternative solutions exist and there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest which justify damage and proper compensatory measures can be secured".
Policy SP1	780801	Jo Fox	Head of Primary Care Estates NHS	3636	Supporting	In addition to medical facilities, the NHS would support the development of sustainable communities. I acknowledge the Councils commitment to this agenda.	
Policy SP1	408497	Mr C Mills		3764	Objecting	To build housing, retail and business space on Grade 1 agricultural land clearly fails any sustainability test at the first hurdle.	
Policy SP1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3668	Objecting	Object to the inclusion of a sustainability policy in the plan as it contradicts the NPPF the plan can not be made sound or compliant by one policy. Also it is contrary to the principle of localism. Do not like the section on presumption in favour of sustainable development. Sustainable development should be provided in a integrated and balanced way.	Delete policy
Policy SP1	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4409	Supporting	DIO supports the principles in this policy.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP1	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4555	Supporting	I support this policy, provided that the focus is on 'sustainable'. I agree that this approach should be applied to proposals for new development, and that such proposals should be rejected if they are inconsistent with the principles of sustainability in the plan, including the policies for transport and for the environment. I believe that policies SP2, on new development, and SP3a, on the proposed site for new development in South Canterbury, should be rejected on these grounds.	
Policy SP1	782028	Terrace Hill		4929	Supporting	Terrace Hill supports the principle of taking a positive approach to development proposals, to reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development as established in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	
Policy SP1	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5506	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'Localism'. This includes the willingness to work with Neighbourhood Plans as well as the commitment to meeting current needs and working with the community.	
Policy SP1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5518	Objecting	Inconsistency here as this DLP would not meet the qualifications or pass the criteria set out here! Change required: a Statement saying that the Council will commit itself to the same standards and criteria.	
Policy SP1	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5906	Objecting	Policy should reflect wording of the NPPF, no justification for departing from the standard wording. It risks the Plan being found inconsistent with NPPF, which sets out approach to decision-taking (14, 186 - 198). Presumption in favour of sustainable development, no provision for declining proposals that undermine the strategy for sustainable development in the Plan. It is unclear exactly what this means and it is a deviation from NPPF para 14.	Policy SP1 should reflect the wording of the standard NPPF compliant policy approach.
Policy SP1	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	5991	Supporting	We support this policy, provided that full and equal weight is given to the word 'sustainable' as well as 'development'. We agree that this approach should be applied to proposals for new development, and that such proposals should be rejected if they are inconsistent with the principles of sustainability in the plan, including the policies for transport and for the environment. We believe that policies SP2, on new development, and SP3a (South Canterbury) should be rejected on these grounds.	
Policy SP1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5984	Objecting	Neighbourhood Plans. As the Council was aware that not all neighbourhoods had plans and policies under the NPPF guidelines, which would form the basis of this Draft Local Plan then urgent steps should have been taken by Canterbury Council to assist areas without these safeguards. Without this approach there was inequality in the District, leaving some neighbourhoods more vulnerable than others. Neighbourhood plans do not exist for the 3 villages in the Sturry Parish. Is this democratic?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP1	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6894	Supporting	Support in principle. Whilst in support we regret that no reference is made to seeking to use Brownfield sites. The sustainability of existing settlements must be considered as well as that of any of the new settlements. See General Statement above.	Incorporate aspiration to use Brownfield wherever possible, and acknowledge that improvement to sustainability of existing sites should be factored in as well as commitment to ensuring sustainability of new sites.
1.54	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		73	Supporting	Yes! to the sentence: "...significant additional provision of open space...."	
1.54	665473	Dr Richard Norman		518	Objecting	The case for an increase above the historic level of development has not been made. It is incompatible with the commitment to sustainability, and incompatible with the commitments to reduce traffic congestion and protect the environment and open space.	A level of development at the historic level, roughly between 500 and 600 new dwellings a year, would be sufficient to meet demand and to support the predicted level of employment. It would be realistically achievable, and would be in accordance with the wishes of local people, most of whom would support a level of development at no more than 550 new dwellings a year.
1.54	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1203	Objecting	We do not agree that there needs to be a significant increase above the historic level of development in the area. The continuation of previous levels of development would be sufficient to meet predicted levels of employment. The aim of meeting the need for more affordable and low-cost housing can be met without going beyond historic levels	The continuation of historical levels of development, at between 500 and 600 new dwellings a year. The policy should also take better account of paragraphs 1.35 and 2.71-2.74 and of policy HD7. Targets for new housing development should reflect the need to make better use of the existing housing stock, by limiting further concentrations of HMOs and by encouraging more purpose-built student accommodation to take the pressure off family housing. A necessary first step would be a serious attempt to obtain reliable data on the number of HMOs in the district, and this should be followed by serious negotiations with the universities about capping student numbers and about providing more purpose-built student accommodation. The proposed figure for the scale of new development at present makes no reference to these factors.
1.54	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1303	Objecting	The Council has produced no evidence to support its belief that the city needs an additional 15,000 houses to ensure the economic growth desired. It looks like this number of houses has been chosen to make up a shortfall in its revenue.	I should like to see a housing policy based on real evidence of economic growth.
1.54	778466	Mrs Barbara Hudgell		1345	Objecting	I feel the amount of building envisaged in the future is too large to make it sustainable and will eventually have a detrimental affect on the area. The area is not suitable to increase the building and population by too large an amount without putting a strain on resources and adding to pollution and traffic problems that already exist.	To limit the amount of development to make it more sustainable for the area.
1.54	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1611	Objecting	There is no support for this from the local residents. Ref. MORI Poll.	Listen to the poll and interpret it correctly. The council may have an aspiration but do not use polls to justify it when they say the opposite.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.54	778754	Mrs Patricia Smith		1581	Objecting	The number of new homes proposed is too high and should remain at the level of the South East Plan. Large sites are inappropriate in an historic city and smaller developments throughout the three town would allow growth to be managed according to local need. People want to live in Canterbury precisely because it is small, so building vast estates will destroy the way of life for current residents.	Reduce the number of new homes proposed to the level suggested in the South East Plan and spread the developments across the three towns of Canterbury, Herne Bay and Whitstable.
1.54	779227	Mr Paul Uden		1751	Objecting	The long term annual allocation of housing within the plan is arbitrary, unrealistic and overly aggressive. Building on this scale will have a dramatic effect on the local community in South Canterbury. The disruption and uncertainty over the development will last for a generation. There is no justification for the Council's claim that an increased rate of house building (50% higher than the average for SE England) is necessary because the planning inspector will reject it as being too low.	
1.54	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1845	Supporting	The scale of development is justified by the evidence base built up over the past 7 years since adoption of the Canterbury Local Plan including the Experian study work and the NLP "Development Requirements" study in 2006.	
1.54	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1919	Objecting	There does not need to be a significant increase above the historic level of development in the area. The continuation of previous levels would be sufficient to meet predicted levels of employment, and there is no evidence that an increased would generate greater economic growth or any long-term increase in employment opportunities. The aim of providing more affordable and low-cost housing can be met without going beyond historic levels of development, provided the right priorities are in place.	The continuation of historical levels of development, at between 500 and 600 new dwellings a year. The policy should also take better account of paragraphs 1.35 and 2.71-2.74 and of policy HD7. Targets for new housing development should reflect the need to make better use of the existing housing stock, by limiting further concentrations of HMOs and by encouraging more purpose-built student accommodation to take the pressure off family housing. A necessary first step would be a serious attempt to obtain reliable data on the number of HMOs in the district, and this should be followed by serious negotiations with the universities about capping student numbers and about providing more purpose-built student accommodation. The proposed figure for the scale of new development at present makes no reference to these factors.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.54	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2190	Objecting	We do not agree that there needs to be a significant increase above the historic level of development in the area. The continuation of previous levels of development would be sufficient to meet predicted levels of employment, and there is no evidence that an increased level of development would generate greater economic growth or any long-term increase in employment opportunities.	The continuation of historical levels of development, at between 500 and 600 new dwellings a year. The policy should also take better account of paragraphs 1.35 and 2.71-2.74 and of policy HD7. Targets for new housing development should reflect the need to make better use of the existing housing stock, by limiting further concentrations of HMOs and by encouraging more purpose-built student accommodation to take the pressure off family housing. A necessary first step would be a serious attempt to obtain reliable data on the number of HMOs in the district, and this should be followed by serious negotiations with the universities about capping student numbers and about providing more purpose-built student accommodation. The proposed figure for the scale of new development at present makes no reference to these factors.
1.54	778777	Mr Nick Waldron	The Waldron Family	2038	Supporting	CCC requires significant housing and economic development for local people throughout the District over the plan period and a clear statement of intent is provided in this paragraph	
1.54	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2244	Objecting	In order to meet the objectives of the Council it is recognised in the plan that there will need to be a significant increase in the scale of development historically achieved for both housing and employment (para 1.54). The Company welcomes and supports this position as the previous level of planned housing provision in the South East Plan (at 510 dpa Table H1b) is not considered adequate to meet upto date requirements.	
1.54	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2570	Objecting	I disagree with the councils "vision"which includes the desire to build at a far higher rate than they have historically. Most residents (Ref. MORI Poll) want the same building rate or less.	
1.54	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3062	Objecting	Disagree with Council's vision especially building at a far higher rate. The 70000m2 employment space at South Canterbury is unrealistic, uncosted and undeliverable. At a public meeting the Leader and Officers were unable to convince us that any real work had been done on testing the hypothesis. It will never happen. It is a fig leaf to cover its justification for the housing development.	
1.54	776051	Mr Rick Strange		3269	Objecting	CCC have failed to mention that ccc have failed to mention or explain that the New Homes Bonus (NHB) lies at the very heart of the local plan. The building of houses has nothing to do with local requirements, population increase or new business in an area. It is based on the greed of local council's and 'cattle prod like' inducement from centre government. NHB induces local council's to build far more houses than necessary. The 750 houses a year will destroy everything canterbury stands for.	
1.54	404737	Mr Richard Guest		3825	Objecting	Scale of new development Para 1.54 €" 1.55: I disagree with the councils "vision"which includes the desire to build at a far higher rate than they have historically. Most residents (Ref. MORI Poll) want the same building rate or less.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.54	408497	Mr C Mills		3766	Objecting	I fundamentally disagree with the council's 'vision' which is alluded to here. This includes the desire to build at a far higher rate than they have historically. Employment space of 70,000 sqm proposed in South Canterbury it seems to I to be unrealistic, uncosted and ultimately undeliverable.	
1.54	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3687	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent object to the scale of new development proposed, as we explain in detail in Part 1 of our response.	
1.54	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4556	Objecting	No need for a significant increase above the historic level of development. Nathaniel Lichfield or CCC haven't shown that a higher housing target would generate economic growth. The development is driven by the pursuit of central government funding. Previous levels of development would be sufficient to meet employment needs. Affordable and low-cost housing can be provided without going beyond historic levels of development 500-600 dwellings/yr. Take account of plan policies. Cap student numbers.	The continuation of historical levels of development, at between 500 and 600 new dwellings a year. Take better account of paragraphs 1.35 and 2.71-2.74 and of policy HD7. Make better use of the existing housing stock, limit further concentrations of HMOs, encourage more purpose-built student accommodation. Obtain reliable data on the number of HMOs in the district, negotiate a cap on student numbers and about provide more purpose-built student accommodation. The proposed figure for the scale of new development at present makes no reference to these factors.
1.54	380375	Wrentham Estates		5113	Objecting	We also support the approach set out in Paragraph 1.54 that: "To implement the Council's Vision for the area, there will need to be a significant increase above the historic level of development in the area, for both housing and employment space.€"	
1.54	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5519	Objecting	The Green Infrastructure Strategy is still awaited though this paragraph gives the false impression that it is currently available!	
1.54	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5520	Objecting	The scale of acceptable development is crucial! It is admitted that the chosen scale is driven by the Council's vision which envisages and demands a significant increase in historic and present levels of development! Is that sustainable? Questioning of that vision (and the underlying premise that our well-being relies on its fulfilment) has big implications for this and the subsequent section of the DLP.	
1.54	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5785	Supporting	The respondents support the implementation of Council's vision for the area and the acknowledgement that as a result there will need to be a significant increase in development and in the provision of open space. The assessment of local housing markets and the associated increase in housing requirements over and above the old South East plan targets is particularly welcomed and demonstrates that a robust approach has been taken to housing supply.	
1.54	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5817	Supporting	The respondents support the implementation of Council's vision for the area and the acknowledgement that as a result there will need to be a significant increase in development and in the provision of open space. The assessment of local housing markets and the associated increase in housing requirements over and above the old South East plan targets is particularly welcomed and demonstrates that a robust approach has been taken to housing supply.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.54	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5910	Objecting	LOCAL' need means different things to different people. To the Council it probably always means the District of Canterbury, to a 'local' resident it means their immediate neighbourhood/community. Was this differentiation made clear to people responding to the IPSOS MORI poll?	In the Plan, the projections for LOCAL housing need to be clearly defined. Show this clearly and separately from the estimated requirement for economic growth and road infrastructure funding, with the local housing need target for each neighbourhood clearly identified for each site location with the proposed mix of house type indicated as well.
1.54	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	5992	Objecting	We do not agree that there needs to be 780 properties built a year, which is a significant increase above the historic level of development (510 per year). The previous levels of development would be sufficient to meet predicted levels of employment. There is no evidence that an increased level of development would generate greater economic growth or increase in employment opportunities. Meeting the need for more affordable housing can be met without going beyond historic levels of development.	The continuation of historical levels of development, at between 500 and 600 new dwellings a year. The policy should also take better account of paragraphs 1.35 and 2.71-2.74 and of policy HD7. Targets for new housing development should reflect the need to make better use of the existing housing stock, by limiting further concentrations of HMOs and by encouraging more purpose-built student accommodation to take the pressure off family housing. A necessary first step would be a serious attempt to obtain reliable data on the number of HMOs in the district, and this should be followed by serious negotiations with the universities about capping student numbers and about providing more purpose-built student accommodation. The proposed figure for the scale of new development at present makes no reference to these factors. The policy should also take into account making use of vacant properties, including industrial and business, and areas where planning has been agreed but not progressed. For example there is planning permission for 3 hotels in Canterbury, but none have progressed and no more should be agreed until others are developed.
1.54	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5995	Objecting	The scale of development for many people is unacceptable and unproven. For acceptance more information is needed (*Survey 'Sturry Residents Together')	
1.54	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5985	Objecting	The reference to the fact that the scale of development is also needed to fund infrastructure appears to have been omitted. Surely an oversight?	
1.54	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6343	Objecting	I object to these paragraphs. Comment: I object to the scale of new development proposed as I think it is totally unsustainable for the district and based on flawed transport data. The aim to provide more affordable and low-cost housing should, as a matter of priority, be achieved by developing more purpose-built student accommodation and bringing family homes which are now let out to students back into the general housing stock.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.54	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6433	Objecting	We do not share Council's conviction that historic level of development in needs to be raised. Predicted levels of employment can be addressed by maintaining that level. We have seen no convincing evidence of a causal link between increased development and greater economic growth or any legacy of lasting increase in job opportunities. Much of the cost of new construction goes literally to bricks and mortar. According to one US study (by Heidi Garrett-Peltier) only 28% of this is labour.	1. Sticking to historical levels of development of no more than 550 new dwellings a year, called for by local public opinion expressed in the Ipsos MORI Survey and the Canterbury Society's Residents' Vision document. 2. Implementing the Council's 2012 Housing Strategy (1.35) which will help to achieve this. 3. We also see the need for smarter use of the housing we already have. 4. We welcome Policy HD6. On our Barton estate younger families are moving in and so far there is only a handful of recently converted student HMOs. However we need firm action to make this the case right across Canterbury in areas where communities are under stress. There is no reference to the actual number of HMOs in the District. This must be addressed. 5. Student numbers have recently fallen off a little but this could change. More student rooms are being built by the universities but this must increase. As in Oxford the HE Sector must be persuaded to do much more to ease pressure on the housing stock by this means and by limiting student admissions. 6. Don Foster, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government, responsible for building regulations, housing, climate change and sustainable development, has recently confirmed the DCLG's published guidance https://www.gov.uk/definitions-of-general-housing-terms that all student accommodation, on or off campus, can now be included toward the housing provision figure in Local Plans. The Council have refused to take this into account when calculating the number of housing units to be provided in this Plan resulting
1.54	476233	Mrs Catherine Cantwell		6719	Objecting	The most problematic point is the entirely unjustified statement of vision on p.18: "a significant increase above the historic level of development in the area, both housing and employment space." This entirely contradicts all the positive stated aims, and necessarily undermines them.	
1.54	784489	Dr Robert Mayer		6953	Objecting	Obj to basic premise that there needs to be a significant increase in development. Suitable for Ashford but destructive for Canterbury should not become industrial hub as will harm tourism. More housing = more jobs is unrealistic. Closure of physics and sciences courses at UKC no longer provides hook for high tech industries. Forget social engineering for purpose of retaining technical graduates. more reliable would be expansion in agricultural/ horticultural college given demise of Wye.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.55	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1268	Objecting	We do not agree with the first statement that there needs to be a significant increase of development above the historical levels in the area. We support development at current levels, with emphasis on providing homes and land for job creation which complement each other.	Make better use of existing housing stock, as well as redundant retail accommodation. Encourage the Universities to provide purpose built accommodation relative to the number of students they accept. Serious discussions should take place with the Universities to cap student numbers. There are serious concerns that the numbers of students in Canterbury are likely to overtake the core resident group, which will become seriously destabilising. Provide encouragement to student landlords to rent their housing stock, as appropriate, to families or single people.
1.55	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1277	Objecting	We do not agree with the first statement that there needs to be a significant increase of development above the historical levels in the area. We support development at current levels, with emphasis on providing homes and land for job creation which complement each other.	Make better use of existing housing stock, as well as redundant retail accommodation. Encourage the Universities to provide purpose built accommodation relative to the number of students they accept. Serious discussions should take place with the Universities to cap student numbers. There are serious concerns that the numbers of students in Canterbury are likely to overtake the core resident group, which will become seriously destabilising. Provide encouragement to student landlords to rent their housing stock, as appropriate, to families or single people.
1.55	408497	Mr C Mills		3768	Objecting	I fundamentally disagree with the council's 'vision' which is alluded to here. This includes the desire to build at a far higher rate than they have historically. Employment space of 70,000 sqm proposed in South Canterbury it seems to I to be unrealistic, uncostered and ultimately undeliverable.	
1.55	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3688	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent object to the scale of new development proposed, as we explain in detail in Part 1 of our response.	
1.55	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5522	Objecting	Other factors, such as the preservation of the environmental character of the District and ease of movement into and out of Canterbury also affect our well-being. Given the geographical and other constraints and the difficulties we already face, a much greater weighting should be given to the economic, social and environmental aspects of sustainability.	
1.55	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6345	Objecting	I object to these paragraphs. Comment: I object to the scale of new development proposed as I think it is totally unsustainable for the district and based on flawed transport data. The aim to provide more affordable and low-cost housing should, as a matter of priority, be achieved by developing more purpose-built student accommodation and bringing family homes which are now let out to students back into the general housing stock.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	408032	Mr Stephen Metherell		38	Objecting	The figures for new houses are staggering. Where do they come from? What are they based on? Inadequate consideration given to employment (where are the employment opportunities), infrastructure (there has been no sign of amelioration at Canterbury), utilities (we are boarderline for water and I have doubts over other utilities).	It is important to go back to the basic questions of: How many new houses do we REALLY need?, what are they needed for? - If the numbers and purposes are very clearly defined, are our plans really siting the new houses in the most appropriate geographical areas? If we think that they are, are the resources, infrastructure, utilities capable of supporting them? What are our long term plans for infrastructure, etc that will make future development of the city and its surrounds possible
Policy SP2	766790	M Hogben		60	Objecting	The proposal, especially huge numbers of houses at south Canterbury is not logical. The consequences of doing nothing would make the traffic situation very much worse. Long needed long term infrastructure must be provided. Over 10000 houses leads to between 15000 and 20000 cars, buses and heavy transport on the already cogested and oplluted roads. This, together with housing in other areasm will make pollution intolerable.	Long needed long term infrastructure must be provided, including a complete ringroad around canterbury. Abandon the proposal if finance is not available for the whole infrastructure to be completed and the housing built elsewhere, perhaps Asford or Medway.
Policy SP2	766797	Miss L Dowle		109	Objecting	I am of the understanding that the Canterbury district is already ahead of its targets for housing development for now and the foreseeable future. It has been brought to my attention that within the Canterbury district there are already many thousands of vacant properties, surely the council would be better advised to bring these back into the housing stock, thus eliminating the need for development. Therefore there is no need for this development.	
Policy SP2	767812	Mrs C Johnstone		126	Objecting	Object to whole plan as services can not cope and there are too many people in east kent already. Keep farmland and greenfields as we are loosing the ability to feed ourselves.	Restrict development to brownfield land only and limit scale. The area is far too over populated to be able to take any more.
Policy SP2	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	147	Objecting	In conclusion, the draft Local Plan proposes a level of house building significantly in excess of the current rate which in turn is already significantly in excess of the south east rate. There is no proven correlation between levels of house building and economic development so there is no proof that this level of build would bring greater wellbeing. Indeed, the accompanying congestion and loss of green field land is likely to have severely detrimental effects	A level of build at, or close to, the existing level is recommended.
Policy SP2	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		422	Supporting	The Table in Policy SP2 sets out the land allocations required to meet the Districts development needs over the plan period.The Strategic Site Allocations proposed in this Plan accord with the Councils evidence base and forms a positive, justified and effective strategy which will help it meet its objectively assessed development needs consistant with the test of soundness set out in paragraph 182 of the NPPF.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	422109	Ms Ann Parkin		189	Objecting	The very significant increase in traffic would place intolerable demands on existing roads. The Old Dover Road and New Dover Road cannot cope with the present level of traffic at peak times. Development of the County Cricket Ground has already added to the traffic congestion. There will still be a great increase in the use of existing road structures and any road development into the city would be very expensive and likely to involve loss of existing houses.	
Policy SP2	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	212	Objecting	The sheer scale of the proposed housing development is quite staggering. For all the Plan pledges to protect wildlife, the natural environment, rural lanes, etc., it is bound to have a negative impact on the lives of people living in the locality in terms of increased traffic congestion (and consequent pollution), further loss of green and open spaces and greater urbanisation of what is still a relatively rural part of East Kent.	
Policy SP2	772200	Solihin Garrard		244	Objecting	I am concerned about the proposed levels of house building, especially, but not only, in the South Canterbury area. There is empty housing available for ungrading. It is unaccompanied by an uncredible infrastructure scheme. The Councils strategy for transport infrastructure will not resolve transport and air quality issues. More action on water supply is required. There is no mention of provision of future health provision. Significant lack of strategic planning, development plan impractical.	
Policy SP2	772987	Mrs Doreen Louren		308	Objecting	Central Government funding may make these schemes financially attractive in the short term but if the infrastructure requirements were addressed they would show that the money would not even meet this immediate expenditure, let alone environmental costs.	
Policy SP2	772987	Mrs Doreen Louren		316	Objecting	The Council consulted with Nathaniel Lichfield to satisfy its objectives for the plan. It has chosen to ignore NLP's recommendations of 600-700 dwellings p.a by calling for an average of 800 houses p.a. The Council also commissioned MORI to conduct an opinion poll, which demonstrated that a majority of those questioned thought a maximum of 550 houses p.a. desirable. The Canterbury Society's 'Vision for Canterbury' supports this figure as being sufficient for present and future needs.	
Policy SP2	773146	Dr Peter Thomas		263	Supporting	I entirely accept the need to substantially increase the overall supply of housing within the district over the timescale to which the Draft Plan relates.	
Policy SP2	411787	Mr & Mrs David and Melanie Boorman		743	Objecting	I am concerned at the proposed number of houses to be built within the small confines of Canterbury. We already have poor air quality in many areas of the city. Traffic congestion will be increased, the recent problems with St Dunstons has highlighted this. Roads are poorly maintained at present extra traffic will not help. Water supplies are in short supply and public services are stretched to the limits.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	665473	Dr Richard Norman		519	Objecting	The case for development at this level has not been made, and is inconsistent with the commitment to sustainability and with the policies on protection of the environment and open space in the draft Plan.	A level of development between 500 and 600 new dwellings a year, adding up to about 10,000 over the 20 year period, would be sufficient to meet demand and support the predicted level of employment. It would be realistically achievable and would be in keeping with the wishes of local people as revealed in the Ipsos-Mori survey.
Policy SP2	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	746	Objecting	Proposed housing requirement of 15,600 dwellings between 2011-2031 or 780 dpa is not adequate to address need identified by SHMA. Although development requirements study complements the SHMA, the SHMA is the most appropriate way to explore the requirement because it will draw upon other data sources to quantify scale of need (such as affordability, overcrowding, homelessness etc), not just projections.	On the basis of the evidence available in the SHMA the Council should be considering a housing requirement of at least 1100 dwellings per year. This may need to be increased to account for the employment amitions of the plan. Scenarios I and J of the Development Requirements Study provide more accurate and objective assessments of need than than scenario E, the 'futures preferred scenario'. If the Council does not expect to be able to address the full scale of needs indicated by the SHMA or the demographic scenarios I and J within its district then the Council must explain through its plan how it intends for these to be addressed elsewhere. This is test of soundness of the plan (paragraph 182 of the NPPF).
Policy SP2	776445	Dr Grainne Evans		627	Objecting	Object to the scale of new development as outlined in the Draft Local Plan. Suggests that the proposals would adversely affect individual quality of life and the environment.	
Policy SP2	366511	Mr Tony Couperthwaite		803	Objecting	The proposed increased rate of house building in the district is not justified. The district is 50% higher already than the average for south eastern England and the south east of England is higher than the rest of the country!	
Policy SP2	776051	Mr Rick Strange		844	Objecting	Where did CCC obtain the figures of the population expansion for the Canterbury area that they say requires the building of 9616 houses in the next 18 years. Data and projections are totally artificial figures to justify building. Population increases set out are ridiculous. Housing requirement over-estimated by 50%. Are figures based on people moving from London or illegal immigration? Natural population growth would easily be accommodated by housing numbers already in the planning process.	To uphold their figures, the CCC need to demonstrate quite clearly exactly where they expect this vast hoard of new people to come from. As most of the new building is to be in and around Canterbury City, an area which currently has a population of 50,000 approx, it would appear that the CCC is expecting a population increase in Canterbury City and the immediately surrounding villages (Sturry, Bridge etc) of well over 50%. This is quite ridiculous, as it would be a population explosion not yet seen anywhere in the world.
Policy SP2	776051	Mr Rick Strange		857	Objecting	In their Local Plan, the preferred option is for 780 houses to be built per year for 18 yrs as this will generate 6,500 jobs. With average density occupation 33,274 people would need to share the 6500 jobs. What will the remaining 26,774 people do? Of course 9,906 of this will be children, but that still leaves 16,868 people without any work. If CCC thinks that these people will commute outside the area to find work, then something v. serious would need to be done to the entire transport system.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	776757	Mr Adrian Fox	Policy and Projects Manager Dover District Council	731	Objecting	In terms of the level of housing and employment development you will be aware that as part of Dover District Council's Land Allocations Local Plan (which is due to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for Examination in early August) we have revised our own economic forecasting. We would, therefore, like to be assured and demonstrated by evidence that the proposed level of growth will not undermine Dover District's Adopted Core Strategy. Until this has been demonstrated it is difficult a	We would like to be assured and demonstrated by evidence that the proposed level of growth will not undermine Dover District's Adopted Core Strategy.
Policy SP2	777517	Mr Keith Groombridge	Barham Court Farms	1402	Objecting	We object to Policy SP2 which includes phasing and fails to boost significantly the supply of housing.	Omit phasing and commit to a MINIMUM of 15,600 housing units over the plan period to 2031.
Policy SP2	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		911	Objecting	POLICY SP2: I object to the proposed housing numbers for 2016-2031 (840 unit's pa). This is an increase of 64.1% over the South East Plan level (510 unit's pa), My reasons for objecting include: The majority of people in the District (61%) support the South East Plan level of 510 units or a lower level. The justification for this very large increase is to support economic growth. Yet there is no evidence that economic growth is being held back by the lack of labour. Th	
Policy SP2	777424	Mrs & Mrs Edmed		850	Objecting	Object to the development requirements as set out in the draft Local Plan.	
Policy SP2	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		924	Objecting	50,000 sq m new "comparison shopping" (as opposed to convenience shopping) retail space is set aside for Canterbury and 3,250 for Whitstable. Zero of either kind is set aside for Herne Bay. Yet CCC keeps telling us that 70p in Henre bay's retail pound is already spent outside the town. The plan will make that worse - we will have 12,000-15,000 more people; the current inadequate shopping mix; and no new retail provosion. This will add to the need to drive out of the town to shop.	a proper retail strategy for Herne Bay that recognises that residents already levae the town to shop elsewhere and that our tiny supermarkets and shopping centre do not meet local demand now.
Policy SP2	778048	Mr Stuart Read		1079	Objecting	Unconvinced of the need for the housing numbers proposed.	
Policy SP2	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1204	Objecting	The proposed level of development, adding up to 15,600 new dwellings in the 20-year period 2011-2031, is not justified by projections for employment and the local economy. The Nathaniel Lichfield Report forecasts a 4.7% growth in employment, which would amount to about 4,500 new jobs in the period of the Plan. 15,600 new dwellings would represent three for every new job - far more than could conceivably be needed.	A target of between 500 and 600 new dwellings per year over the 20-year period would be consistent with the economic and employment projections for the period; would be realistic in the light of historic levels of about 545 per year; would be in keeping with local support for a target of 550 a year or lower; would require less building on greenfield sites and would create less traffic congestion; would coincide with the proposal in the Canterbury Society's Vision for Canterbury for a target of about 550 per year.
Policy SP2	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1440	Objecting	Student demand for private rented accommodation reduces the availability of family homes and alters character of neighbourhoods. Inflationary pressure on rents and house prices. UKC is increasing campus units and CCCU are epaning halls of residence. Has this been taken into acount in forecasts? How many more houses could be released by agresive programmes on the part of universities?	Houses 'redeemed' from students should be treated as deductions from the new dwellings requirement.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1272	Objecting	The proposal to build up to 15.600 new homes in the period of the plan is not supported by projections for employment. No evidence has been produced to support the contention that more homes will create jobs by itself. During a period of economic growth, the district was building about 550 homes per year, and local evidence suggests that difficulties were experienced even then in selling all of those properties.	Maintain a target of building between 500 to 600 houses pa. over the period of the plan. This would be consistent with economic and employment projections. It would be in line with public support, (see the Canterbury Society's 'Vision for Canterbury), and require less building on greenfield sites.
Policy SP2	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1273	Objecting	The proposal to build up to 15.600 new homes in the period of the plan is not supported by projections for employment. No evidence has been produced to support the contention that more homes will create jobs by itself. During a period of economic growth, the district was building about 550 homes per year, and local evidence suggests that difficulties were experienced even then in selling all of those properties.	Maintain a target of building between 500 to 600 houses pa. over the period of the plan. This would be consistent with economic and employment projections. It would be in line with public support, (see the Canterbury Society's 'Vision for Canterbury), and require less building on greenfield sites.
Policy SP2	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1274	Objecting	The proposal to build up to 15.600 new homes in the period of the plan is not supported by projections for employment. No evidence has been produced to support the contention that more homes will create jobs by itself. During a period of economic growth, the district was building about 550 homes per year, and local evidence suggests that difficulties were experienced even then in selling all of those properties.	Maintain a target of building between 500 to 600 houses pa. over the period of the plan. This would be consistent with economic and employment projections. It would be in line with public support, (see the Canterbury Society's 'Vision for Canterbury), and require less building on greenfield sites.
Policy SP2	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1275	Objecting	The proposal to build up to 15.600 new homes in the period of the plan is not supported by projections for employment. No evidence has been produced to support the contention that more homes will create jobs by itself. During a period of economic growth, the district was building about 550 homes per year, and local evidence suggests that difficulties were experienced even then in selling all of those properties.	Maintain a target of building between 500 to 600 houses pa. over the period of the plan. This would be consistent with economic and employment projections. It would be in line with public support, (see the Canterbury Society's 'Vision for Canterbury), and require less building on greenfield sites.
Policy SP2	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1276	Objecting	The proposal to build up to 15.600 new homes in the period of the plan is not supported by projections for employment. No evidence has been produced to support the contention that more homes will create jobs by itself. During a period of economic growth, the district was building about 550 homes per year, and local evidence suggests that difficulties were experienced even then in selling all of those properties.	Maintain a target of building between 500 to 600 houses pa. over the period of the plan. This would be consistent with economic and employment projections. It would be in line with public support, (see the Canterbury Society's 'Vision for Canterbury), and require less building on greenfield sites.
Policy SP2	778387	Mr David Smith		1329	Objecting	I do not agree with the proposal to add 15,600 new houses to the District. I find the Nathaniel Lichfield Report unconvincing in its projected growth forecasts. The idea of adding 780 new homes every year is not sustainable. Canterbury does not have the necessary infrastructure or space to accomodate this level of development.	A maximum target of 500 new homes to be built each year, but subject to an annual audit of recording what percentage of new homes completed are actually sold and occupied. All unsold homes should be carried forward into the following year's allocation. Action should also be taken to turn the many empty and derelict houses currently in the District into liveable homes as part of the 500 per annum allocation.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1304	Objecting	There is no justification for the increase in the rate of house building. There are no indications that it will be needed. It is contrary to the wishes of residents. On top of these reasons, the Council plans to build the bulk of these houses in completely the wrong places, wasting valuable top grade agricultural land and land of high visual importance. The locations are also wrong as they will severely increase traffic congestion and place people far from where they want to get to each day.	I should like to see the Council reduce its planned housing rate to what the city actually wants and needs.
Policy SP2	778563	Mrs Susan Langdown		1319	Objecting	The levels of house building suggested are too high, and likely to be unsustainable. Strongly recommend building at levels between 500 - 600 per annum. This is a figure more in tune with the results of the Ipsos Mori report.	Reduce building levels to between 500 - 600 per annum.
Policy SP2	777305	Mr Jason Hobbs	Area Manager Homes and Communities Agency	1595	Supporting	They are encouraged that policy seeks to maintain a sufficient supply of land for housing and employment, based on development requirements from background studies, particularly 780 dwellings/yr identified by NLP.	
Policy SP2	777494	Mr Fred Wilson		1512	Objecting	Concerned about plans for large amounts of housing because: housing requirements have been double counted; std formulae do not take into account the past pressure from student housing; universities are building more accommodation; including student requirements while not counting provision is an error that will result in an overestimate.	
Policy SP2	777933	Professor Stephen Peckham		1483	Objecting	Over development that will place a substantial strain on the transport, social and economic infrastructure of the City. It will damage its cultural heritage and place as a major historic site and tourist attraction.	
Policy SP2	778073	Ms Claire Dethier		1504	Objecting	Concerns that need for housing may be overestimated. Also, the need for housing takes into account the student population, yet student housing does not count towards meeting housing need. 780 dwellings exceeds the recommendation in the Development Requirements study. City is constrained by a number of issues which mean meeting needs is unrealistic (delivery and infrastructure), would have a unsustainable impact on the road network. - improvements have heritage impacts	Canterbury City Council ought to consider whether it may be appropriate considering the constraints of the City to proposing a lower housing target with a commitment to carry out an early review to assess the impact of the lower target. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes clear that "Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless: any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole".
Policy SP2	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1706	Objecting	The overall scale of development provided in the emerging Local Plan, particularly in respect of housing land provision, is inadequate having regard to the growth agenda advocated by Government and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. If the City Council is to meet the housing need in full, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, then development at the highest end of the scenario ranges assessed by NLP should be adopted (ie at least 1,200 dwellings pa).	Development at the highest end of the scenario ranges assessed by NLP should be adopted (ie at least 1,200 dwellings pa)

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1705	Objecting	The proposal is that the ONLY retail provision for Herne Bay between now and 2031 will be the Central Development Area. This is absurdly unrealistic, and fundamentally damaging to Herne Bay's future. The CDA was devised in the boom years and has languished since. This is simply a mechanism for forcing the CDA through - capital receipts for CCC, an inappropriate and unwanted town centre for Herne Bay.	Pragmatically and practically, CCC must prepare a "Plan B" for the retail regeneration of Herne Bay. So far, it's best shot - Plan A, the CDA - has failed to attract enough interest to get off the ground. Herne BAY simply cannot afford to put everything on hold in the (forlorn?) hope that CCC's pipedream comes to fruition. The Local Plan MUST make provision for retail growth in Herne Bay as well as/instead of the CDA.
Policy SP2	778073	Ms Claire Dethier		1534	Objecting	Evidence base report Canterbury Development Requirements Study explains that Dover and Ashford are providing more housing than required to meet their need and may be able to accommodate some displaced growth if they maintain their existing approach. Has this option been fully considered and discounted?	
Policy SP2	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1614	Objecting	The building rate is far above the national average and not supported by a majority of residents.	Build at the preferred sustainable rate of 510 - 550.
Policy SP2	778230	Mr & Mrs S R & D J Miles		1909	Objecting	The Council's proposal to build 15,600 new homes in the District by 2031, with a concentration of 4,000 in South Canterbury in particular, is misguided. We are also fundamentally opposed to the use of greenfield sites in order to achieve large scale housing development.	Housing development should be focussed on brownfield sites such as Howe Barracks, the Wincheap estate, Peugeot garage site and the prison, allowing housing growth to continue at the existing rate.
Policy SP2	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	1686	Supporting	We support the level of growth identified for the district but have a number of concerns over the contingency element built in to the figures. A full report is submitted separately on this matter	
Policy SP2	778733		The John Graham Centre	1851	Objecting	The John Graham Centre is proposing enabling housing development to fund the provision of supported living for people with learning disabilities and it is concerned that this policy fails to make clear the role of villages in meeting either general or specific housing needs.	The policy should identify the split in the location of housing growth in the district and identify the scale of allocations at the rural service centres and local centres
Policy SP2	778738		ARJO Wiggins	1877	Objecting	The policy fails to identify the scale and loication of growth at urban centres, rural service centres and local centres. No other policy remedies this and SP 2 should be amended to rectify the situation	SP2 needs to identify the scale and location of growth within the district
Policy SP2	778739	Mr A Salvatori		1662	Objecting	Policy fails to identify the level of housing growth in villages to satisfy local need. Other plan policies, as they relate to this issue, are muddled, confused and give no clear guidance. It is the responsibility of this policy to identify and define the locational strategy for new housing development across the District . If defined it will set the context for SP3 and SP4 and allocations on the proposals map and the detailed policies in the housing chapter	The level of housing growth should be broken down into main urban areas, rural service centres and local centres
Policy SP2	778740		Stour Valley Estates Ltd	1675	Objecting	The policy should make clear the amount of growth at rural service centres and local centres. Other policies of the plan which refer to housing development at these villages do not help clarify situation.	The policy should set the level of housing development at urban areas, rural service centres and local centres
Policy SP2	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	1989	Supporting	Support the Plan's approach to housing numbers as a minimum	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1846	Supporting	The minimum housing quantum set out at Policy SP2 is supported.	
Policy SP2	778680	Mark & Dawn Walsh		2136	Objecting	object	
Policy SP2	778683	Ms Sarah Wood		2149	Objecting	I think that the proposals for 15,600 new houses, including 4000 in south Canterbury, are more than is needed, and will add to congestion and the destruction of the countryside, so I object to policies SP2 and SP3a	
Policy SP2	778716	Ms Sue Pratt		2153	Objecting	Objects to Policy SP2 because: 15600 houses are too many for the area; there is no the water infrastructure; road and railways cause pollution and traffic delays without more cars and lorries; traffic management and a ring road are required.	
Policy SP2	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1920	Objecting	Employment growth forecasts 4,500 new jobs. 15,600 new houses represent three for each job created - more than is needed. Development targets are also unrealistic. The past average of 545 pa, experienced sluggish sales and an assessment whether supply outstripped demand is needed. If a target of 780 pa is adopted, then, even if houses are not built, the excessive targets will blight large parts of the district. The proposals are also contrary to the wishes of local people as surveyed by Mori.	A target of between 500 and 600 new dwellings per year over the 20-year period · would be consistent with the economic and employment projections for the period; · would be realistic in the light of historic levels of about 545 per year; · would be in keeping with local support for a target of 550 a year or lower; · would require less building on greenfield sites and would create less traffic congestion; · would coincide with the proposal in the Canterbury Society's Vision for Canterbury for a target of about 550 per year.
Policy SP2	405580	Mr Graham Robin		2221	Objecting	The housing allocation seems arbitrary and has not been evidenced properly. You refer to 'government direction' but do not quote or reference any government policy document nor show where the figure of 4,000 new dwellings/homes comes from.	The Council would better serve the people of the City to listen; reduce the scale of development and then face the Planning Inspector with a well supported enfranchised plan.
Policy SP2	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2276	Objecting	Our major concern is the level and location of house building over the 20 year period. There is no convincing reason why the NLP advice of a requirement of between 600 and 700 a year has been rejected; the way the Council reports the result of the Mori Poll significantly distorts the size of the population that supports a higher level of building; university expansion of student accommodation will reduce pressure on housing stock, allowing house-building at the lower end of the NLP range.	
Policy SP2	778492	D H Morgan		2266	Objecting	I question the number of new houses that are being proposed. The proposal is to increase the building rate, and, with the present rate, we have many unoccupied properties in the area. We should concentrate building on brown field sites. The infra-structure in Canterbury and the South-East is not adequate to support the proposed development.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2191	Objecting	The proposed level of development, adding up to 15,600 new dwellings in the 20-year period 2011-2031, is not justified by projections for employment and the local economy. The proposed development targets are also unrealistic. The average number of new dwellings built in the district in the period from 1991/92 to 2011/12 was 545 per year. The proposed development targets are also contrary to the wishes of local people.	A target of between 500 and 600 new dwellings per year over the 20-year period would be consistent with the economic and employment projections for the period; would be realistic in the light of historic levels of about 545 per year; would be in keeping with local support for a target of 550 a year or lower; would require less building on greenfield sites and would create less traffic congestion; would coincide with the proposal in the Canterbury Society's Vision for Canterbury for a target of about 550 per year.
Policy SP2	778648	Sharon & Stephen Sayers		2268	Objecting	Although I understand the need for more housing in the South East, we have to be very careful that the areas don't become saturated with housing which could lead to many serious issues relating to water supply, jobs, infrastructure, wildlife and environment, quality of life and open spaces.	
Policy SP2	778712	Mr Robert Keen		2185	Objecting	I object to Policy SP2 of the Draft Local Plan	
Policy SP2	778777	Mr Nick Waldron	The Waldron Family	2039	Supporting	Support the housing figures stated in the Policy but only as a minimum requirement over the plan period.	
Policy SP2	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2243	Objecting	In the event that the local economies elsewhere in the sub-region do not perform as expected, there may be a need to compensate through increases in employment and housing provision in the Canterbury district. The requirement to cater for increased employment at Canterbury would create additional problems of traffic congestion at Canterbury if travel to work from other districts is encouraged as a result of a lack of housing locally.	It is considered that accordingly, there should be an element of contingency introduced into the strategy so as to accommodate additional housing if the economy performs better than expected. In the absence of this, the plan would fail to reflect the requirements of the NPPF to cater for changing circumstances through flexibility (para 14).
Policy SP2	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2367	Objecting	The preferred development options set out in the Draft Local Plan including the increase of housing figures from the abolished South East Plan do not legally comply with the SEA Directive. The increased housing figures, purported need for new infrastructure and location of these proposals (SP3 policies and many of the transport policies) must be revisited to include reasonable alternatives including sustainable transport as key drivers.	
Policy SP2	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2415	Objecting	Current housing figures do not comply with the SEA Directive. Sustainable communities have to live within environmental limits. The Plan has little regard to environmental restraints as the proposals for huge growth in housing and population demonstrate. It would allow a substantial loss of the best farmland, would worsen air pollution and congestion, increase the district's carbon footprint, lead to greater water stress and destroy yet more biodiversity.	The Draft Plan is playing Russian Roulette with our future and must be thought out again in order to achieve sustainable development

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	422982	Cllr Martin Vye		2411	Objecting	Two reasons are given in the Draft Local Plan for target of a very large number of extra dwellings in the District. The first is that building this number is necessary to increase the number of jobs available to residents; and the second, that the under-provision of affordable housing in the District can be remedied by building a very large number of houses. I have serious reservations about the arguments seeking to justify the very large number of dwellings proposed in the Draft Local Plan.	
Policy SP2	778657	Prof J H Strange		2421	Objecting	Objects to the proposal for 15,600 new houses, particularly the 4000 in south Canterbury are too many. This is not justified economically. Development except at Hersden will add to congestion and pollution and the destruction of the countryside. Infrastructure will be inadequate. The proposals need to be scaled down.	Scale down proposals
Policy SP2	778686	Alan & Britta Pearlman		2430	Objecting	Object to SP2 and SP3a as such a large increase in new dwellings will threaten community life and important community amenities.	
Policy SP2	778773	Ms Janet Almead		2330	Objecting	I wish to protest against the huge scale of development proposed in the Canterbury District Local Plan. The greatest and most disastrous effect of the influx of such a large new population will be on traffic levels. The main roads into Canterbury and Broad Oak Road too, are daily clogged with slow moving private cars and it is not hard to imagine the Canterbury of the future. Yes, development and housing are no doubt necessary, but the level set out in the Local Plan is far too high.	
Policy SP2	778801	A C Strange		2348	Objecting	The proposals for 15,600 new houses, particularly the 4000 in south Canterbury, are, I believe, far more than will be needed. I cannot see that this is justified by economic considerations. Such development in all areas with the possible exception of Hersden will add to congestion and pollution and the unnecessary destruction of the countryside. I am particularly concerned that the proposed infra-structure will be inadequate. I think these proposals need to be scaled down considerably.	
Policy SP2	778956	Dr Michael Forrester		2483	Objecting	I believe that further destruction of the environment will be the result of policy SP2 and am opposed and object to this.	
Policy SP2	779270	Ms Pauline Walters		2462	Objecting	I object to policy SP2.	
Policy SP2	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2245	Supporting	The proposed increase in housing provision from 10,200 in the period 2006 to 2026 (SEP H1) to 15,600 for 2011 to 2031 as shown in policy SP2 is considered to be a reasonable response to the pressures facing the district.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2247	Objecting	It is clear from the NPPF that there is a desire for the development to be 'front loaded'. This is not the case under policy SP2 which identifies the phasing of the proposed provision within 5-year periods. The provision for period 2011 to 2016 is actually reduced compared to the others possibly due to the Council's view that there has been over provision in recent years. The inclusion of this over provision has no basis in policy terms and should be discounted when the plan is being considered.	The base date of the housing evidence should be amended to comply with the start of the plan and the resulting calculation on the residual supply (in para 2.18) should also be amended to suit.
Policy SP2	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2724	Objecting	The total housing provision is excessive, especially in Herne and Broomfield and surrounds. It will impact on roads, schools, village shops, environment. Question funding availability for road improvements. Numbers rely on old, limited studies, need to use up to date information. Question growth and job predictors and ability to achieve the housing targets. Plan is driven by need for costly road infrastructure (see report). Large greenfield sites limit choice. Develop sustainable sites.	New development should be located where it is needed and where it can be sustainably accommodated.
Policy SP2	778333	Mr Ian Gregory		2598	Objecting	Object to the proposed housing provision of just 15,600 dwellings in the plan period. The Council has failed to provide for it's objectively assessed requirements, and has therefore breached government policy. This does not meet the need set out in the SHMA and ignore the issue of the backlog of unmet needs. The Council has also ignored 2008 household projections which would show a need for 17,600 dwellings and 2011 (interim) household projections - interim requirement for 18900 dwellings.	Projections based at a particular point in time do not take into account existing needs. Unfortunately, this is exactly what the Council has done. In these circumstances, therefore, it is proposed that this policy be amended so as to provide for 22,000 dwellings.
Policy SP2	778333	Mr Ian Gregory		2599	Objecting	The Policy does not propose an even spread of development throughout the plan period, but instead has only modest provision in the first five years, with higher provisions thereafter. This is surprising, given the fact that there is a considerable backlog of unmet needs at the start of plan period.	In these circumstances, it is proposed that provision be made for 7000 dwellings 2011-2016, and for 5000 in each quinquennium thereafter. In this way, the existing problems should be dealt with reasonably quickly, rather than left until later on.
Policy SP2	778861	David & Teresa Kemsley		2521	Objecting	There is no analysis of population growth and demographic change to support the numbers proposed . Nor is there any recognition of the point made by Eric Picles about variations of provision to meet the needs of different age groups	
Policy SP2	778868	Mr Tom Tomaszewski		2509	Supporting	I support Policy SP2	
Policy SP2	778870	Leigh Derbyshire		2532	Objecting	I believe that furthur destruction of the environment will be the result of policy SP2 and am opposed and object to this.	
Policy SP2	778884	Mr Ian Johnson		2584	Objecting	Why does Canterbury have to expand at the rate that it is doing so? I understand that in the South East only Milton Keynes and Slough are expanding faster, neither of which merits emulation. It should be noted that we live in a distinguished Cathedral City; the residents have no wish to live in a large conurbation. The City Council should be reminded that there have already been another 3,000 properties built for student use.	Why is there not a plan for limited growth by use of brownfield sites?

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2616	Objecting	On behalf of my clients, it is submitted that adopting a strategic requirement of 15,600 dwellings will not deliver sufficient dwelling completions to meet the level of need identified by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which concludes that affordable housing need is in excess of 1,000 dwellings per annum. Furthermore, the Local Authority have adopted an over optimistic contribution from existing allocations, existing sites with planning permissions and small sites contributions.	
Policy SP2	779099	Ms Jennifer Lennard		2644	Objecting	I object to policy SP2.	
Policy SP2	779572	Ms Margaret Derbyshire		2772	Objecting	I believe that further destruction of the environment will be the result of policies SP2 and SP3a and am opposed and object to these.	
Policy SP2	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2913	Supporting	Policy SP2 sets out the total housing, employment and retail development requirements for the Plan Period (2011-2031). These appear to be based on a robust independent assessment of development needs.	
Policy SP2	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3014	Objecting	We would question whether this level of development can be accommodated whilst still protecting the ecological network and sites designated under European law. Sites are well within the visitor catchment area and visitor numbers are likely to increase especially within the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar, The Blean Complex SAC and Stodmarsh SPA and Ramsar. Also likely to be impact from developments on The Swale SPA. Likely in-combination impacts with plans in neighbouring districts.	
Policy SP2	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2780	Objecting	It is plain to see what developers would like to see and to understand their point of view but local residents opinions are not taken into account (61% responding to the SE Plan support 510 dwellings per year). This is sustainable, particularly if we make use of brownfield sites like Chislet or the old prison. And, of course, Howe Barracks now comes into the equation.	
Policy SP2	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2805	Objecting	With online purchasing becoming more prevalent, we should also rethink the amount of retail space we need and how it should be used to best advantage.	With online purchasing becoming more prevalent, we should also rethink the amount of retail space we need and how it should be used to best advantage.
Policy SP2	779274	Mr Graham Duplock	Parish Councillor Parish Councillor Beskesbourne	2824	Objecting	The desire to build housing at a rate 40% higher than that achieved in recent years is questionable. I believe this to be an unrealistic target which brings into question the infrastructure benefits possible from development levies.	
Policy SP2	779556	Mr Jon Linnane		2902	Objecting	Objecting to the level of development proposed as there is no public support, lack of infrastructure planning, increased pollution from additional traffic, loss of grade 1 agricultural land increasing UK dependency on foreign imports.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	779564	Mr J Tinker		2909	Objecting	Similarly there appears to be empty commercial and business properties in the industrial estates of Whitstable, Herne Bay and Wincheap. Unused commercial property is probably worse for the community than the scrub land described above. Therefore I am questioning whether there is quite the need for business floorspace as indicated or whether the space would be left unlet or businesses move from existing sites to new sites.	
Policy SP2	414960	Cllr Alex Perkins	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3158	Objecting	The building 800+ new homes every year for 20 years is not sustainable. The draft plan pays no regard to many of the developments already being built in Canterbury and the neighbouring districts. 500 [new houses] a year across the district should be the absolute maximum. Canterbury already struggles with traffic, air quality and infrastructure problems. This plan offers no remedies for these issues and is based purely on so-called "economic drivers".	500 [new houses] a year across the district should be the absolute maximum. Ideally less! With no more than a third of those being built on sites around Canterbury.
Policy SP2	417774	Tory Family		3187	Objecting	On behalf of my clients, it is submitted that adopting a strategic requirement of 15,600 dwellings will not deliver sufficient dwelling completions to meet the level of need identified by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which concludes that affordable housing need equates to 1,104 dwellings per annum. Furthermore, the Local Authority have adopted an over optimistic contribution from existing allocations, existing sites with planning permissions and small sites contributions.	
Policy SP2	777509	Mrs Monica Blyth		3137	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Herne Bay as the amount of housing is disproportionate to the need. Doubts enough jobs can be generated and the infrastructure proposals are sustainable. Concerned about increased through traffic at Herne en-route to Canterbury; and access to healthcare (esp. hospitals) and school places. Current developments in Herne Bay and Whitstable remain unsold, as mortgages are difficult and local residents are unlikely to be able to afford properties in the area.	
Policy SP2	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3063	Objecting	Do not support the higher rate of building as the numbers have been arbitrarily chosen to allow upgrading of the Bridge A2 junction via levy money. No real publically avialbe costings have been done. The junction will nver be delivered unless funded outside of developer led levy money. The higher rate is at odds with MORI. The provision of a new junction will encourage people to travel more and further.	
Policy SP2	779290	Mr John Christian		3304	Objecting	Concerned about the development proposals for almost 16,000 new houses, 25% more than the existing 61,000 households - where is the evidence for the level of in-migration anticipated? There is also a lack of detailed infrastucture planning associated with the new developments and how the hospital service, road network, parking and commuter links will be able to cope. The Lichfield report uses a large number of assumptions. For this reason it can only be a guide to some of the options.	Much more detailed infrastructure planning needs to be done before any development takes place.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	780293	John & Kate Hills		3217	Objecting	We believe that further destruction of the environment will be the result of policies SP2 and SP3a and are opposed and object to these.	
Policy SP2	780314	Ms Helen Gardiner		3229	Objecting	The proposals for 15,600 new homes including 4,000 in south Canterbury are more than is needed. If this number of new homes is built it will add to congestion and destroy the local countryside. I therefore object to policies SP2 and SP3a	
Policy SP2	479719	Dr Robert Jupe		3506	Objecting	I think the proposal for 15,000 houses is too ambitious, and so oppose policy SP2.	
Policy SP2	481630	Dr R B Mallion		3479	Objecting	Object to the proposal to build 15600 new houses, including 4000 in South Canterbury. I am not at all convinced by the arguments given that so many are needed. It would cause disproportionately increased traffic congestion, irretrievable loss of green-field sites, would increase population of the city by more than 20% and the city cannot support this increase. The 43% increase in annual house building to 780 a year seems excessive when job provision is envisaged as only 225 per year.	I understand that the Ipsos-Mori poll commissioned by the Council showed that 39% would favour the housing target proposed in the Plan but nearly half (48%) thought that the target should be 550 houses per year (or lower) - the historic level of house-building in the city. The Canterbury Society's Vision for Canterbury proposes a housing target of precisely that just referred to - namely, 550 houses per year. In view of the above data, and the fact that no more than 4500 extra jobs are anticipated (equivalent to an average of only 225 annually), this, in my view, is the upper bound of what the target should revert to.
Policy SP2	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3408	Objecting	I believe that further destruction of the environment will be the result of policy SP2 so am opposed to it. For the last 13 years the rate of house building has been 556/yr. The Plan proposes 780, a 40% increase. There is no evidence that so many houses are required or that it will stimulate the economy. There are many empty houses. Traffic and infrastructure issues. If there is to be any development the council should impose strict controls on the quality and visual impacts.	If there is to be any development the council should impose strict controls on the quality and visual impact of the buildings.
Policy SP2	780207	Pru Cherry	The Whitstable Road Residents Association	3398	Objecting	Object to policy SP2 which will cause the city to grow too quickly and risks destroying its heritage nature. The huge number of new households will lead to increased pressure on water supplies and all infrastructure, including hospital services which are barely able to cope now.	
Policy SP2	780449	Daniel & Elizabeth Rikh		3332	Objecting	We know that a further 50% increase in house building is not what the majority of people in our district want.	
Policy SP2	407886	Mr J and P Booth		3521	Objecting	The council considered that 9200 new homes was the appropriate number to address identified housing needs of local people and to support the economic aspirations for the district. Yet now the Draft Plan calls for almost 55% more development than was believed to be sufficient in 2010. There is no explanation for this change.	
Policy SP2	780801	Jo Fox	Head of Primary Care Estates NHS	3634	Objecting	The proposed development of 15,600 residential units over the Plan period. The increase in population from such housing developments creates demand on healthcare resources provided in the community and in local GP surgeries, where little or no space or capacity exists.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	408497	Mr C Mills		3728	Objecting	Canterbury does not need such a high level of housing: 15.600 new homes. Such a housing allocation will cause chaos with regard to traffic congestion and there has to be serious concerns that other infrastructure areas such as education, healthcare, social services and welfare and caring for our increasing ageing population will reach breaking point under the plan.	
Policy SP2	408497	Mr C Mills		3769	Objecting	Policy SP2 - I do not support the higher rate of building that is shown in this table. In reference to the employment space of 70,000 sqm proposed in South Canterbury it seems to I to be unrealistic, uncosted and ultimately undeliverable.	
Policy SP2	780273	A D Linfoot		3851	Objecting	It is widely felt (and I share these views) that the scale of housing development proposed in the Plan is excessive, and is driven partly by the interests of landowners and prospective developers, and partly by the financial and planning pressures imposed by central government.	
Policy SP2	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3765	Objecting	There are plenty of opportunities for businesses in the area with vacancies on some of the industrial estates and very little progress on the Altira site, which by now should have been fully completed. Surely this shows that the area is not going to attract the types of employment that the Local Plan predicts. Research is a wonderful thing but like all statistics can be read in any way that supports the case, and I believe that this is how the Council have sued their research.	
Policy SP2	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3779	Objecting	In the present economic environment it is extremely difficult to be able to purchase a first house and as first time buyers fuel the housing market I see little need for an additional 4,200 houses even over the next 20 years. Even if this number of families were attracted to the area and were able to fund their property, there certainly would not be the employment opportunities to support their dream.	
Policy SP2	13719	Mr Steve Moore	Thanet District Council	4114	Supporting	The document and evidence base suggest that the preferred level of employment growth would be higher than that associated with baseline forecasts for the district and that housing provision would fall somewhat below the level implied by migration trend based population projection. The need to achieve a balanced relationship between these elements of growth is acknowledged.	
Policy SP2	780272	Councillor Tony Austin	Councillor Canterbury City Council	4159	Objecting	I believe the amount of development in the District Plan should be limited to 500 homes/year and that these should be concentrated on the outskirts of central Canterbury, not to urbanise the existing village of Sturry. 400 homes should be allocated in the plan for the Barracks Site and Cockering Farm should be used also.	
Policy SP2	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4242	Objecting	The table set out in Policy SP2 is based upon a significant underestimate of housing requirements. If the twin strategic objectives of sustaining economic growth and meeting social housing requirements are to be achieved then at least 1,000 dwellings per annum will be required over the period 2016-2031.	At least 1,000 dwellings per annum will be required over the period 2016-2031.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	779227	Mr Paul Uden		4277	Objecting	The long term annual allocation of housing within the draft plan is arbitrary, unrealistic and overly aggressive. There is no justification for the City Council claim that an increased rate of house building (50% higher than the average for South Eastern England which is already higher than the remainder of England) is necessary because the planning inspector will reject it as being too low.	
Policy SP2	780846	Ms Helen Applegarth		4260	Objecting	There may well be a nationwide need for more homes but I am not convinced of the local need as the 14 new homes in Stour Mews, Sturry seem to remain vacant and unsold.	
Policy SP2	780847	Miss & Mr H & M Audsley & Dethier		4298	Objecting	The plan proposes the building of 780 new houses per year, which is an increase of 40% on current levels. The justification for this level of housing is that it will help to attract economic development to the area. However, the Canterbury Development Requirements Study Final Report outlines ten potential scenarios, but also acknowledges there are more conservative estimates of future economic growth.	
Policy SP2	780847	Miss & Mr H & M Audsley & Dethier		4301	Objecting	We are concerned about how the City Council plans to encourage companies to base their businesses in the Canterbury district, particularly when surrounding districts will be competing for business investment. To support the City Councils stated "preferred scenario" of 6,500 additional jobs, much work needs to be done to attract new business opportunities and large scale employers. This is against the background of one of the area's major employers (Pfizer) closing their Sandwich plant in 2011.	
Policy SP2	780963	Mr Harvey Blaymire		4314	Objecting	As the plan is to last until 2031 there should be structured building approval that will take up demand as it occurs rather than a 'mad' dash for all sites once the plan is approved.	As the plan is to last until 2031 there should be structured building approval that will take up demand as it occurs rather than a 'mad' dash for all sites once the plan is approved.
Policy SP2	780965	Mrs D Jeffers		4320	Objecting	The evidence base report "Canterbury Development Requirements Study Final Report (CDRSFR) makes clear on several occasions that some of the data that it is relying upon to make recommendations may be inaccurate due to the special circumstances that Canterbury experiences in terms of inward and outward migration of students. The need for housing may therefore be significantly overestimated.	Surely this means that the need is actually being overestimated and ought to be reduced to take into account this imbalance into consideration?
Policy SP2	780965	Mrs D Jeffers		4322	Objecting	Is the Borough capable of meeting this need or the preferred approach? Shouldn't Canterbury City council also consider whether the approach should be to consider the constraints of the city and propose a lower housing target with a commitment to carry out an early review to assess the impact of the lower target. The Council should concentrate proposed new growth on brownfield sites, such as Howe Barracks and/or on lower grade agricultural land before considering valuable grade I agricultural land.	Shouldn't Canterbury City council also consider whether the approach should be to consider the constraints of the city and propose a lower housing target with a commitment to carry out an early review to assess the impact of the lower target. The Council should concentrate proposed new growth on brownfield sites, such as Howe Barracks and/or on lower grade agricultural land before considering valuable grade I agricultural land.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	780965	Mrs D Jeffers		4331	Objecting	Insignificant research has been carried out throughout the county/south east region or country as a whole to assess the cumulative impact of most authorities needing to significantly increase their housing numbers from the south east plan figures. On its own the growth in Canterbury will be significant in terms of the impact on infrastructure, but taken in combination with significant growth around the County could be substantial.	
Policy SP2	780965	Mrs D Jeffers		4333	Objecting	Annual build rates to consider - are the growth rates that the Council is targeting realistic? Over last 13 years the annual rate of house building in Canterbury District has been 556 - the plan proposes 780 which is an increase of 40% - there's no evidence that so many houses are required.	
Policy SP2	780983	Mr Martin Ward		4271	Objecting	The proposals for 15,600 new houses in the district must be both questioned and resisted. Building 4000 new houses in South Canterbury is more than can be borne by that area. Overall, building such a large number of new houses will only add to the congestion already experienced in the area and increase the destruction of the countryside. Again, it will destroy the very essence which makes Canterbury unique. I object to Policy SP2.	
Policy SP2	406328	Mr Daniel Smith		4532	Objecting	Object to scale of house building as proposed in the draft Local Plan.	
Policy SP2	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4507	Objecting	An appropriate strategy for the plan would see development in the lower mid range equating to scenario B (600 houses/yr, 12000 across the life of the plan) creating 2500-3500 new jobs in total. This will have less environmental impact and be more sustainable as set out in NPPF. The sequential approach should be applied but with some changes as detailed. Rural allocations should accord with the settlement hierarchy. They have presented their calculations and proposed allocations.	Change whole plan strategy to scenario B - 600 housing units/yr.
Policy SP2	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4387	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. They have fundamental concerns with respect to the amount of development proposed and the fact that is based on NLP's scenario E. They dispute the SA and its findings. They object to the use of Scenario E to set the levels of development. Housing target unachievable. Plan based on delivery of infrastructure esp roads but there is no infrastructure plan. Plan should be based on scenario B which would be deliverable.	Based plan strategy and development amounts on scenario B of NLP report.
Policy SP2	781053	Mrs V A Osborne		4309	Objecting	I am extremely concerned about the plans for so many houses to built in this area, with no mention of infrastructure. The schools and hospitals are seriously overstretched, and water in the South East is at a premium, and there is a shortage of jobs.	
Policy SP2	781064	Mr Richard Grayson		4316	Objecting	Policy SP2 - I regard the proposals for 780 new houses (15,000 new houses over a 20 year period) pa to be excessive. 780 houses pa is against the wishes of the majority and not fully justified in my opinion.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	781156	Mr Andrew Stacey & Family		4384	Objecting	This proposal for nearly 16,000 new households is a huge increase, being more than 25% , over one quarter more than the existing 61,000 households mentioned in the Lichfield report. I was also unable to find any detail of infrastructure planning beyond that associated with the new developments. This proposal will put extra pressure on the existing infrastructure with increased amounts of traffic.	
Policy SP2	781157	Mr Richard Pettman & Family		4388	Objecting	With another 16000 potential households (say 48000 additional people), our already overloaded systems will be unable to cope. Surely any draft plan should include some positive advance planning for facilities such as these to give a fuller picture of the scope of what is required.	
Policy SP2	781163	Ms Carole Parmiter		4318	Objecting	If the whole plan were implemented, and the population of the area increased to the level suggested, then Canterbury would become an intolerable place to live. Without a complete ring road, traffic flow in every direction would grid lock. Also, local essential services, already cut to the bone, would collapse under the pressure of demand. There seems to have been no thought given to employment opportunities locally for such a vast influx of people.	
Policy SP2	411808	Ms Annette Woods		4606	Objecting	New houses do need to be built in the area, but not on the scale that is proposed. Councillor John Gilbey has stated that 'the council do not want to build so many houses, but this massive building programme is being forced on the council by the government, as one large development is the only way to build economically.'	
Policy SP2	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4643	Objecting	Objects to the provision of 15600 new homes over the next 20 years because: it is not justified by employment projections; is unrealistic as only 545 was achieved in boom times; 780/yr is a 43% increase; excessive target will create a planning blight; contrary to wishes of local people shown in the Ipsos-Mori survey. Have a more realistic target of 550/yr which would be supported by local people and is consistent with economic projections.	A target of between 500 and 600 new dwellings per year over the 20-year period · would be consistent with the economic and employment projections, realistic in the light of historic levels, in keeping with local support, require less building on greenfield sites, create less traffic congestion and· would coincide with the Canterbury Society's Vision for Canterbury of about 550 per year.
Policy SP2	780004	Ms Heather Stennett	Secretary The Society of Sturry Village	4581	Objecting	In our view the draft plan is unsound since the housing numbers are based on untested assumptions about economic development and inflated by the dubious decision to bridge the railway at Sturry. There is little indication that the plan even attempts to fulfil City Council pledge: [Para 1,11] €Ç plan for the right type and number of homes in the right place to create sustainable communities in the future	
Policy SP2	781018	Mr Geoffrey Woods		4610	Objecting	New houses do need to be built in the area, but not on the scale that is proposed. Councillor John Gilbey has stated that 'the council do not want to build so many houses, but this massive building programme is being forced on the council by the government, as one large development is the only way to build economically	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	781019	Mr & Mrs B Morgan		4615	Objecting	We understand a number of housing is necessary but the vast amount planned can only have a negative affect on our living environment.	
Policy SP2	781255	Robert & Sandra Shine		4500	Objecting	In relation to sustainable development the Plan states that there is a difficult balance to be struck between factors but the Plan clearly already accords an overriding priority to a massive housing development in Canterbury to support assumed economic growth and diversification. There might be growth in the region in the future but why all the associated housing would have to be concentrated in one area of one particular urban settlement is never properly explained.	
Policy SP2	781261	Mr John Moore		4472	Objecting	I am objecting on the Local plan proposals on the basis that I am not aware that a housing needs survey has been carried out. This local plan is based on the, amount of land made available by developers rather that the amount of houses, that the area needs. I understand that a local needs to be put in place, but a local plan that has a housing needs survey attached.	
Policy SP2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4676	Objecting	The draft Local Plan makes a number of false assumptions, that: - The assumption that mass house-building will galvanise economic recovery is unproven. - The methodology used to support the Draft Local Plan is flawed. - The proposed level of house-building (780 a year) does not follow from the analysis. - The Council has provided no evidence of having collaborated with other planning authorities on housing numbers - There is no evidence that the Council has taken account of sustainability	
Policy SP2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4671	Objecting	Building 780 units of housing per annum is excessive given the constraints imposed by the historic character and setting of Canterbury and will lead to damaging impacts on the city. We support the provision of 580 units per annum over the plan period, which can be accommodated within the Council's SHLAA List.	We support the provision of 580 units per annum over the plan period, which can be accommodated within the Council's SHLAA List.
Policy SP2	780842	Revd & Mrs Clive & Helen Barlow		4726	Objecting	Objects to numbers of new houses proposed, no evidence that the number of houses are needed. Objects to south Canterbury due to traffic and infrastructure impacts and building on Grade 1 Agricultural land. Objects to government pressure driving the plan. More local infrastructure and transport planning needed, particularly hospital access. Will have a negative impact on Canterbury and surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP2	781595	Ms Laura Jowers		4786	Objecting	15,600 new houses, are more than is needed, and will add to congestion and the destruction of the countryside. Loss of agricultural land. Traffic congestion, air pollution and water supply issues. There is no evidence they are needed, they will create financial gain for developers but no jobs. Take student housing into account to reduce the amount of housing needed. Concentrate on brownfield sites.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	781637	Mr Brendan Power		4785	Objecting	15,600 new houses, including 4000 in south Canterbury, are more than is needed, and will add to congestion and the destruction of the countryside. Loss of agricultural land. Traffic congestion, air pollution and water supply issues. There is no evidence they are needed, they will create financial gain for developers but no jobs. Take student housing into account to reduce the amount of housing needed. Concentrate on brownfield sites.	
Policy SP2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4940	Objecting	Obect to housing numbers on grounds of historic importance of Canterbury; unproven links between housing and economic growth; impact of new homes bonus; lack of public support; and past performance in terms of housing completions.	
Policy SP2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4949	Objecting	We would prefer to see a reduction in the rate of provision from 780 units per annum to around 550 and a more dispersed pattern including Hersden and possibly Thannington. This would mean that for the period of the plan the total number of units required would be reduced from 15,600 to 11,000, a saving of 4600 units which would allow the controversial proposal for 4000 units on High Grade agricultural land in South Canterbury to be removed from the plan.	We would prefer to see a reduction in the rate of provision from 780 units per annum to around 550 and a more dispersed pattern including Hersden and possibly Thannington.
Policy SP2	781033	Ms Hazel Brackley		4820	Objecting	The number of properties proposed seems in excess of those proposed in other parts of the country.	
Policy SP2	782028	Terrace Hill		4930	Objecting	A requirement for 96,775 sqm of employment land is unrealistic in light of the local market and historical poor uptake of employment land, eg. Altira Park. The plan states that the current pipeline supply of employment land is sufficient to meet the identified requirements and the local plan recognises that the ELR has identified a supply of employment land beyond that required to meet the need for employment uses. The Local Plan target is not underpinned by a robust evidence base.	The final employment targets need to be realistic and based on both robust evidence and a balanced understanding of the local market. In any event, the Plan should confirm that development targets will be treated flexibly to ensure that the final Local Plan is capable of being responsive to change and will allow appropriate developments to be considered on their merits.
Policy SP2	13812	Mr N J Blake		5172	Objecting	The Council has tried to demonstrate that its preferred option of 15,600 homes is determined by rational mathematical analysis. No consultations was carried out, as to locations, extent and impact. The result is opposition in the area affected. Affordable housing can only be provided at a rate of 30% of total housing. To meet a need for it, private sector housing needs to be built in that ratio. Further, policy is locked into a scenario determined by current policies. No population growth analysis	The number of houses proposed can only be arbitrary and must be constrained by what communities can accept and what can be built without unacceptable damage to the environment.
Policy SP2	780277	Yvonne & Mark Culverhouse & Ford		5061	Objecting	We respect there is a need for social housing and we also feel in order to address this, huge estates like Site 8 are not the answer, as problems can arise. Smaller pockets of housing would be better and an overall view should be taken to avoid future problems. Due to once being homeless 26 years ago and Canterbury City Council helping us, we do have an understanding of this situation after spending 21 good years on a council estate ourselves.	PLEASE DO NOT LOOK AT NORTH HERSDEN SITE 8 AS AN ANSWER TO YOUR REQUIRED FIGURES WITHOUT LOOKING AT THE BROADER PICTURE, IF SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY IS TRULY PART OF THE LOCAL PLAN.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5022	Objecting	The Council's calculation of its housing land supply is 'Unsound'. The DLP fails to allocate sufficient sites to meet requirements. Revise Table 3. Make efficient use of sites, such as the Former Herne Bay Golf Club (400 to 600 dwellings). This will comply with sustainability provisions of the NPPF (para 7 & 58), as it would optimise the use of the Site, increase economic output, deliver additional units and social infrastructure without comprimising local environment. Amend SP2 as outlined	Amend Policy SP2 as follows: Add 'minimum' and 'targets' remove 'requirements and guidelines' - to read as follows "Land is allocated to meet the identified minimum development targets, as set out below. Increase housing allocation on the golf club from 400 to 600 units.
Policy SP2	782042	Tesco Stores Ltd		5011	Objecting	It is not clear whether the retail figures included in Policy SP2 relate to the capacity studies assessment to 2026 or the Local Plan period. It is not clear from Policy SP2 whether these figures relate to the gross or net floorspace requirement.	
Policy SP2	782042	Tesco Stores Ltd		5017	Objecting	Policy SP2 does not identify any capacity for additional retail floorspace in Herne Bay. There is no guarantee that the additional floorspace will be delivered within the Central Development Area or sites identified within the AAP.	The additional quantum of retail floorspace should therefore be included within Policy SP2 in order to ensure that the required floorspace is delivered over the plan period.
Policy SP2	782439	Mr Alan Holden	Chairman Broad Oak Preservation Society	5066	Objecting	We have strong doubts about the methodology which the Council's technical advisers have used to predict the numbers of new dwellings required in the district in the next 20 years.	
Policy SP2	421400	Mr Ben Knox		5294	Objecting	I oppose SP2 My overall view is that this plan does little for the existing residents of the Canterbury, who you are supposed to represent. It will lead to increase in urban sprawl, increased traffic and air pollution, loss of amenity and open space, and stretch infrastructure beyond breaking point. At a national level we should be looking to invest in jobs, knowledge based economy and housing in other parts of the country, not the overcrowded and relatively affluent South East.	
Policy SP2	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5317	Objecting	CAST do not agree with the levels of housing development proposed in the local plan. canterbury has relatively low levels of unememployment and housing should be provided in areas where there is high unemployment in East Kent. Could improve public transport links from these areas to Canterbury if still need additional workers. Infrastructure should be secured before housing devt. Devt seems tobe led by need to secure s106 monies to pay for infrastructure. Greenfield devt will not be sustainable.	
Policy SP2	782449	Ms Jayne Ward		5142	Objecting	The proposals for 15,600 new houses in the district must be both questioned and resisted. Building 4000 new houses in South Canterbury is more than can be borne by that area. Overall, building such a large number of new houses will only add to the congestion already experienced in the area and increase the destruction of the countryside. Again, it will destroy the very essence which makes Canterbury unique.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5226	Objecting	Furthermore, the core part of the Draft Local Plan - future housing numbers - is predicated on almost 10,000 houses being built on Greenfield land. This despite the MORI poll showing that 70% of local respondents do not want to build on greenfield land. Therefore, this part of the plan goes against the expressed views of local people.	
Policy SP2	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5465	Objecting	Housing completion figures have averaged 545 units over last 21 years and 696 over last 6 years representing comparatively high levels of housing which should have earned the District the right to adopt a lower and more realistic figure now. I object to the high target figure of 780 houses/year. This is unreasonable, unjustified and unsustainable. Residents have not asked for this high housing target figure. The Core strategy, and NLP do not specify 780 homes per year.	
Policy SP2	406391	Mr Alan Best	Swale Borough Council	5498	Objecting	Welcome the Canterbury Local Plan and notes the City Council's intention to meet its objectively assessed needs in respect of its housing and employment targets. In this respect, you will be in receipt of our own consultation draft Local Plan and the email from Gill Harris in respect of Swale Borough Council's own unmet housing needs. You will no doubt wish to reflect on these issues and the respective relationships between/implications for our targets e.g. migration/commuting.	Wish us to reflect on Swales unmet housing needs and the implications for migration and commuting.
Policy SP2	781562	Mr Chris Morrissey		5311	Objecting	The proposed building rate is far higher rate than it has been historically, and the Ipsos MORI research indicates that the majority of residents want to see a similar or lower building rate (2012, p.29).	
Policy SP2	781622	Mr T Whiting		5401	Objecting	The council spent a fortune changing the traffic flow through the Westgate Towers making congestion worse. This same council that is trying to cut congestion now proposes development on St Stephens field with its associated extra traffic in the city plus 4,000 new houses in south Canterbury, I don't think they have any credibility remaining. I therefore object to policies SP2 and SP3a	
Policy SP2	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5353	Objecting	Southern Water is the statutory wastewater operator for Canterbury. They assessed all of the strategic and allocated domestic sites of 20 dwellings and above in the Local Plan document, with respect to water supply and sewerage capacity. They were unable to carry out capacity checks for the non-domestic sites and sites without a number of dwellings.	
Policy SP2	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5523	Objecting	: I object strongly to the housing development element of this policy. The scale of the proposed housing is unjustified and will cause considerable problems! The pursuit of a lower housing target figure and one no greater than 650 houses per year over the whole Plan period.	The pursuit of a lower housing target figure and one no greater than 650 houses per year over the whole Plan period.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5618	Supporting	Support housing of 780 pa, is in the range identified for economic growth while not impacting negatively on the natural environment or quality of life. Support the focus on employment, growth and development of a business base. Welcome the increased housing allocation in Canterbury. The city is a hub for business, visitors and higher education. Urban focus maximises transport sustainability, infrastructure improvement and new economic opportunities. Range of housing options.	
Policy SP2	406848	Mr Graham Norton	Land and Planning Director Strategic Land Kent	5535	Objecting	land supply proposed is too low. This is set at 15,600 dwellings or 780 dpa which is set 30% below the 1,104 dpa identified in the SHLAA. the SHLAA is the foundation stone for future provision and population projections. The 2008 household projections indicate 16,760 households being formed over 2011 -2031 or 840 pa. There is an under provision of housing. Council are failing to meet their own objectives. Land supply should be increased to 20000, release more land on edge of Canterbury.	The land supply should be increased to approximately 20,000 dwellings and a substantial, increased proportion, should be released at the urban edge of Canterbury City.
Policy SP2	784704	Mrs D Potts		5773	Objecting	The amount of housing proposed is too much and would change the district forever by merging rural, city and coastal areas. The road system could not cope with the extra cars generated. The proposed infrastructure is insufficient. How can such changes be contemplated without a district transport strategy? For more than a decade Canterbury has built 50% more homes than the SE average, increasing by another 50% is too much. New houses are needed but at a lower level. Look at and cost infrastructure	
Policy SP2	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5823	Supporting	Housing: KCC supports the proposed development of 15,600 units and the strategic development sites. The South East Plan figure of 10,200 dwellings would lead to virtually no net increase in local workforce to support the broadening and strengthening of the local economy. KCC therefore agrees there is a need for an increase above the historical levels of the rate of development in order to implement the City Council's vision for the area.	
Policy SP2	784807	Mr John Pike		5933	Objecting	Generally I do not think Canterbury has sufficient infrastructure to cope reasonably with more housing. Environmentally Canterbury is already overcrowded, the further destruction of the environment as a result of policies SP2 and SP3a cannot be justified - I strongly object on environmental grounds: traffic congestion; lack of infrastructure provision; loss of agricultural land.	
Policy SP2	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5908	Objecting	Welcome the Council's vision of a significant increase of development. The policy to address historic problems of suppressed development is supported. However, the housing provision falls short of the objectively assessed need of 831 houses/yr (16620 over plan period). Census and ONS projections justify an increase in housing provision. An up-dated assessment of the housing provision figure is required to ensure plan is sound and provides for the District's objectively assessed needs.	An up-dated assessment of the housing provision figure is required to ensure that the Plan is sound and provides for the full objectively assessed needs of the District.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	5993	Objecting	The proposed level of development, adding up to 15,600 new dwellings in the 20-year period 2011-2031, is not justified by projections for employment and the local economy. The proposed development targets are also unrealistic. The proposed development targets are also contrary to the wishes of local people.	A target of between 500 and 600 new dwellings per year over the 20-year period · would be consistent with the economic and employment projections for the period; · would be realistic in the light of historic levels of about 545 per year; · would be in keeping with local support for a target of 550 a year or lower; · would require less building on greenfield sites and would create less traffic congestion; · would coincide with the proposal in the Canterbury Society's Vision for Canterbury for a target of about 550 per year · bringing the 2000 plus empty residential units into use, and assessing the vacant industrial and business units (use council tax and business rates records)
Policy SP2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5996	Objecting	No mention of retail provision for the rural sites. If this is to protect small retail units already in existence then this is omission is most welcome.	
Policy SP2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5997	Objecting	Chapter 3 talks about allowing for growth of existing business. How will this be possible if houses are built where expansion is needed? Who can foresee which businesses are going to expand?	
Policy SP2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5998	Objecting	Where does required road infrastructure fit in?	
Policy SP2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6198	Objecting	The target of 15,000 new houses in the district with 30% being affordable means 4,500 affordable dwellings. While the the Council states that 30% of new dwellings will be affordable housing at each site, it is less clear what type of house. Will the appropraite services be available? How will they be funded? At the Sturry/ Broad Oak and Hersden development potentially 1300 people may require extra support - impact on social structure? How can decision be made without accurate statistics.	There needs to be much clearer correlation between the total affordable/social dwellings target and the actual number of local people in Need now and forecasted, as there seems to be a large difference in this Plan's target and the present situation, which then begs the questions: Where will the extra people come from? What will they do?
Policy SP2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6199	Objecting	The need to provide housing for economic growth as opposed to meeting existing housing need is a different issue and the figures to support this should be shown separately, particularly as the business to housing land allocation has not been spread evenly across all sites listed in Policy SP3.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6435	Objecting	We do not share Council's conviction that historic level of development in needs to be raised. Predicted levels of employment can be addressed by maintaining that level. We have seen no convincing evidence of a causal link between increased development and greater economic growth or any legacy of lasting increase in job opportunities. Much of the cost of new construction goes literally to bricks and mortar. According to one US study (by Heidi Garrett-Peltier) only 28% of this is labour.	1. Sticking to historical levels of development of no more than 550 new dwellings a year, called for by local public opinion expressed in the Ipsos MORI Survey and the Canterbury Society's Residents' Vision document. 2. Implementing the Council's 2012 Housing Strategy (1.35) which will help to achieve this. 3. We also see the need for smarter use of the housing we already have. 4. We welcome Policy HD6. On our Barton estate younger families are moving in and so far there is only a handful of recently converted student HMOs. However we need firm action to make this the case right across Canterbury in areas where communities are under stress. There is no reference to the actual number of HMOs in the District. This must be addressed. 5. Student numbers have recently fallen off a little but this could change. More student rooms are being built by the universities but this must increase. As in Oxford the HE Sector must be persuaded to do much more to ease pressure on the housing stock by this means and by limiting student admissions. 6. Don Foster, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government, responsible for building regulations, housing, climate change and sustainable development, has recently confirmed the DCLG's published guidance https://www.gov.uk/definitions-of-general-housing-terms that all student accommodation, on or off campus, can now be included toward the housing provision figure in Local Plans. The Council have refused to take this into account when calculating the number of housing units to be provided in this Plan resulting
Policy SP2	476233	Mrs Catherine Cantwell		6727	Objecting	No need to plan for a large population expansion. New housing proposals should be scaled down, and not be permitted on greenfield sites. Provision of affordable housing cannot be solved by new house building. New builds are highly priced. A better idea would be to refurbish older properties and convert other built units in town. New build should always be on brownfield sites, car parks might be acceptable.	New housing proposals should be scaled down, and should never be permitted on green field sites
Policy SP2	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6761	Supporting	NLP Scenario E provides a balance approach to accommodating the majority of needs but the plan doesn't address the consequences of reducing population led housing needs targets. Support general levels of growth. Concerned that any reduction in housing numbers (as proposed by other submitters) would not meet housing needs, nor comply with NPPF, reduce economic growth and impact on infrastructure/services provision.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP2	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6815	Objecting	NLP report has been used to justify growth scenario E, however, DTZ report Oct 2008 also commissioned by CCC, starts from a completely different base line EIP panel report figures. NLP now argues this approach is inadequate in terms of employment. However, we do not believe the evidence base supports the adoption of scenario E. PopGroup modelling tool is not a transparent tool. Support in principle wish to create employment for future generations, but not to the scale of irreversible building.	
Policy SP2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6856	Objecting	The no. of people resulting from 15,000 houses is not clearly stated. Planning homes seems illogical without the pop estimates. The reason for this may be that Gvt funding is related to the number of houses built and more houses = increased developer contribution. This must be kept in check by realism. Risk of accomodating London overspill, detrimental impact on communities and infrastructure uncertain. Unwanted ubanisation at Sturry and Hersden. Sustainable communities will not be created.	
Policy SP2	13835	Mr Michael Steed		6989	Objecting	Object to the numbers for 2016-31 (840 units pa). This is an increase of 65% over the SE Plan level (510 units pa). The rate for 2011-16, of 600 pa creates enough strain. Road infrastructure can't cope . The Ipsos MORI survey showed congestion is the top priority for most people; the present rate of building worsens the problem; further increases will make road congestion intolerable. Don't exceed the present house-building rate until transport infrastructure improved and less dependence on car	Do not exceed the present house-building rate until we have a much improved transport infrastructure, involving less dependence on private cars.
1.56	408032	Mr Stephen Metherell		42	Objecting	Are our plans really siting the new houses in the most appropriate geographical areas? The present plans seem alarming, and no-one has clearly defined for me, as yet, the why's and the what for's regardless of the very, very negative implications for our infrastructure and amenities and facilities. The net result must be a deterioration of living standards in and around Canterbury, for no clearly defined reason.	
1.56	765228	Mr Peter Eynon		43	Objecting	Comments on 8 site development. There is no indication of how the following is being addressed. 1. The water supply for this area is near to capacity and this will prove further strain on supplies. 2. The sewage system is likewise at near capacity, how is this going to be addressed. 3. Similar concerns for gas & electricity.4. The whole infrastructure requires to be looked at, or the information in the magazine needs to be more informative if these have been thought through.	
1.56	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		77	Objecting	I refer to the proposed new developments for Herne Bay: these now make it essential that the plan for a safe walking/cycling route from Herne Bay to Canterbury, outlined in the Walking and Cycling Strategy 2003, is implemented pronto.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	411892	Dr & Mrs David & Janet Heathcote		274	Objecting	If the proposed scheme is implemented it would have a horrendous effect on the city and its environs in terms of punishing levels of traffic and pollution. There also seems to be no awareness of the vital need to preserve as much surrounding greenery as possible.	
1.56	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	209	Supporting	Focusing development in six delineated areas, rather than trying to build the projected 15,000 houses in a piecemeal way which could encourage random and speculative development. This should help mitigate the general environmental impact.	
1.56	772987	Mrs Doreen Louren		315	Objecting	Developers will look to exploit large greenfield sites rather than in-filling; and anticipate greater profit from more expensive properties.	The Council should be prepared to explore more complicated and, possibly, more expensive ideas. Contracts should be drawn up to hold companies to the dwellings agreed upon, on social and ethical grounds.
1.56	773038	Mrs S Allcock		273	Supporting	Objects to any plan to build houses on farmland beside Cockering Road in Thanington.	
1.56	634241	Mr Robert Douthwaite		890	Objecting	An SEA can be incorporated into an SA, but in this instance the consultant AMEC has issued a disclaimer that the SA 'does not comply with the legal requirements of the SEA Directive'. The local Development Plan is therefore open to legal challenge. An SEA should examine the likely significant effects on the environment and the reasonable alternatives to the proposed plan.	Within the context of the need to mitigate the impact of development on the best agricultural land, the SEA should have identified the quality of agricultural land for each SHLAA site and quantified the cumulative impact of the preferred plan on agriculture (economic and other) compared with an alternative plan (say, development of poorer land to the North of the city). A similar procedure should have been followed for each of the other sustainability issues. In conclusion, I object to the LOP, firstly on the grounds that it is neither

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	776051	Mr Rick Strange		871	Objecting	The detail on the Plan at the moment illustrates little or no provision for new schools, hospitals, churches, playing fields, parks, cycle paths, village halls, car parking facilities, recreation facilities, shops, pubs or any of the other necessary facilities that are required if a new development is to be called 'Sustainable' and service an additional 33,274 people. All developments MUST be sustainable. They will not create community and are not sustainable. They just illustrate greed.	If a new estate or estates are to be built then CCC could do no worse than to copy the way in which villages developed naturally in the past and add modern concepts to this. The start of every plan should be the heart of the estate and these should be the public facilities that are as close to the centre of the estate as possible giving the inhabitants of all houses the least possible journey to reach. The centre should be pedestrian only with parking in a circle around the back of the units. Within this centre at each estate there should be; shops, church, village hall, doctor's surgery, dentist, pub / gastro pub, flower beds, benches, some trees, cafes, primary school, etc.. Without at least a good percentage of these any estate will be just a dead, lifeless load of dormitory bricks & mortar. (Look at any estate in the Canterbury area to see examples of thoughtless, unimaginative, greedy developments that have been overseen by past CCCs). Areas for new business and therefore work for the inhabitants of these 'New Villages' must be strategically placed. Little Barton Farm would be OK with a huge amount of money spent on the basic infrastructure for the South Canterbury estate, but where on earth all the thousands from Sturry, Hersden, Broad Oak, Herne Bay etc., etc. are going to work?
1.56	776757	Mr Adrian Fox	Policy and Projects Manager Dover District Council	734	Objecting	We believe that further information is required in order to demonstrate the deliverability of the strategic sites in terms of the level of infrastructure that will be required to support them. However, without a robust evidence base that clearly demonstrates that the sites are viable and capable of delivering new infrastructure it is questionable whether the document satisfies paragraph 173 in the National Planning Policy Framework.	We believe that further information is required in order to demonstrate the deliverability of the strategic sites in terms of the level of infrastructure that will be required to support them.
1.56	355426	Cllr Ashley Clark	Secretary Friends of Duncan Downs	1022	Objecting	Many of our members and persons we encounter are resentful of the fact that it appears there is to be yet more development for Whitstable. There is an acceptance that given the national situation some development will have to take place and in the circumstances it is proper that the other parts of the District have to accept a greater share. The proportion awarded to Whitstable although unwelcome by many is understandable and is fairer when balanced against the District as a whole.	
1.56	777424	Mrs & Mrs Edmed		854	Objecting	Objects to the key development sites identified in the draft Local Plan. Development should be smaller and of manageable scale, in areas needing regeneration, economic development and housing	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	978	Objecting	Many of our members and persons we encounter are resentful of the fact that it appears there is to be yet more development for Whitstable. There is an acceptance that given the national situation some development will have to take place and in the circumstances it is proper that the other parts of the District have to accept a greater share. The proportion awarded to Whitstable although unwelcome by many is understandable and is fairer when balanced against the District as a whole.	
1.56	777542	M H Aspell		1456	Objecting	There hasn't been much thought to what affect these houses will have on the Hospitals, Schools and Doctors. Also building on greenfields will stop farming and we will be buying food from abroad at a cost. Also we would have a shortage of water.	
1.56	13742	Mr G Eaton	Clerk Chislet Parish Council	1696	Objecting	The Parish Council has significant concerns about the effects the proposed housing developments will have on the local infrastructure in particular on the increased traffic on the A28 and would wish to ensure that any adverse effects are minimised.	The Parish Council has significant concerns about the effects the proposed housing developments will have on the local infrastructure in particular on the increased traffic on the A28 and would wish to ensure that any adverse effects are minimised.
1.56	778073	Ms Claire Dethier		1549	Objecting	Transport modelling of the County taking into account the proposed growth of all of the Borough's must be a priority and without this information, the plan cannot be considered sustainable. I also understand that Canterbury City Council has recommended these sites without having received the results of their transport modelling.	
1.56	778073	Ms Claire Dethier		1532	Objecting	Spatial distribution is inappropriate and unsustainable. It is located on the wrong side of the city. The largest employer, HS1 and railway access are located to the north. It would involve the loss of Grade 1 agric land. No plan has been established to show how the proposed new dwellings would access this quickly and easily via public transport. The proposal fails to deliver the largest proportion of affordable housing where the demand is. Issues could be spread throughout the borough.	
1.56	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1892	Objecting	The housing strategy is simply a collection of what developers have said they will do. Alongside housing there needs to be investment in business growth, education infrastructure, roads and junctions, rail access, water supply and drainage infrastructure, and the provision of various community assets. The proposals are not thought through and merely responsive to developers out for their own profit. If all these developments go ahead, it will cause the Council problems and cost in the future.	Drop half the development proposals Plan for the development of Education Sector. Come up with a real plan for Business
1.56	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2368	Objecting	The preferred development options set out in the Draft Local Plan including the increase of housing figures from the abolished South East Plan do not legally comply with the SEA Directive. The increased housing figures, purported need for new infrastructure and location of these proposals (SP3 policies and many of the transport policies) must be revisited to include reasonable alternatives including sustainable transport as key drivers.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2399	Objecting	With reference to the proposed new developments for Herne Bay: these now make it essential that the plan for a safe walking/cycling route from Herne Bay to Canterbury, outlined in the Walking and Cycling Strategy 2003, is implemented immediately.	
1.56	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2252	Objecting	Under draft policy SP3, the proposed strategy involves a high proportion of development on strategic sites: some 9,000 on 8 strategic sites and a further 916 on 6 large sites. This position is highly likely to leave the plan severely exposed if a small number of allocations are compromised or delayed. This concentration inhibits both flexibility and competition. It also reduces the ability of the plan to provide for a contingent approach, all contrary to the NPPF	
1.56	778304	O W Presland		2607	Objecting	A phasing of development should be included to ensure that there is a steady stream of development throughout the period.	
1.56	778672	Ms Sheila Kesby		2525	Objecting	HMO's should be restricted and new homes built on brownfield sites. Meeting housing target will not create jobs. Meeting the housing target will creat 3 houses for each job. Reduce housing target to 4.7% so it is the same growth as employment.	Reduce the housing target so that new house building is done at the same rate as the 4.7% growth in employment as forecast in the City Council's commissioned Nathaniel Lichfield Report.
1.56	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2580	Objecting	When looking at the maps for South Canterbury in the Local Plan, in addition to the above, one might like to consider the following when considering a development in any area (not just south canterbury): €€ Smaller scales of development	
1.56	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2619	Objecting	The evidence supporting the Local Plan is severely deficient and fails to demonstrate justification for the proposed strategic allocations. Canterbury is the principle settlement and should be the focus for allocations and housing. Relying on a single site, without demonstrating it is viable or deliverable is unjustified, not sustainable or in accordance witha sound evidence base. There is no evidence explaining why the LA has deviated from Options Report Strategy for two urban extensions.	Allocate land at New Thanington
1.56	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2632	Objecting	No transport evidence base has been provided to demonstrate the impact of the proposed strategic allocations on the highway network. It is clear that the Local Authority does not have a sound evidence base to demonstrate that their proposed strategic allocations are viable or deliverable. There are no model outputs, no numerical analysis, no transport strategy is provided, and no infrastructure plan made available. Infrastructure to connect allocations to P&R hubs is a further untested expense.	Of particular concern is that the levels of highway capacity provision suggested, whilst they may well provide some relief to the congestion problems in the District, will also serve to induce and encourage car use. It appears to represent a significant overall network betterment strategy, and hence the balance between private car use and "soft" modes - especially public transport for travel into the City, is not changed. It will be important that the evidence base is able to demonstrate that the balance of travel mode share is shifted away from the car.
1.56	779083	Ms Jane G Canning		2631	Objecting	The council needs to be sure there is a market for the houses they build. They must build sensible houses at affordable prices. This plan needs more thought than we have seen at the moment. I say we stop and think again. The sheer size of the present plan will surely ruin Canterbury as we know it.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	778493	Dianne & N D Lawrie		2694	Objecting	Objects to proposed housing development, wants to know about: number of people waiting for a house; the number of empty and for sale homes. Most occupants will be tenants from out of the area .Build houses where work is and adequate roading unlike Herne Bay. Utilise empty buildings, brownfield sites and space above shops.	Utilise empty buildings, brownfield sites and space above shops.
1.56	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2914	Objecting	Policy SP3 identifies 8 strategic site allocations for mixed use and housing led developments which comprise a total of 8,000 of the 15,600 total dwellings required over the plan period. As these sites comprise just over 50% of the total proposed housing allocation their deliverability and viability will be essential to the soundness of the Plan. Should any of these sites not be capable of meeting the tests set out in the NPPF in this respect, the Plan will be at risk of being found unsound.	The next draft of the Plan should include a schedule to demonstrate the phasing of the Strategic Allocations over the Plan period. The viability test in the NPPF for sites expected to deliver in the first five years of the plan is a stricter one than for those sites expected to come forward in the medium term.
1.56	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2937	Objecting	The various strategic allocations for the CS Draft are set out under policy SP3 and its sub-policies. However, as a fundamental pretext for the consideration of a Preferred Draft, it is unclear how the sites here have been evaluated against other competing sites €“ such as New Thanington. The tests set out in Policy SP1 should be applied, clearly, to the preferred and competing sites so that there is some evidence as to why particular options were rejected and others selected.	The rationale for including only one strategic site around Canterbury is not substantiated or supported by evidence or satisfactory explanation. It appears from the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that the only difference in performance of criteria is where the New Thanington Site gets a major negative for Geology and Biodiversity in contrast to the South Canterbury site which scores a major positive.
1.56	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2835	Objecting	The correct approach is to minimise the need and extent of travel. (1) Remove the need to travel as far as possible, by seeking to minimise journey length; (2) Ensure that where journeys have to be made they can be made conveniently by "soft" modes; then, (3) Require that measures to maximise walking, cycling and public transport use are provided as part development. It is unclear that the allocations follow the hierarchy of transport modes: walking; cycling; public transport; P&R; then car	This would lead to a CS draft approach that would be along the following lines: Locate strategic allocation sites in as close a proximity to the maximum number of local facilities, employment and education as possible; then, Ensure that they are well connected to public transport, walking and cycling facilities (including multi-modal hubs for these modes); then, Require that mixed use sites, in addition to the above, should seek to maximise the opportunities for journeys to be undertaken within the site, and therefore completed by soft modes. This principle would support, in principle, the allocation of sites closest to the City Centre - such as New Thanington
1.56	779145	Mr & Mrs D & P D Hobbs		2843	Objecting	The area in Herne Bay which is allocated for houses is a FAR FAR higher percentage than the rest of the Canterbury area and all of it borders the village of Herne and the hamlet of Broomfield.We will become part of the Herne Bay sprawl, we will no longer be a village and will lose our identity.	
1.56	779344	Mr & Mrs Janet & Stuart Barber		2859	Objecting	Agree with all the comments contained in the e-mail sent by Mrs Mary E Pottinger, of Peartree Road, Herne Bay in regards to the proposed developments at Herne, Greenhill and Beltinge. These developments would also have huge impact on local GP surgeries and dentists; as well as the hospitals which are already under strain.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	414960	Cllr Alex Perkins	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3179	Objecting	The three brownfield sites [Chislet Colliery, Howe Barracks and the Prison] are either entirely ignored or only considered only peripherally within the existing plan. More effective use should be made of brownfield sites before proposing building on high quality farmland.	
1.56	417774	Tory Family		3192	Objecting	It is submitted that the 'strategic allocations' will not deliver dwelling completions as envisaged by the emerging Plan. The evidence base informing the Plan is severely deficient and fails to demonstrate that the strategic allocations are economically viable or deliverable within the plan period. These allocations are dependent upon significant strategic infrastructure and no evidence has been published to demonstrate that the necessary strategic infrastructure can be funded or delivered.	
1.56	777509	Mrs Monica Blyth		3147	Objecting	Object to the development proposals at Herne Bay. Herne Village will lose its identity if all the proposed development takes place in the green gap between Herne Village and Greenhill/Herne Bay; and the view from the conservation area towards Herne Bay will be destroyed.	
1.56	779341	Prof Stephen Peckham		3043	Objecting	Object to the main development proposals. These will create significant local problems through increased traffic; and put local education; and health and social care amenities under strain. Support regulating HMO's; but raises objection to there being no incorporation of the potential impact of housing on new brownfield sites; or recognition of the impacts on small changes to current traffic flows. There should be no development before transportation and public service issues are addressed.	
1.56	779360	Ms Alison Grubb		3324	Objecting	Concern about the lack of planned infrastructure to meet the demands of the developments planned. Canterbury is gridlocked at busy times already (although the return to the pre Westgate Towers experiment has improved things greatly) and will be worse unless adequate road measures are taken. Central Govt is blackmailing CCC to accept housing to fund Road infrastructure, should stand up to this pressure. Understand some devt must take place but lack of infrastructure to go with it. Must reconsider	
1.56	121820	Mrs IVD Baker		3452	Objecting	Objects to failure of the plan to protect the best agricultural land from development, because; NPPF requires its protection (P.112); the Council has committed to an environmental policy; non inclusion of Policies CP6 & 7 from core strategy; goes against policies SP4 and EMP12 in LP; plan is unsound because it is inconsistent with NPPF in proposing unsustainable developments on grade 1 agricultural land; only develop on grade 2 qnd below land.	Please delete all proposed significant developments on grade 1 agricultural land, and redirect any necessary developments to land of grades 2 and below as advised by the NPPF.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	121830	Mr MJR Baker		3458	Objecting	Objects to failure of the plan to protect the best agricultural land from development, because; NPPF requires its protection (P.112); the Council has committed to an environmental policy; non inclusion of Policies CP6 & 7 from core strategy; goes against policies SP4 and EMP12 in LP; plan is unsound because it is inconsistent with NPPF in proposing unsustainable developments on grade 1 agricultural land; only develop on grade 2 qnd below land.	Please delete all proposed significant developments on grade 1 agricultural land, and redirect any necessary developments to land of grades 2 and below as advised by the NPPF.
1.56	780283	Mr Robert Jones		3505	Objecting	More houses could be built at sites in Thanington to compensate, Canterbury has far more employment opportunities and much better links to Ashford & London than Herne village does.	More houses could be built at sites in Thanington
1.56	780456	Mr Rory White		3350	Objecting	While one accepts that it is desirable to renew and replenish good housing stock, we have seen no convincing proof that this area NEEDS the number of homes IN THE NUMBER that are proposed. Not only would these plans wreck the essence of the city itself but of all the smaller communities that surround it. Broad Oak, Sturry, Hersden and Herne would become just an extended urban sprawl, with boundaries literally blurred and any distinctive character and coherence totally lost.	
1.56	407886	Mr J and P Booth		3534	Objecting	A set of Developer driven proposals which will maximise their returns. They do not represent what the populace want and are dangerous in that if implemented could undermine the unique character of Canterbury as a World Heritage Site. New Garden Cities should be built where there is an adequate supply of water and where there are no infrastructure restrictions.	
1.56	773749	Dr Roger Blackman		3575	Objecting	It appears that the chosen locations are those preferred by developers and therefore profit-led, in total disregard to the needs of the area as they now exist, and at variance with the Council's own policies as stated in the same document.	
1.56	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3565	Objecting	Building so many houses in the north of the district goes against this action as most people will travel elsewhere to work. I support some housing development close to Canterbury where all the jobs, schools and facilities are. To reduce travel/congestion/journey times new homes should be built closer to Canterbury not 6 miles away.	
1.56	780801	Jo Fox	Head of Primary Care Estates NHS	3635	Objecting	In all, the overall plan sees the development of 15,600 residential units over the Plan period. The increase in population from such housing developments creates demand on healthcare resources provided in the community and in local GP surgeries, where little or no space or capacity exists. (see attached for detail)	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	780827	Mr M P J Baker		3456	Objecting	Objects to failure of the plan to protect the best agricultural land from development, because; NPPF requires its protection (P.112); the Council has committed to an environmental policy; non inclusion of Policies CP6 & 7 from core strategy; goes against policies SP4 and EMP12 in LP; plan is unsound because it is inconsistent with NPPF in proposing unsustainable developments on grade 1 agricultural land; only develop on grade 2 qnd below land.	Please delete all proposed significant developments on grade 1 agricultural land, and redirect any necessary developments to land of grades 2 and below as advised by the NPPF.
1.56	780828	Mr Jeremy D I Baker		3454	Objecting	Objects to failure of the plan to protect the best agricultural land from development, because; NPPF requires its protection (P.112); the Council has committed to an environmental policy; non inclusion of Policies CP6 & 7 from core strategy; goes against policies SP4 and EMP12 in LP; plan is unsound because it is inconsistent with NPPF in proposing unsustainable developments on grade 1 agricultural land; only develop on grade 2 qnd below land.	Please delete all proposed significant developments on grade 1 agricultural land, and redirect any necessary developments to land of grades 2 and below as advised by the NPPF.
1.56	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3689	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent objects to the strategic allocations made under policy SP3 as per their Part 1. The policy guidance on the proposed sites is lacking. More supporting text is required to explain what is proposed for each site and how they will be developed. This should be reflected in the individual policies. The reader is left unclear about what will be considered and how they will progress.	
1.56	780510	Ms Mary Berg		3696	Objecting	Object to the development proposals outlined in the current Local Plan as it is flawed. The Plan should determine what the local infrastructure can support THEN consider what improvements could be made.	
1.56	13719	Mr Steve Moore	Thanet District Council	4113	Supporting	Also supported is the indication that growth will be principally focussed at or adjoining the existing towns.	
1.56	780272	Councillor Tony Austin	Councillor Canterbury City Council	4161	Objecting	400 homes should be allocated in the plan for the Barracks Site and Cockerling Farm should be used also.	
1.56	780846	Ms Helen Applegarth		4262	Objecting	Broad Oak has infilled all of its open space and it's Common over the years. I would like to see a Village Green re-established to give back Broad Oak its heart. This would take the form of a mown grassed area with benches, wildflower meadow areas, trees, play equipment and recreational space.	I would like to see a Village Green re-established to give back Broad Oak its heart. This would take the form of a mown grassed area with benches, wildflower meadow areas, trees, play equipment and recreational space.
1.56	780968	Mr Simon Wall		4353	Objecting	Much of the proposed building sites are on farmland. This will result in a loss of arable land. What action is being planned to ensure that such building work will not cause a reduction in agricultural production and food supply?	
1.56	406328	Mr Daniel Smith		4520	Objecting	Object to any further housing in the countryside, villages, and towns of Canterbury, Whitstable and Herne Bay while there is a level of unoccupied housing in the district.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4377	Objecting	Housing developments that destroy the green belt are not communities. Communities take years to develop and it sometimes requires several generations to give a sense of 'place'. Locating a new estate next to a community will not always simply enlarge the community but lead to a schism. Unfortunate but true. In the same way that knocking down terraces in the sixties and replacing them with modern high rise blocks failed the communities, these proposed massive sprawls will result in problem areas.	
1.56	779662	Mr Graham Kenmir		4466	Objecting	Although mention is made of 'Garden City principles' policy SP3 setting out the listed infrastructure requirements of the identified strategic sites is very precise on number of homes but far less so on the kind of provisions which enhance and improve the sense of communities. For some sites these provisions are barely mentioned (e.g. Sites 2, 6, 7 & 8). Once again the impression given is of developer-led housing estates not creatively thought out communities.	
1.56	779662	Mr Graham Kenmir		4467	Objecting	The emphasis is on economic development leading the need for homes. The draft Plan appears to rely on business etc following the homes. The site requirements given in SP3 give no indication that there will be substantial opportunities for employment on or near those sites. Again the impression is of dormitories from which the working population will commute to work elsewhere, that is those for whom there is work.	
1.56	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4508	Objecting	An appropriate strategy for the plan would see development in the lower mid range equating to scenario B (600 houses/yr, 12000 across the life of the plan) creating 2500-3500 new jobs in total. This will have less environmental impact and be more sustainable as set out in NPPF. The sequential approach should be applied but with some changes as detailed. Rural allocations should accord with the settlement hierarchy. They have presented their calculations and proposed allocations.	Change whole plan strategy to scenario B - 600 housing units/yr.
1.56	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4408	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. comments on the sites proposed for inclusion in the Plan, in policies SP3a - h, HD1, EMP1, TCL7 and TCL10. As a general point, though, we find that the policy guidance on the proposed sites is lacking. In particular we consider that more supporting text is required to explain what is actually proposed for each site and how they will actually be developed. This should then be reflected in the individual policies themselves.	
1.56	780002	Mr Howard Myers including household		4599	Objecting	CCC has failed to highlight or expand on a proposals on land S of Hersden as set out in paras 1.58-1.61. this has not been publicly announced. When added to this site there could be an additional 1200 homes and an undisclosed number of new commercial units constructed. It is extremely evident that CCC has not produced sufficient, suitable or acceptable information and is therefore this community is unable to analyze data. This is totally unacceptable & project should not be pursued.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	781255	Robert & Sandra Shine		4501	Objecting	There might be growth in the region in the future but why all the associated housing would have to be concentrated in one area of one particular urban settlement is never properly explained.	
1.56	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4740	Objecting	The designated sites are sensitive to water supply. Allocations to ensure scale of development is deliverable and clarify nature of mitigation. They should be tested against policies in the plan. Consideration should be given to sites that are, or may be, used by protected species. Development would lead to a loss of agricultural land. Subject to HRA, consideration should be given to policies and mechanisms for off-site mitigation. Thanet looking for solution for impact on coastal designations.	designations.
1.56	13753	Mr Jeremy Bellamy		4996	Objecting	Cockering Farm, which is not allocated in the Local Plan, has far better transport links than the proposed sites in Sturry Parish with potential access onto the A2 and access into Canterbury without the obstacle of the level crossing. The easier access into Canterbury would be a considerable advantage, and it is felt that developing Cockering Farm would present an easier fit into the existing urban environment of the City than what it is proposed in Sturry-Broad Oak and Hersden.	
1.56	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4887	Objecting	The Draft Local Plan focuses on the delivery of the proposed housing numbers on a relatively small number of developer led sites, which will deliver the key infrastructure requirements for the whole. This poses risk to the viability of the Plan, should one or more of the developer led schemes fail. There is no fallback position, acknowledgement of the risk or mitigation strategy.	
1.56	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4894	Objecting	The Plan fails to meet NPPF's need for joined up thinking. There is a disconnection between the provision of appropriate housing and employment growth; and an over reliance on a few large sites with no supporting development briefs. The viability of the sites has not been robustly tested and the assessment of Affordable Housing need is out-dated and should be reassessed. Finally, sustainable transport schemes, incorporating the proposed new developments, are essential to mitigate their impact.	
1.56	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4838	Objecting	Concerned about a disconnection between the potential business demand for labour and the provision of appropriate housing and its tenure. There should be at least an aspiration for the numbers of "employees" and their likely direction of employment at the various development sites included in the Local Plan.	
1.56	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4834	Objecting	The Plan goes little further than identifying locations put forward by developers for homes or employment. This leaves the strategic direction for each site almost entirely to markets and the developers submission. The lack of outline Development Briefs for the key sites exacerbates this serious situation as they would surely be a first step in shaping a vision for the whole district.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	781040	Ms Dawn Stroud		4813	Objecting	Herne Bay or Whitstable might well be more able to absorb new housing and a greater share.	
1.56	13812	Mr N J Blake		5171	Objecting	There is a realisation that the traffic problems in Canterbury are so severe that they require a solution. This appears to have led to the conclusion that development has to be concentrated into a few very large sites. This very concentration increases the congestion of those parts of the road system adjacent to the sites, for which no improvements are shown or likely. This "road driven" locational philosophy seems to have derailed all the other normal Town Planning inputs.	
1.56	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5468	Objecting	The adverse impacts of the proposed distribution of development will outweigh benefits! Impinging on high quality grade 1 agricultural BEFORE considering sites on brownfield, disused & lower grade agricultural land is totally irresponsible, bad planning and environmentally unsound. The argument that choosing a development strategy dominated by one massive development site in South Canterbury is more sustainable than any other option is open to t debate. Many smaller sites would be more sensitiv	Prior to looking at greenfield options, remaining brownfield sites and disused land in both urban and rural areas should be researched and clearly identified. Options to intensify current urban land uses and other development sites should also be rigorously investigated. A proper planning approach, taking full account of the Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal, would have factored all those possibilities in first, giving priority to sites close to bus routes, railway corridors and railway stations, and would have then looked at the poorer quality greenfield resources. Applied to the District, I believe such an approach would have highlighted the possibility of some of the already proposed sites in Herne Bay plus minor developments at such places as Chilham, Chartham, Bekesbourne, Adisham, Littlebourne etc and the possibility of new garden village developments at Hersden and Yorkletts on poorer quality land. Searching for suitable areas with spare infrastructural capacity is also wise.
1.56	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5476	Objecting	LARGER VILLAGES and LITTLEBOURNE No allocations except for Sturry, Hersden and Barham. The DLP is not, as claimed, commensurate with the Rural Hierarchy Study! There are no allocations to reinforce the other rural hubs, such as Littlebourne.	
1.56	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5479	Objecting	The SHLAA analysis and the final choice of sites do not match up and serious questions can also be posed regarding the applicability, wisdom and usefulness Amec methodology. One is left reaching the conclusions that the Council's own planners could have done a far better analysis, especially with their local knowledge. This is must be the case as comparing sites and scorings does not produce a fully consistent and objective pattern. Again this undermines the value of the whole exercise.	
1.56	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5524	Objecting	Is this particular distribution of strategic development wise? No. What are the alternatives? The main ones should have been set out for comparison.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5808	Objecting	The importance placed towards locating development on previously developed land in the first instance, and in advance of Greenfield land, is a clear objective requirement within the Sustainability Appraisal. By contrast the draft Local Plan is inconsistent with the Sustainability Appraisal as the major 'Brownfield' site with the area, the land at South Hersden has not been allocated as a priority.	
1.56	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5741	Supporting	Welcome location of new employment/commercial land near to housing. Need to ensure that employment sites are these are brought forward in a timely manner. Supports the approach taken by the Council in designating large scale developments rather than a multitude of small sites. It is not an easy sell but is the best method of accruing 'developer contributions' to ensure that the investment in the infrastructure is secured benefiting the wider community.	
1.56	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5762	Objecting	A contention inherent in the argument is that the precise provisions of the Plan are not simple possibilities. They are said to be the only possibility. Yet, at the same time the DLP is also referred to as the 'preferred option'. But the other options, to which this is preferred, are not spelled out. Despite this insistence that there is no alternative to the proposed housing figures and locations, there is precious little evidence about why this is so.	The document should be more modest and drop the 'there is no alternative' line so that critical responses to the consultation can be taken on board
1.56	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5892	Objecting	Development of these proposed sites has the potential to impact upon heritage assets such as direct impact resulting from construction activities and indirect impacts on the setting and character of neighbouring assets and places. The exceptional richness of historic environment + scale of the sites proposed would indicate a good potential for these allocation sites to impact upon presently unknown assets. Advice from CCC archaeological advisor should be sought with specific site analysis.	
1.56	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5846	Objecting	The argument for putting the bulk of housing in Canterbury is firstly that it is Canterbury's 'turn', secondly, the City is seen as an attractive hub: the place where - because of its cultural and other attractions - people want to live, and thirdly, because all the brownfield land has been used up, development has to be on greenfield sites which offer the best return. Concentrating houses also means public transport and facilities are more viable than in a dispersed pattern of development.	
1.56	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5833	Objecting	The importance placed towards locating development on previously developed land in the first instance, and in advance of Greenfield land, is a clear objective requirement within the Sustainability Appraisal. By contrast the draft Local Plan is inconsistent with the Sustainability Appraisal as the major 'Brownfield' site with the area, the land at South Hersden has not been allocated as a priority.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5911	Objecting	Housing supply seems high in Sturry/Hersden/Herne Bay which are less desirable in terms of market demand. Question deliverability especially with the requirements for highway, drainage and other infrastructure. Some of this housing would be better dispersed amongst the larger villages/local centres that are sustainable and have the facilities to support them. Development should be done through neighbourhood plans guided by strategic housing numbers. Will bring flexibility choice and delivery.	Put some of the strategic housing in the larger villages/local centres.
1.56	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6032	Objecting	Sturry is also a Parish is made up of three separate villages - Sturry, Broad Oak and Hersden. Under Policy SP3 Sturry and Broad Oak have, without their consent become con-joined Siamese twins referred to here as Sturry/Broad Oak and have lost their Hersden sibling. Where are the long term implications of this explained?	
1.56	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6023	Objecting	Policy SP3 - OVERALL OPINION: The District cannot support this scale of development without major investment by the providers of utilities and services and these are all factors outside the Council's control. Without the funding and delivery of all the essential work to support these large new/extended communities, and the associated road infrastructure improvements, the aims of this Policy cannot be realised.	
1.56	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6342	Objecting	I object to this definition of Sustainable Development as it is too narrow and fails to acknowledge the 'limits to growth'. These limits are both environmental (eg water availability) and man-made (eg congestion). Until these limits are addressed properly, any development on a large-scale is likely to be unsustainable. The proposed development in South Canterbury is an extreme example. My answer relates to all of the proposed Strategic Development Sites.	
1.56	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6200	Objecting	There is a much larger scale of housing to business land allocation in Sturry Parish than elsewhere. This means that a wider variety of employment opportunities will not be in this part of the District and the number of jobs created here will be inadequate. So, does this mean that the Council is thinking that the Parish of Sturry can be a dormitory area and/or that the District's problems and more challenging households can be concentrated here?	The Council needs to be seen to be appreciating the concern amongst residents about this issue. Information is required as to where the occupants of all the houses will come from; how, when and where the support they may need will be provided with evidence that this will be delivered as it is required; where their 'local' employment opportunities 'in close proximity to their homes will be.
1.56	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6295	Objecting	Is the need for the development allocations on agricultural land as set out in this Plan really proven?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.56	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6763	Supporting	Any reduction in housing numbers will have a significant and adverse impact on the locational strategy of the Council for growth along the Sturry, Hersden and Herne Bay corridor. Expansion needs to occur primarily at Canterbury. Development of new hospital may provide new opportunities along with the employment development. If housing numbers reduced will need to e along Sturry/Herne Bay corridor, impacting on infrastructure. Will contest any reduction in housing at Canterbury.	
1.57	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1925	Supporting	Hillreed is supportive of the indicative allocation at Hersden, which will be subject to further refinement following design workshops involving the community and LPA. Additional study work by Hillreed's masterplanning team is likely to recognise that the boundaries of the allocated area are largely indicative at this early stage and will be subject to refinement. The setting of the listed barns close to Bredlands Lane for instance will be taken into account as the layout progresses.	
1.57	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3690	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent objects to the strategic allocations made under policy SP3 as per their Part 1. The policy guidance on the proposed sites is lacking. More supporting text is required to explain what is proposed for each site and how they will be developed. This should be reflected in the individual policies. The reader is left unclear about what will be considered and how they will progress.	
1.57	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5525	Objecting	Is this particular distribution of strategic development wise? No. What are the alternatives? The main ones should have been set out for comparison.	
Policy SP3 a	765226	Mrs L Hogben		4	Objecting	I am writing to register my concerns over the draft Local Plan to build 4000 homes in South Canterbury. Although I appreciate that some building is necessary I believe that the extra traffic, pollution and added strain on our local hospital are but a few reasons for very careful consideration.	
Policy SP3 a	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		12	Objecting	Colin Carmichael is reported as describing Canterbury's traffic problems as insoluble. I respectfully agree. However adding to the population to the south with the associated employment opportunities is going simply to make a dire problem even worse. Nothing that I have read in the draft persuades me that anyone has a solution. P&R will not magic away increased traffic.I express concern that good quality -is it Grade 1?- agricultural land is to be taken for the proposed development in South Cant	
Policy SP3 a	383359	Ms Judy Seymour - Ure		20	Objecting	Object to development at south canterbury for the following reasons: there are too many houses (8000 people) proposed on one site; universities are building more accommodation and making existing housing available; S. Canterbury is not the right place for commuting; will increase congestion; stretch water resources to their limit; mean the loss of agricultural land; there are no plans for secondary schools and no mention of increasing capacity of the hospital.	The plan needs to be amended

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	766238	Mr Mike Sole		22	Objecting	I would like to make the following objections / comments: Impact on Bridge needs to be considered, including impact on services, traffic and parking; impact of parking and traffic flows to Canterbury East, West and Bekesbourne stations needs considered; impact on parking (including disabled) needs considered; traffic impact in city should have been considered in detail; and the plan does not deal with a predicted demand for places at Bridge Village School.	
Policy SP3 a	766469	Ms Helen Paine		33	Objecting	Object to South Canterbury: it is invasion of a greenfield site, which would mean a merging of bridge with Canterbury; it would ruin the nature of Canterbury; it would represent the loss of valued green open space and there are fewer and fewer options for outside leisure; the extra road systems would generate traffic and contribute to congestion and pollution; schools and doctors are oversubscribed and the hospital could not cope. Howe Barracks is well adapted to meeting housing needs.	Preserve south Canterbury
Policy SP3 a	766609	Mr Paul Chapman		35	Objecting	Object to development at south Canterbury. 1.The development will use large amounts of agricultural land. This is not acceptable when further development in the City itself could provide the necessary units. The now vacant army barracks could also be used to provide a large number of units. 2. There is little or no development of the road structure and there will be further congestion and pollution in the city. The proposed development is not close to the shopping park on Sturry Road.	
Policy SP3 a	766593	Ms Helen Sole		37	Objecting	Has there been any consideration to the effect of 4000 houses on the village of Bridge? Traffic into the village to use facilities will increase. Is there a timescale for the building of a new school and access roads onto the A2 before the first houses are completed? There is no off street parking in Bridge, other than the health centre. Traffic will increase on the congested New Dover and Old Dover Roads. New houses, traffic and loss of farmland will increase air pollution.	
Policy SP3 a	765413	Mr John Rogerson		44	Objecting	South Canterbury infrastructure is overloaded, with many houses unsold, and potential buyers looking elsewhere. Gridlocked traffic on potholed roads, sewage overflows, power cuts & overloaded NHS. The Council are being charmed by planning gain. Building on the Girls Grammar School, together with with other houses to be built in S Canterbury will result in complete infrastructure breakdown.	
Policy SP3 a	766840	Ms Sheelagh Deller		48	Objecting	Concerned about the proposed development in South Canterbury. Building half the proposed homes in one already developed area of Canterbury will cause many problems which will discourage tourism and shopping. There is already congestion and pollution. Why is 2011 traffic data not being used. How will the hospital cope, there is already water stress, loss of needed agricultural land. Include Howe Barracks in the plan.	Ask questions about congestion, pollution and the hospital. Listen to the people who live in Canterbury and have its best interests at heart.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	117585	Cllr Nick Eden-Green		142	Objecting	Development at South Canterbury will result in congestion, is economically risky and is not needed as the proposed housing numbers are too great. Other sites around Canterbury should be looked at in detail.	Undertake a full analysis of other sites including South Hersden Howe Barracks, Canterbury Prison, Wincheap, Peugot Garage, Pin Hill, with student housing at Parham Road and Rhodaus Town, instead of South Canterbury.
Policy SP3 a	766790	M Hogben		61	Objecting	Oject to development of south Canterbury. Building 4000 homes on prime agricultural land is ludicrous. Overwhelming impact of new customers on K&C Hospital. There is no indication of where new sewage works will be sites. New facilities will be needs, including schools, sports, parks, allotments, community hall, shops, religious facilities and cinema. Current water supply is far from reliable. There is the issue of providing work. Travel to train stations and parking needs considered.	There is lesser agricultural quality, such as Blean, Chartham Hatch, Harbledown, Rough Common, Kingston which could be linked to the main roads by a ring road. Has there been a study into this matter. The reservoir at Broad Oak must be built and functioning before any housebuilding work. There would need to be a substantial workplace facilities to attract employers. Experts would have to be employed to comment on works to be provided. Perhaps a new train station could serve the area.
Policy SP3 a	766797	Miss L Dowle		110	Objecting	Object to development at South Canterbury. I fail to see how any housing development could be justified on Grade 1 farmland. The proposals are developer led and do not take account of residents views. The proposal is disproportionate to the city layout and would link the village of Bridge. Canterbury is lacking in major leisure facilities, infrastructure is running to capacity, there is no provision for employment. Where will residents work and travel to work. No justification; oppose plans	
Policy SP3 a	766800	Mr Mark Dowle		133	Objecting	Objects because: use of A1 farmland, is disproportionate, city lacks leisure facilities and none are provide by plan, infrastructure running to capacity, no schools provided for, no transport improvements proposed, plan provides no employment for new housing. Alternative sites should be used and new halls of residence will release houses to residents. No justification for development on arable farmland at south Canterbury.	Include alternative and better placed existing brown field sites, ie, Chartham St Augustines, M.O.D site at Howe Barracks, disused Canterbury Prison, Hersden Colliery. Do not develop farmland at south Canterbury.
Policy SP3 a	766802	Mr Zoe Dowle		134	Objecting	Objects because: use of A1 farmland, is disproportionate, city lacks leisure facilities and none are provide by plan, infrastructure running to capacity, no schools provided for, no transport improvements proposed, plan provides no employment for new housing. Alternative sites should be used and new halls of residence will release houses to residents. No justification for development on arable farmland at south Canterbury.	Include alternative and better placed existing brown field sites, ie, Chartham St Augustines, M.O.D site at Howe Barracks, disused Canterbury Prison, Hersden Colliery. Do not develop farmland at south Canterbury.
Policy SP3 a	766803	Miss K Dowle		128	Objecting	Objects because: use of A1 farmland, is disproportionate, city lacks leisure facilities and none are provide by plan, infrastructure running to capacity, no schools provided for, no transport improvements proposed, plan provides no employment for new housing. Alternative sites should be used and new halls of residence will release houses to residents. No justification for development on arable farmland at south Canterbury.	Include alternative and better placed existing brown field sites, ie, Chartham St Augustines, M.O.D site at Howe Barracks, disused Canterbury Prison, Hersden Colliery. Do not develop farmland at south Canterbury.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	766829	Mr Stuart Field		97	Objecting	Prior to any development in south Canterbury the road system needs to be looked at as a priority. It is essential that there is a new full four way on/off junction on the A2 south of Canterbury (incl removing existing Bridge turn off); a new exit road needs to be built off the southbound A2 at Wincheap; South Canterbury relief road needs revisited; water supply needs discussed with Southern Water; and a full entry/exist needs provided at the north end of the A2 Canterbury Junction.	Only if these road proposals are implemented will there be any hope of preventing total grid lock in the centre of and approach roads to Canterbury.
Policy SP3 a	767055	Ms Julie Mecoli		92	Objecting	Object to development at South Canterbury. Where is the evidence new houses are needed? At what point does the council put forward a sustainable future for Canterbury, not one of constant expansion? It is like a new town, putting a significant strain onto infrastructure that is already stretched to the maximum in terms of traffic, water, sewerage. Pollution levels are high. The Council proposes to make this situation worse. Development on greenfield sites is wrong.	Remove South Canterbury site from the Local Plan
Policy SP3 a	767818	Mrs PMBD Hawkes		125	Objecting	Objects to development on agricultural land at South Canterbury, has long term repercussions on a country's ability to produce food. Once land is lost to food production it can not be recovered. Why was Wincheap not deveoped instead?	Remove New Dover Road site and develop brownfield land at Wincheap instead.
Policy SP3 a	768345	Dr Chris Shilling		119	Objecting	Opposition to the Local Plan as it affects South Canterbury. The amount of housing planned for the area will destroy the character of our area and the volume of increased traffic is completely unfeasible. There are more suitable sites for greater expansion in Herne Bay, Hersden and Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 a	768355	Mrs Terrylee Cox		121	Objecting	I am very concerned about the part of the plan which proposes to build 4,000 houses in South Canterbury, an amount of housing in a location which will have by far the greatest detrimental impact on this beautiful Cathedral city. The facilities and services and roads cannot cope with the current population and their impact, such a large amount of houses, people and cars will compound an already desperate situation.	
Policy SP3 a	768365	Mr Barry Clare		124	Objecting	Objection to allocation of housing at South Canterbury	
Policy SP3 a	768397	Dr and Mrs Lucas		130	Objecting	The scale and location of the South Canterbury aspect of the local plan appears flawed and likely to result in significant changes to the area which are not well justified.	
Policy SP3 a	769835	Ms Anne Welch		146	Objecting	I object to the plan to build 4000 new houses in South Canterbury on the following grounds:- The two Dover roads are already extremely traffic congested. The city's sewage system can hardly cope as it is. School provision would be overstretched if 4000 new households were to be created. The proximity of pleasant countryside would be obliterated by the creation of so many new houses. The site is the wrong end of town- too far from access to HS1 train.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	408452	Mr & Mrs Raymond and Marion Bell		195	Objecting	Object to development at South Canterbury. Brownfield sites should be used first, there is no evidence to support the need for 4000 homes in this area, or proof they will stimulate the economy. Where will people work. Also object for reasons of congension and air pollution, it is unlikelyx that the A2 interchange will eve be built. There are currently over 400 homes for sale in CT1 and CT4, building student accommodation would free up many homes and 4000 home will exacerbate water shortages	
Policy SP3 a	422109	Ms Ann Parkin		188	Objecting	Object to South Canterbury for the following reasons:4,000 homes will have a major impact:No evidence for housing in this area, nor that ther will be enough jobs:Increased traffic congestion and pollution and infrasrtuctue will be expensive:Loss of agricultural land is a travisty when there are brownfield sites available:Severe demands on utilities and water:a detailed analysis of infrastructure needs is required.	
Policy SP3 a	766484	mrs margaret gurr		183	Objecting	Object to proposed development at South Canterbury for the following reasons: the land is needed for food production; a new school is not needed; the roads in Canterbury cannot sustain any more cars; pollution levels are already high (and further increases would increase effects on health); there is no major employment source on this side of Canterbury. Most importantly other areas of the district would welcome housing development and infrastructure, such as along the A299 corridor.	
Policy SP3 a	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		329	Objecting	Concerned about land allocation encouraging more private motor vehicle journeys and not including enough to facilitate sustainable travel modes.	(See annotated map) - Dedicated in-road but physically separated from the main carriageway cycle route along the New Dover Road corridor from the Old Dover Road junction to the city centre (at Fenwicks etc.); - Additional paths to make cycle / foot connections more direct: # Direct shared cycle / foot path to Bridge village; # Use of public bridleway CC47 (with high quality solid surfacing & lighting) as a cycle and pedestrian path; - Traffic restrictions to prevent rat-running between the A2 and B2068; - Cap off Old Dover Road at its junction with New Dover Road for motor vehicles (pedestrians and cyclists still permitted) to explicitly discourage private motor vehicle journeys and make Old Dover Road more amenable to pedestrian / cycle traffic. Or, instead of capping off the road provide a bus gate which will only allow buses as well as cyclists and pedestrians through.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	168	Objecting	By approximately maintaining the current building rate, major development in south Canterbury is simply not needed. The single largest site proposed in south Canterbury is in the wrong place. Indeed, two-fifths of the proposed green field development in the draft Local Plan comprises the south Canterbury site alone. The arguments for it are unproven on economic development grounds, not supported by local people and not sustainable.	
Policy SP3 a	769838	Mr Edward Goff		199	Objecting	New houses will only stimulate the economy in the short term. Have falling student numbers and empty homes been taken into account? 4000 new homes at south Canterbury will create more congestion, pollution and demand on water.	
Policy SP3 a	769847	Mr Andrew Spence		175	Objecting	To build up to 4,000 houses at south Canterbury will be disastrous. The notion of a "fast bus" to bring people from the new development is laughable. Already there are traffic jams up Nunnery Fields at critical times of the day and frequently along the Old Dover Road from the police station to the cricket ground. As for the destruction of the little green belt of grade one farmland lying between the city and Bridge, it would a tragic decision which would be inherited by untold future generations	Why not build in Whitstable, in Herne Bay and Herseden, where people would prefer?
Policy SP3 a	769853	Captain Rens Van Eerten		182	Objecting	With horror I looked at the proposed 4000 homes in south Canterbury. Looking at this plan I can't see the proposed football club and this new secondary school go together. Can I have you few on this please.	
Policy SP3 a	770532	Mrs S Hopkins		193	Objecting	Re.Planning South Canterbury This is my letter Objecting to your current proposal for planning of 4,000 houses in South Canterbury. We understand from our local Councillor Northly that there is no finance for infrastructure and the roads around South Canterbury can not take anymore traffic. And we certainly do not want 4,000 houses here. We want to keep our greenfield sites, so would ask you to reconsider your plans for this great area of Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 a	770533	Mr David Scott		187	Objecting	Object to development at South Canterbury. New and Old Dover Road cannot cope with the traffic as it is. The plan shows for new schools this will cause more traffic in causing even more air pollution. Local hospital services are being downgraded and it is difficult to get app's with Dr, dentists etc. We have Christchurch Collage and Canterbury University. Water supplies are in short supply, sewerage and surface water cannot cope as it is. We have one sewerage works we don't want another one.	
Policy SP3 a	770764	Professor David Welch		204	Objecting	Roads already extremely congested:poor air quality:overloaded sewage system:overstretched school provision:loss of countryside:distance from HS1 train:vision of silicone valley unrealistic:loss of green belt	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	771225	Ms Jane Pollok		165	Objecting	As a south Canterbury resident I have grave concerns regarding the plan to build 4000 houses in the area. I work at the Kent and Canterbury Hospital and cycle to work. However I am acutely aware of the traffic congestion especially in the Old Dover Road. At times there is complete grid lock the length of the road and I have often watched ambulances desperately trying to reach the hospital through the traffic. I am in no way assured that there will be an in	I do not understand why Kent County Council does not look to our Kentish towns which are struggling and offer a combination of regeneration and expansion in the housing market. I cite Dover or Margate as examples. This could be an exciting project, incorporating also a system of moving traffic out of the towns and encouraging the use of public transport, walking and cycling. The Dutch towns are an excellent example of how this could work.
Policy SP3 a	771575	Captain Rens Van Eerten		184	Objecting	South Canterbury is a nice area to live. We do not need more houses which will bring more traffic which will not work.	Builds new house on the land of the old barracks which will close.
Policy SP3 a	771769	Mr Jeffery Elliott		221	Objecting	Objects to the development at South Canterbury because it is a monstrous and unjustifiable imposition on part of the heritage city. The proposal will blight the city.	Provide extra housing at a range of alternative sites within the wider area.
Policy SP3 a	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		474	Objecting	The transport infrastructure is not in place to allow this scale of development.	A substantial improvement to the road infastructure, on the scale of a South Canterbury to Sturry lin road needs to be agreed before this scale of development can be considered. Moving the development Suth so that was centered on Bekesbourne Station would assist with sustainable transport objectives.
Policy SP3 a	408444	Mr & Mrs Bill & Carol Hinchliffe		488	Objecting	Opposes any development at South Canterbury, due to; loss of agricultural land which is needed for food production; it is virtually a new town; development should be on brownfield sites; need for GP's and hospital capacity is not addressed; Langton girls school not moving; the park and ride has just been built, spending more money is not good use of tax payer money; it will increase congestion and pollution in the city; there is a business park at Wincheap with empty sites	
Policy SP3 a	422113	G Ambers		460	Objecting	To practically join the city to bridge is absolutely wrong. I therefore contend that the Draft Plan is totally wrong and impractical, so should be rejected.	
Policy SP3 a	772200	Solihin Garrard		252	Objecting	I am particularly concerned about the proposed levels of house building, especially, but not only, in the South Canterbury area. As well as provision for levels of traffic, air quality, water, and hospital provision; there are clearly other issues, such as the appalling prospect of losing the green gap between Canterbury and Bridge, and the many quality of life issues we shall face in 20 years.	
Policy SP3 a	772987	Mrs Doreen Louren		305	Objecting	Raises concerns about the proposals at South Canterbury such as the use of greenfield and agricultural land, inadequate consideration of infrastructure, water stress; and an increase in traffic and pollution. Questions the demand for increased housing provision in Canterbury and CCC's decision to ignore NLP's recommendations. Suggests universities develop their campuses with student accommodation to free up houses elsewhere; as well as the further consideration of new 'emerging' sites'.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	773027	Ms Sofiah Garrard		317	Objecting	Raises concern about the development proposals for South Canterbury including; traffic congestion, increased water stress, lack of health provision, the use of agricultural land and the erosion of the 'green gap' between Canterbury and Bridge.	
Policy SP3 a	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		278	Objecting	As above, It is too large a development for this area. The infrastructure is inadequate and despite contributions from developers, likely to remain so. The development comes too close to the village of Bridge, at present with well defined boundaries.	Much smaller development
Policy SP3 a	775862	Mr Clive Flisher		341	Objecting	Loss of grade 1 agricultural land; no justification for Simon Langton Girls School to relocate; loss of green space at school and countryside access; Overload of local transport from extra home and industry. Resolve student accommodation to release 4-5000 homes back to family use, then no need to build on prime agricultural land.	Removal entirely of South Canterbury proposal.
Policy SP3 a	407892	Mrs Lynne Couperthwait e		680	Objecting	Objecting in the strongest possible terms to the proposed building of 4000+ houses in the South of Canterbury. The land you are proposing to use in South Canterbury is Grade 1 farmland which is of high landscape value - this means it is some of the finest agricultural land in England.	
Policy SP3 a	420920	Ms Joan Hyde		630	Objecting	I wish to register my objection to the proposed Canterbury South planning proposals. Canterbury is a beautiful Cathedral City which has already given enormously bringing with it many problems which would only be exacerbated if such a huge building project was carried out.	
Policy SP3 a	665473	Dr Richard Norman		520	Objecting	The proposal for 4000 new dwellings in South Canterbury is undesirable and unsustainable. It will add substantially to traffic congestion on the roads into the centre of the city, which are already congested. It will destroy valuable agricultural land and have a damaging effect on the environment.	If the overall new housing target were reduced to between 500 and 600 a year, this massive development in South Canterbury would not be needed.
Policy SP3 a	768224	Dr Torren Peakman		684	Objecting	Regarding the proposed development in South Canterbury. I strongly question the need for an increased level of house building. It is clear that there is still plenty of scope for attractive development without the need for moving onto farming land in South Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 a	774601	Mr D C Hartwell		525	Objecting	Object to proposals at South Canterbury on the basis that the scale is in excess of what the city can sustain for the following reasons. The main arterial roads carrying traffic in/out of Canterbury are already congested and there is no traffic plan or survey; the extra population and traffic will impact on environmental and historic fabric of the city; capacity of the existing water supply / sewage infrastructure is insufficient; and challenges the potential for job expansion in the district.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	775179	Mr Steve Allinson		514	Objecting	Object to proposals at South Canterbury on the basis that the scale is in excess of what the city can sustain for the following reasons. The main arterial roads carrying traffic in/out of Canterbury are already congested and there is no traffic plan or survey; the extra population and traffic will impact on environmental and historic fabric of the city; capacity of the existing water supply / sewage infrastructure is insufficient; and challenges the potential for job expansion in the district.	
Policy SP3 a	775201	Mr John Darling		605	Objecting	Proposals for south Canterbury should be reconsidered. Development would obscure the distinctiveness of this historic city within the kentish landscape and as a centre of pilgrimage. It would spread urban outskirts and reduce access to the countryside. Pilgrims way would be swallowed up. Future local demand is not justified and impact on congested traffic routes and community services is not sufficiently taken into account. Destruction of agricultural land is short sighted.	
Policy SP3 a	775418	Ms Elizabeth Darling		469	Objecting	Objects to the South Canterbury allocation because, it is an important attractive place for walkers, it is grade 1 agricultural land, issues accommodating additional traffic.	
Policy SP3 a	775423	Rev & Mrs Wilton		484	Objecting	Object to proposals at South Canterbury on the basis that the scale is in excess of what the city can sustain for the following reasons. The main arterial roads carrying traffic in/out of Canterbury are already congested and there is no traffic plan or survey; the extra population and traffic will impact on environmental and historic fabric of the city; capacity of the existing water supply / sewage infrastructure is insufficient; and challenges the potential for job expansion in the district.	
Policy SP3 a	775604	Ms J Mayne		468	Objecting	I object strongly to the building of thousands of houses on the land south of canterbury. The land is grade A agricultural. Infrastructure - Canterbury's road networks would not cope with the extra traffic. The down grading of Kent and Canterbury Hospital. Not adequate sewage. Canterbury has already built more than its expected new quote of housing. There are other areas - Barracks. No jobs to support extra housing. Removal of recreation area. Its a historical pilgrimage route.	
Policy SP3 a	775608	Ms Gwendolin Armstrong		465	Objecting	I am very concerned that the area around south Canterbury is being considered for development for the following reasons : It is not a brownfield site. Traffic into canterbury on the New & Old Dover Roads would be even worse, causing increased congestion, pollution and delays. The green fields must be protected.	
Policy SP3 a	775809	Ms Debbie Shilling		585	Objecting	South Canterbury - I would like to register my objection to the local plan as currently presented. I believe the infrastructure is insufficient to support such a large development. We have a duty of care in this area and I believe this proposal for South Canterbury would be detrimental to the area in a host of ways.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	775890	Mr John Alterskye		621	Objecting	Objects to proposals at South Canterbury as there is no justification for an increased rate of house buildings when completions are already above the national and regional averages; it will worsen congestion and parking problems in the City; and would result in the loss of prime agricultural land.	
Policy SP3 a	775969	Mr Barry Arscott		506	Objecting	Object to development at South Canterbury. Concerns over badger sets and owls nesting within the area. Concerns over additional traffic and parking. Also concerns over noise and constrcution dust when devleopment is going ahead.	
Policy SP3 a	776234	Miss J Bell		598	Objecting	Opposes plans to build 400 houses at south Canterbury because; there are other sites that could be used; it is grade 1 farmland; no benefit to South Canterbury; where are people going to work; the infrastructure is insufficient; the A2 interchange will not happen; does not believe we need more homes in Canterbury; there are water shortages; just need more student accommodation to free up rental accommodation.	
Policy SP3 a	776237	Mr Michael Clancy		599	Objecting	Objects to 4000 homes at south Canterbury because; is based on Ipsos Mori research done 18 months ago on 1.5% of population; is not justified; no evidence new houses are required; where will new jobs, hospitals, GP's, shops, schools and leisure activities come from?; roads already solid with traffic; will make traffic congestion, air pollution and water shortages worse; loss of grade 1 agricultural land; brownfields sites should be developed; based on student demand which is now falling.	I strongly believe the proposal to build 4,000 houses in South Canterbury should be scrapped.
Policy SP3 a	776435	Reverend Julia Butterworth		619	Objecting	Object to proposals at South Canterbury as it would result in the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land and is in an Area of High Landscape Value; increase traffic congestion and access problems around the city; and there is no guarantee that water supply and drainage will be adequate to service the planned development.	Development needs to be more evenly spread over the city area and to concentrate first on brownfield sites such as the barracks and Hersden.
Policy SP3 a	776706	Ms Susan Le Touze		753	Objecting	The scale of the building proposed is disproportionately focused on South Canterbury. This will radically change the city, noted for its historic character, in a very undesirable way. It will increase the existing traffic congestion and pollution. It will put a strain on the infrastructure, notably water supplies and sewage, which are already more or less at capacity. I don't believe there is sufficient employment in the area to meet the suggested increase in population.	
Policy SP3 a	366511	Mr Tony Couperthwaite		806	Objecting	Object to proposal to build 4,500 new houses in south Canterbury. Allowing development here to build a relief road is not a justified reason. We should not be building on Grade 1 agricultural land needed for food production when there are alternative areas that would more readily accept development. The land is AHLV and development would change the character and view of Canterbury. Local traffic would increase, Nackington Road already struggles.	If development here must go ahead then it should be scaled down drastically and other alternative sites found. There are other alternatives; The Wincheap industrial estate, Canterbury Army barracks. Steering Universities to build 'student accommodation' on their existing land, of which they have plenty, instead of buying up land that could be used for local housing. Canterbury Prison site. Further development in Hersden, this area is a prime area for further development and something locals in that area have been asking for.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	404732	Mr Christopher Young		886	Objecting	Object to development at South Canterbury for the following reasons: excessive numbers of houses, against the wishes of 70% local residents; high quality agricultural land; 8000 extra daily vehicle movements will increase congestion and pollution; residents need safeguarded against aggressive developers; housing development already 50% higher than SE; landscape gives context to historical development at Canterbury; urban sprawl joined to villages would ruin Canterbury.	Many favour the building of more new houses in surrounding villages including Hersden and the coastal fringe. This would at least avoid some extra vehicle movements along the already peak time congested Old Dover Road and Nackington Roads. Councillors and Council officers must find a way to gain several smaller developments over the whole Canterbury district by working with residents, government, and developers to provide the right mix of new housing and other local developments. Otherwise Canterbury and District will end up with huge estates of largely commuter four plus bedroom two bath roomed (just) detached double garaged houses built on former greenfield land. (This is because this is the type of development which brings most profit to developers).
Policy SP3 a	459158	Mr Gerry Reilly		847	Objecting	I wish to register my strong objection to the development proposals for the South Canterbury area. There are implications for city traffic congestion, air pollution, permanent loss of greenfield areas and the increased pressure on the provision of water and sewage provisions as well as the overall impact on the provision of civic amenities and facilities.	
Policy SP3 a	777164	Mrs Marian Nicholson		683	Objecting	I register my protest at the size of the proposed development in the Barton area of Canterbury. New Dover Road is already overloaded. Where are these residents going to do their food shopping? No provision mentioned. We do not need the quantity of housing in this area.	
Policy SP3 a	777173	Mr Tim Timpson		749	Objecting	Building 4,000 house in South Canterbury would bring the city to a standstill. If there is any development allowed in South Canterbury it is imperative that the limited money available from the developer is used to provide a road from the New Dover Road, south of the Gate Inn, in a north-east direction, over the railway to Littlebourne Road. This then provides a relief, release valve, for traffic flows in SE Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 a	777176	Mrs Pamela Alterskye		696	Objecting	I express my strong objections to the development of South Canterbury. There is no justification for the City Council's claim that an increased rate of house-building is necessary. If more housing is necessary in the area I would suggest that the depressed seaside towns in the area, particularly Herne Bay, would welcome an increase in population. I fail to understand claims that the new roads mentioned in the plan will reduce traffic congestion. I consider the loss of prime agricul	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		923	Objecting	I object to the allocation of 4,000 houses on land at South Canterbury. Major housing development in South Canterbury is not necessary to meet the SEP housing numbers of 510 pa. Building houses does not generate economic growth in the longer term which is the main justification for the proposed large increase in the rate of house building. Better sites are available which have not been included, e.g. Howe Barracks and the former colliery site. The area is AHLV, Grade 1 agricultural land.	
Policy SP3 a	777235	Mr & Mrs G E Brindle		845	Objecting	Too many dwellings especially at south Canterbury more than local needs and there are no guarantees that the infrastructure improvements will be done. Building on greenfield sites is unacceptable there are empty properties and brownfield lands that should be used first. Greenfield land is valuable for agriculture. Traffic density is a problem, additional cars will choke the roads and worsen air pollution. There is little prospect of work opportunities being created people will have to commute.	
Policy SP3 a	777309	Ms Margaret Smith		994	Objecting	4000 houses at south Canterbury is excessive because: more cars would increase traffic congestion and air pollution, facilities such as water and sewage need updating, use of grade 1 agricultural land, more schools would be needed, the hospital would need to be upgraded, more GP's would be required, let the tourist city continue, more student accommodation will release houses.	
Policy SP3 a	777338	Mrs Mary Truelove		995	Objecting	The vast development of 2000 houses at New Dover and Nackington Road will result in an enormous increase in traffic at peak times and does take account of the 3 secondary schools and 300 school children who will be put at risk by the increase in traffic. Also rejects Policy C19 of the current plan as the land should be used for food production not a university.	
Policy SP3 a	777356	Mrs T McCarthy		999	Objecting	Objects to the the use of Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land at south Canterbury. Development should be taken on brownfield land and lower value agricultural land first. A housing estate can't provide food for the future. Direct housing to land of low value	
Policy SP3 a	777362	Ms Susan M Reilly		848	Objecting	I wish to register my strong objection to the development proposals for the South Canterbury area. There are implications for city traffic congestion, air pollution, permanent loss of greenfield areas and the increased pressure on the provision of water and sewage provisions as well as the overall impact on the provision of civic amenities and facilities.	
Policy SP3 a	777364	Michael & Daphne Reeve		846	Objecting	We are naturally very concerned about the housing plans for South Canterbury for these particular reasons. The traffic especially during term time is extremely heavy daily and this could only get worse with the introduction of thousands of new houses over the coming years. The plans would wipe out prime farmland off the New Dover Road and Nackington Road. Concerns over provision of infrastructure ie sewage, water etc that goes with the housing.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	777372	Mr N S Jones		842	Objecting	I understand that the Council is considering building 4000 new houses along with a new business park on this area of Canterbury, adding a development the size of a village. The local hospital has been downgraded. The plan will cause a huge increase in traffic. There will be considerable extra strain on utilities. Some of the building will be on grade 1 agricultural land.	
Policy SP3 a	777373	Mrs J P Jones		843	Objecting	I understand that the Council is considering building 4000 new houses along with a new business park on this area of Canterbury, adding a development the size of a village. The local hospital has been downgraded. The plan will cause a huge increase in traffic. There will be considerable extra strain on utilities. Some of the building will be on grade 1 agricultural land.	
Policy SP3 a	777424	Mrs & Mrs Edmed		828	Objecting	Objects to development proposals at South Canterbury as the population is expected to remain stable for the next ten years; local infrastructure for transport, utilities, health care, employment can not sustain a population increase of 20%; the site is both greenfield and grade 1 agricultural land; and is concerned about the funding of community facilities.	
Policy SP3 a	777425	J V Daws		815	Objecting	Re :South Canterbury. I appreciate there is an urgent need for more affordable housing, improved employment opportunities and updates to transport infrastructure and facilities within the South Canterbury Area. However I feel that the proposed plan is in excess of what can be comfortably sustained within South Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 a	777755	R A & S L DeChaine		885	Objecting	We are concerned about this development plan. As far as South Canterbury is concerned the land proposed for this building is prime agriculture land which should surely be used for the purpose it was intended. One of our main concerns is medical facilities, particularly hospitals. These hospitals will not just cope with what will probably be an extra 12,000 people just in Canterbury district alone.	
Policy SP3 a	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1101	Objecting	Concerned about development at South Canterbury and the extent to which additional residential housing and commercial development in South Canterbury would increase traffic congestion in Nackington Road and Old Dover Road, impeding access to Canterbury by Waltham parishioners. WPC notes that the layout for the new housing developments in South Canterbury includes vehicular access into Nackington Road, together with a fast bus link past the relocated Simon Langton Girls' School.	WPC would like to see more in the Plan about the details of this crossing so as to maintain reasonable accessibility to Canterbury for both residents in the new housing development and existing residents in outlying rural areas such as Waltham.
Policy SP3 a	776710	N & R.J Smith		1084	Objecting	Raises concerns about development proposals at South Canterbury such as the use of greenfield, agricultural land; erosion of the greenbelt between Canterbury and Bridge; increased traffic congestion and pollution.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	777357	Mrs A Austin		1179	Objecting	Objects to 4000 new homes at South Canterbury because of the; destruction of the finest agricultural land, increase in traffic congestion and air pollution from new residents, lack of infrastructure especially as the new A2 slip will mean no money left for schools, surgeries etc. Some house building must occur but rejects the amounts in the local plan and them being sited on grade 1 agricultural land.	
Policy SP3 a	777358	D F Toze		1193	Objecting	Objects to development of 4000 houses on land at south Canterbury because: rejects the number of new homes proposed; of the destruction of grade 1 agricultural land; increases in traffic and air pollution cause by the new residents; unacceptable pressure of services and the level paid will go to the A2 slip instead of on schools, GP's and community centres. Some new housing is need but rejects that is should be located at one site.	
Policy SP3 a	777478	Mr John J Davis		1132	Objecting	I wish to place my objections to the Draft Local Plan, particularly in respect of the proposed development in South Canterbury. Development should be confined primarily to Brown Field sites in this area such as Howe barracks, the prison, St Martin's hospital site and what happened to the redevelopment of the Wincheap industrial estate.	Development should be confined primarily to Brown Field sites in this area such as Howe barracks, the prison, St Martin's hospital site and what happened to the redevelopment of the Wincheap industrial estate.
Policy SP3 a	777479	Ms Jennifer S Davis		1150	Objecting	I wish to place my objections to the Draft Local Plan, particularly in respect of the proposed development in South Canterbury. Development should be confined primarily to Brown Field sites in this area such as Howe barracks, the prison, St Martin's hospital site and what happened to the redevelopment of the Wincheap industrial estate.	Development should be confined primarily to Brown Field sites in this area such as Howe barracks, the prison, St Martin's hospital site and what happened to the redevelopment of the Wincheap industrial estate.
Policy SP3 a	777482	Ms Janet Clancy		1122	Objecting	I strongly object to the proposed development in South Canterbury. Even if the number of properties were to be reduced, it makes no difference to the fact that It will be a travesty for this development to go ahead, whatever form it takes; there should be no development on this site at all under any circumstances.	There should be no development on this site at all under any circumstances.
Policy SP3 a	777570	Mr J K Rishworth		1071	Objecting	The document lacks remotely enough justification or preparation for a new suburb of 4000 dwellings south of Canterbury. It would be a different scale of anything seen recently; it is too far out to be practical to walk into town or the west station and residents would use their cars; roads are already congested and bus and cycle lands are not an option on congested roads.The proposed new A2 junction does not add anything to the routes available into and out of the proposed development.	
Policy SP3 a	778048	Mr Stuart Read		1080	Objecting	Raises concerns about development proposals at South Canterbury such as the use of greenfield, agricultural land; and inadequate consideration of infrastructure and services in terms of roads, water, sewage, health care, schools etc.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	778054	Mr Chris Briggs		1162	Objecting	Objects to development proposals at South Canterbury as increased traffic problems would discourage employers; extra traffic and the new road would be dangerous; it uses greenfield, agricultural land; and new homes would only feed demand for student accommodation.	
Policy SP3 a	778071	Miss Catherine Shilling		1181	Objecting	Objects to the development proposals for South Canterbury as it would; connect Canterbury with Bridge, destroy countryside and wildlife, increase pollution and overcrowding; and impact on the historic setting of the city which is its main attraction and economic generator. Increased house building per annum would reduce the attraction for families wanting to live in Canterbury rather than increase it.	
Policy SP3 a	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1205	Objecting	Building 4000 new dwellings on the South Canterbury site would be incompatible with other policies in the Plan. Even if the proposed infrastructural facilities were created, there would still be many more people travelling into the centre of Canterbury for employment, shopping and other purposes, and this would inevitably add to the traffic congestion on what are already very congested routes. The proposed development would use valuable agricultural land and be destruction.	If the overall development target for the district were reduced from the proposed 15,600 new dwellings to something closer to 10,000, the 4,000 new dwellings proposed for the South Canterbury site would not be needed. If some new development in the city is required, we suggest that the possibilities offered by the Howe Barracks site should be investigated more thoroughly than has so far been done in the draft Plan.
Policy SP3 a	777344	Mrs E K Loveday		1253	Objecting	Objects to a giant housing estate being built on grade 1 and 2 agricultural land at South Canterbury. Council has failed to take account of the significance of the land, it is not sustainable to build houses. Future food sources are important. The massive housing estate will not be a community and will destroy the landscape and heritage of the City. Build on land of lesser agricultural quality.	
Policy SP3 a	777346	Mr J Mills		1237	Objecting	The heritage city of Canterbury is surrounded by farmland of high landscape and agricultural value. The construction of 400 houses at south Canterbury will fundamentally change the character of the city. The Council seems bent on destroying the beauty of the city's setting. Visitors from Dover will have to pass through a housing estate before they see the Cathedral. 400 houses will damage the landscape setting and quality of life fo the residents.	
Policy SP3 a	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1322	Objecting	The size of this particular development is totally out of proportion. There is no evidence that employment will meet the number of anticipated new workers. The impact on the present infrastructure of Canterbury could be catastrophic.	The overall level of development should be revised downwards. Any development in south Canterbury must be tailored to known need and job prospects
Policy SP3 a	777355	Mrs S Ansell		1239	Objecting	Objects to 4000 houses in south Canterbury on land use and transport grounds. Concentrating houses on the urban fringe is not preferable to small developments throughout district. The development is just to provide the A2 slip to benefit business and road construction interests. The levy should provide facilities like schools, GP's and shops. The quality of life of south Canterbury residents will be undermined by road building, traffic and pollution and it will change the character.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	777359	Mr S Ranson		1236	Objecting	Concerned about the use of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land for housing. Development should be directed to brownfield sites and areas of lower agricultural value first. A giant housing estate at south Canterbury can not provide food for future generations.	
Policy SP3 a	778045	Councillor Simon Cook	Canterbury City Council	1194	Objecting	If there is to be development in South Canterbury, the proposed green gap needs to be completely protected with absolutely no conditionality; any development needs to be conditional on the infrastructure (especially roads) being developed in line with the housing; junior school provision needs to be carefully managed, Bridge and Patixbourne school is already highly subscribed; and some thought needs to be given to traffic in Bridge (increased car traffic for shops would be problematic).	
Policy SP3 a	778387	Mr David Smith		1330	Objecting	I do not agree with this major expansion of Canterbury. It will result in the destruction of open countryside. The additional people and their cars will add to the already serious conjection of the roads and the City Centre. Canterbury has reached saturation point and cannot sustain this massive level of expansion.	A complete review of this policy. Reduce the number of new homes to be allocated and seek alternative sites for the reduced numbers.
Policy SP3 a	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1305	Objecting	This scheme has not been fully thought through. It seems very unlikely that a developer would be prepared to donate a complex road junction, a shopping centre, schools, allotments ans so forth in order to build 4,000 houses, especially when 30% of the houses are affordable housing. One feels developers will just cherry pick the best sites and leave.	I should like to see the Council lowering its proposed rate of house building to what it is now, and begin by bringing empty houses back on the market and recovering HMOs from student accommodation and continung by filling in brown field sites, leaving top farmland alone.
Policy SP3 a	778563	Mrs Susan Langdown		1321	Objecting	Object to the high density development proposed for sites 1 and 2. If approved, these proposals will have an enormous impact on the rest of Canterbury, and will not benefit either new or old residents. There are serious doubts as to the need for this level of building, and no evidence that jobs will be created to provde employment for such a large increase in population.	Reduce the overall density of development to within the range of 500 - 600 p.a.
Policy SP3 a	304601	Mr Eric Parkinson		1488	Objecting	Objects to housing allocation at South Canterbury because: 1 Housing need has been overstated, higher than SE ave; 2 the value of prime agricultural land has not been taken into account, it must be protected for food, alternative sites were not assessed; 3 It promotes roading buildings schemes that will lead to more traffic movements and congestion; 4 farmland will be concreted over to provide short range park and ride. Put development on lower grade/brownfield land at Hersden/Aylesham/Snowdown	An alternative land use/transport model for development on lower grade land through at peripheral expansion nodes (Hersden/ Aylesham/ Snowdown).
Policy SP3 a	408148	Dr Sheila Sweetinburgh		1530	Objecting	South Canterbury - the size of the proposed development is out of scale with the city. You may refer to it as a 'garden city' but the concentration of housing, commercial and business areas would seem to suggest city, not garden. Congestion, pollution and other problems would make life in large sectors of Canterbury extremely difficult and would also constitute a danger to public health. Similar problems would result as a consequence of pressure on the sewerage system, the provision of water u	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	415773	Ms Eleanor Brown		1544	Objecting	Regarding the proposed 4000 new houses for South Canterbury, the majority of people in the district support the level of only 510 units or less. South Canterbury as a green belt is an area of valuable farming land which creates a beautiful approach to the city for tourists.	
Policy SP3 a	421407	Ms Carol Mather		1493	Objecting	South Canterbury has been allocated more than its share of housing with 4,000 new houses planned for land off Nackington Road and on Little Barton Farm. This includes building on 70 acres of fertile Grade I agricultural land. Canterbury can accommodate all the extra traffic.	
Policy SP3 a	422606	Ms Lynne Parkinson		1505	Objecting	The building of 4000 houses at South Canterbury will produce an enormous depressing housing estate. There will be no facilities as funds will be put to road building. The plan doesn't differentiate between agricultural quality of greenfield sites. The land is needed to provide food. Houses should be built on brownfield sites. New residents will block the roads adding to congestion, will not be fixed by new A2 slip.	Build the houses somewhere else, where these people are supposed to be.
Policy SP3 a	777173	Mr Tim Timpson		1429	Objecting	New Bridge junction -It would be far more cost effective to amend the current junction than build a new one with all the new works required. The attached plan illustrates. Building 4,000 houses in South Canterbury would bring the city to a standstill. Sturry-Hersden with a Javelin Parkway Station is the answer to the large 4,000 houses development	
Policy SP3 a	777288	Mr James Peddie		1613	Objecting	I object South Canterbury allocation. 1. Traffic implications. 2. A2 junction at Bridge, it is feasible that if funded by building contractors is an unrealistic aspiration. 3. Facilities including public transport and shopping will require funding. 4. Utilities- The water supply for Canterbury is already precarious. 5. Extra demand on Public services. 6. Loss of green space and top grade farm land.	
Policy SP3 a	777345	Mr M Loveday		1502	Objecting	Objects to use of high grade agricultural land for a giant housing estate at south Canterbury. The development of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land is not sustainable. Future food resources are important. Building on this land is the last option when land of lower value is available. Disperse accommodation over district and take into account student accommodation being built by the universities.	Disperse accommodation across the district on low value land.
Policy SP3 a	777494	Mr Fred Wilson		1508	Objecting	Objects to South Canterbury because; it is on the wrong side of the city for the university and fast rail link and constrained cross city transport; infrastructure improvements may not be in place before houses are built and existing infrastructure wouldn't cope; loss of grade 1 agricultural land. Build on Howe Barracks and some houses in conjunction with eastern bypass. Too many houses, poorly located with infrastructure than won't cope.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	777539	Mr Peter Ashenden		1507	Objecting	Objects to South Canterbury because; too many houses too fast; the character will be transformed by people, roads and traffic; will benefit new residents and developers not current residents; building on greenfield land not to benefit of nation; new road will destroy neighbourhoods that are quiet and neighbourly. Learn from the cricket ground and improve the existing asset.	
Policy SP3 a	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		1569	Objecting	Excessive and unsustainable.	Delete the area referred to in SP3a.
Policy SP3 a	13737	Mrs V McWilliams	Clerk Bishopsbourne Parish Council	1699	Objecting	Object to the development at South Canterbury on grounds of scale, agricultural land, road congestion, education issues, health facilities.	Remove South Canterbury Allocation; but if allocated, there should be a guaranteed substantial green belt between any Canterbury expansion and the villages of Hardres, Bishopsbourne, Bridge, Patricbourne, Bekesbourne and Littlebourne.
Policy SP3 a	13749	Mrs Valerie McWilliams	clerk Kingston Parish Council	1702	Objecting	Object to the development at South Canterbury on grounds of scale, agricultural land, road congestion, education issues, health facilities.	Remove South Canterbury Allocation
Policy SP3 a	13759	Mrs Valerie McWilliams	Clerk Womenswold Parish Council	1701	Objecting	Object to the development at South Canterbury on grounds of scale, agricultural land, road congestion, parking and transport issues, education issues, health facilities.	Remove South Canterbury Allocation
Policy SP3 a	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1726	Objecting	Site 1 (SP3a) requires the delivery of a major new junction onto the M2 motorway, the funding and delivery of which is uncertain given the current economic climate and lack of available public funding. The significant reliance that the Local Plan strategy places on delivery of this site within the Plan period is unsound and not consistent with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (especially at para 47-55, 157 and 173 - 177).	Include under Policy SP3 the allocation of an additional Strategic Site at Bodkin Farm, Chesterfield, Whitstable. This site covers an area of some 28 ha (69 acres) and is located to the south east of the defined urban area of Whitstable, just south of Thanet Way (A2990). The site comprises SHLAA Sites 009 and 178. Although the site is presently situated within the Green Gap area between Whitstable and Herne Bay, it is bounded on three sides by existing development (to the south and west) and by the A2990 (to the north) and clearly contained both physically and visually by a strong tree/hedge belt and rising land (to the east). Development of the site will not conflict with the aims of the Green Gap between Whitstable and Herne Bay since the width of the Green Gap will not be reduced nor will the development increase the likelihood of coalescence between Whitstable and Herne Bay. The site is strategically well located to meet the Council's development needs and presents the opportunity for a mixed use development of employment, leisure and residential uses (including the potential delivery of new 'turnkey' affordable family housing, fully built and equipped at no cost to an approved RSL) with associated amenity space, urban park and neighbourhood store. We attach a preliminary indicative master plan (drawing ESBF-SK10B) showing how the site might be developed responding to the existing site constraints. Based on this development option, the site could accommodate some 300+ dwellings and 8.2 ha of employment (B1/B2), 4.2 ha of leisure use and some 6 ha of green space. The indicative master plan shows how residential and employment uses can be kept to

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	778073	Ms Claire Dethier		1529	Objecting	Inappropriate and unsustainable. It is located on the wrong side of the city. The largest employer, HS1 and railway access are located to the north. It would involve the loss of Grade 1 agric land. No plan has been established to show how the proposed new dwellings would access this quickly and easily via public transport. The proposal fails to deliver the largest proportion of affordable housing where the demand is. Issues could be spread throughout the borough.	Location if development at the northern side of Canterbury would be far more practical in terms of minimising the need to travel, access to high quality public transport and in effect significantly reducing the impact on the existing road network which already struggles at peak times.Consider alternative sites of lower agricultural quality. Transport modelling results are needed to determine the impact of the development.
Policy SP3 a	778135	Mr Harry Blows		1645	Objecting	A large development of greenfield land as proposed would create undesirable urban sprawl detracting from the 'Canterbury experience'; it would create unfocused communities, and add to road transport congestion. It would thus be directly at odds with district policies expressed in this Local Plan.	Reconsider land allocations with an emphasis on development enhancing 'sattelite' communities on the public transport corridors. Consider re-opening rail station at Chislet to serve proposed development at Hersden.
Policy SP3 a	778182	Gordon and Susan Manley		1591	Objecting	There is no question that the fertile and attractive farmland lying south of Canterbury has more value than the area to the north-east of the city lying between the coast and the A28.The Draft Local Plan if not largely redrawn will cause havoc in terms of traffic congestion in the Old Dover Road area.	
Policy SP3 a	778183	Jo and David Pick		1536	Objecting	The huge scale of the proposed house-building programme in south Canterbury is a threat to the character of the entire city. Hundreds of residents from the proposed development will have to access the city centre every day, either for work locally or to board commuter trains to London. The appalling traffic congestion, which already blights our lives, is bound to become much worse.	
Policy SP3 a	778377	Ms Ruth ORiordan		1551	Objecting	South Canterbury - I question the need for more housing in that area. As Canterbury is at present the approach from the south is worthy of such an ancient city.What a shame to fill the green spaces loads of houses.	
Policy SP3 a	778529	Ms Rachel Franks		1626	Objecting	I oppose the building of 4000 new homes at South Canterbury.The reasons for my opposition are explained below: Does Canterbury need 4000 homes? No. Can South Canterbury's infrastructure cope with an additional 4000 homes? No. The existing road structure will not cope.The pollution extra traffic will generate 4000 new homes will increase the demand for water in an area that is already designated an area of water stress.The recent availability of land at Howe Barracks in C	
Policy SP3 a	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1615	Objecting	There is no justification for development on this scale in south Canterbury. The residents do not support it and the destruction of grade 1 farmland cannot be described as sustainable. There will be increased congestion and pollution and the lack of infrastructure provision will bring misery to the existing residents. There are other sites that should be brought forward first.	Keep to existng building levels and remove the "supposed" need for these 4000 houses.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	778754	Mrs Patricia Smith		1582	Objecting	Building 4000 homes and 70,000 sqm of employment space here does not "protect the best of the district's built and natural environment". 25% of the total allocation of homes is too many for this site. The slip road would not be needed without this development and it would not alleviate the congestion into the city. A "new town" on the edge of an historic city will seriously and adversely affect the landscape setting of Canterbury and encroach on greenfield land close to an AONB.	Build far far fewer homes, if any, and no employment space and don't waste money on a new A2 junction.
Policy SP3 a	13739	Mrs Christobel Seath	Clerk Bridge Parish Council	1890	Objecting	Object to the allocation of land at South Canterbury on grounds of agricultural land, traffic and "rat-running", effect on Bridge and its services, not convinced by business land proposals, pressure on schools, impact on medical facilities. If this development is to go ahead, Bridge Parish Council would like to see a much wider protected green space, preserved as Grade 1 / 2 agricultural land in compliance with the NPPF, between the city and the village.	Preference should be given to brownfield land and re-using empty housng stock. If this development is to go ahead, Bridge Parish Council would like to see a much wider protected green space, preserved as Grade 1 / 2 agricultural land in compliance with the NPPF, between the city and the village.
Policy SP3 a	778230	Mr & Mrs S R & D J Miles		1905	Objecting	We are convinced that the proposed development of 4,000 homes in the South Canterbury area is not needed and is simply not sustainable. There is pressure on services already, and the road transport system will not be able to cope with the significant increase in traffic that this development will inevitably bring. We are also fundamentally opposed to the use of greenfield sites in order to achieve large scale housing development.	Housing development should be focussed on brownfield sites such as Howe Barracks, the Wincheap estate, Peugeot garage site and the prison, allowing housing growth to continue at the existing rate.
Policy SP3 a	778237	R & M Smith		1979	Objecting	We object to the proposal to build 4,000 houses at South Canterbury for the following reasons : 1.The infrastructure is already unable to cope. The addition of further houses will obviously exacerbate this problem. 2. Employment prospects in and around Canterbury are already extremely limited. 3. No A & E at Canterbury hospital. 4. Much of the housing in Canterbury is rented by students. 5. There is land at Howe Barracks for development.6. Development in this area will create urban sprawl.	
Policy SP3 a	778391	Mr Robert Brown		2006	Objecting	To impose 4,000 houses on South Canterbury, away from West Station does not seem reasonable and where are the roads to take more traffic? Develop at Hersden, a brownfield site or one of the villages.	Develop Hersden, a brown field site, or one of the villages
Policy SP3 a	778395	Mr & Mrs P C C & D Graham		2007	Supporting	4000 houses and a business park at south canterbury is unsustainable and inappropriate because: water supply and sewage disposal; exacerbate congestion and pollution; reduce access to the world heritage site, university and high speed rail; will impact tourism and economy; loss of grade 1 agricultural land. Housing/commercial development should be on brownfield sites away from Canterbury city such as at the coast or Ashford.	
Policy SP3 a	778474	Mr R Feakins		2001	Objecting	Objects to 4,000 houses in South Canterbury, because; of the lack of infrastructure, roads and A&E.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	778642	Rory & Denise Sunnuck & Bond		1652	Objecting	We object to the proposed development of 4000 houses in South Canterbury. We set out below our reasons for being firmly against this proposal : The number of houses proposed, such a huge concentration of homes in one area is untenable. This will lead to air pollution, traffic congestion, pressure on current resources and loss of grade 1 agricultural land. Student numbers should not be considered when deciding housing numbers. Negative and environmental impact on the World Heritage site.	
Policy SP3 a	778713	Ms Christine Buchan		1992	Objecting	Objects to South Canterbury Site being considered for planning, is a waste of good agricultural ground when there are other sites of poorer land quality.	
Policy SP3 a	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	1687	Supporting	We support the allocation of this site. However the uses identified need also to accommodate a relocated Kent and Canterbury Hospital close to the A2 junction (see report)	Hospital and health uses should be added to the land use mix
Policy SP3 a	777377	Councillor James Flanagan	Petition from Councillor James Flanagan	2174	Objecting	Object to the allocation of land at South Canterbury, on grounds of traffic congestion, loss of greenfield and grade 1 agricultural land, lack of public support, and possible impacts on Pledges in the Council's Corporate Plan. Housing may not be needed as Government allows us to count student accommodation towards housing.	Surely the best way forward is to remove this site from the Draft Plan, and avoid such large scale development in the South Canterbury area.
Policy SP3 a	778403	Mrs Christobel Seath		2095	Objecting	Object to the allocation of land at South Canterbury on grounds of agricultural land quality, not convinced of the economic case for housing, impact on traffic, impacts on services and the local villages.	
Policy SP3 a	778405	David & Roberta Hargrave		2025	Objecting	Objects to 4000 houses at South Canterbury because:current traffic queues; no where for shoppers to park their cars; nowhere for 12000 extra people to shop, find employment, go to school, get doctors; the homes will need water, electricity, gas, waste disposal; they will create atmospheric pollution in an area already at a critically dangerous level; it will be an environmental disaster. The catastrophic plans must be modified.	The catastrophic plans must be modified.
Policy SP3 a	778409	Mr JK Hodgson		2111	Objecting	Objects to 4000 houses at south Canterbury because: The roads are inadequate to deal with current congestion from the 2 hospitals and 3 schools; Amazed that Council will consider further building without infrastructure improvements; the failure of the Towers Traffic scheme indicates that the introduction of 4000 cars to the area is folly; resolve traffic congestion rather than building more houses.	Resolve traffic congestion rather than building more houses.
Policy SP3 a	778472	Ms Deborah Feakins		2115	Objecting	Objects to South Canterbury, because: the development is flawed; takes grade A farmland; erodes beautiful countryside; not good environmentally or for food production; will cause traffic congestion and pollution; is because developers want it there; will damage historic feel of Canterbury; could be in other brownfield locations; where are the jobs to be; there is not sufficient infrastructure; consultation during the holidays; the plan will be railroaded through with no listening to locals.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	778486	Prof & Mrs Osman & Lorna Durrani		2122	Objecting	Objects to South Canterbury because: there is no evidence so many houses are needed nor that they will stimulate the economy or create jobs; student housing numbers are falling and new student housing is being built; it will create a new housing estate with people who want to work, shop and use schools, health services, water; It will exacerbate congestion, pollution; increased traffic will damage historic buildings; loss of grade 1 agricultural land. Focus on Howe Barracks and brownfield sites	A more moderate increase of housing, specifically a reduction from 4,000 houses in South Canterbury to a maximum of 2,000. Use of brownfield sites, empty houses, Howe Barracks site.
Policy SP3 a	778494	Mrs A Ray		2176	Objecting	I am writing in reference to proposed building of 4000 new properties on the farm above Barton Estate. It will mean much more traffic down New Dover Road which is already congested first thing in morning way back on to the Dover by pass.	
Policy SP3 a	778680	Mark & Dawn Walsh		2137	Objecting	object	
Policy SP3 a	778683	Ms Sarah Wood		2150	Objecting	I think that the proposals for 15,600 new houses, including 4000 in south Canterbury, are more than is needed, and will add to congestion and the destruction of the countryside, so I object to policies SP2 and SP3a	
Policy SP3 a	778716	Ms Sue Pratt		2154	Objecting	Objects to Policy SP3a because: 15600 houses are too many for the area; especially 4000 at south Canterbury on farmland; there is no the water infrastructure; road and railways cause pollution and traffic delays without more cars and lorries; traffic management and a ring road are required.	
Policy SP3 a	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1921	Objecting	The construction of 4000 houses in South Canterbury would be contrary with other Local Plan policies, increase traffic congestion, destroy agricultural land and erode the character of the city. The proposed development would increase population by about 20% to 25%. Continuing expansion through unrestricted development will impact on the local economy's key competitive advantages i.e. Canterbury is "a greatly attractive place to live", and "the high quality of life enjoyed by most residents".	If the overall development target for the district were reduced from the proposed 15,600 new dwellings to something closer to 10,000, the 4,000 new dwellings proposed for the South Canterbury site would not be needed, and the effect of HD6 policy would reduce the need even further. If some new development in the city is required, we suggest that the possibilities offered by the Howe Barracks site should be investigated more thoroughly than has so far been done in the draft Plan.
Policy SP3 a	405580	Mr Graham Robin		2222	Objecting	There is a suggestion that the 'levy' will fund new roads which will reduce Canterbury's traffic congestion. This is not evidenced by current studies which show 'ring roads' add rather than reduce traffic (Rheims Way & Wincheap). The proposed A28 'relief road' through South Canterbury will add more traffic, more pollution and, more congestion. Object to the site at South Canterbury on grounds of traffic congestion and pollution, loss of agricultural land and impact on World Heritage Site.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2289	Objecting	Concerned about over concentration of new housing in South Canterbury - more than a more than a quarter of the total to be built across the District, creating an entirely new suburb. Raises issues of urban sprawl; linking to surrounding villages; loss of Grade 1 agricultural land; impact on trees / wildlife; there will be insufficient services and social infrastructure; increased congestion and air pollution; stress on water resources and sewerage facilities.	In our view the whole proposal for anything like this level of housing in the South Canterbury area should be dropped. If these 4,000 buildings were removed from the draft plan, the Canterbury District would still build at a rate of 580 dwellings each year on average. And making this up to a figure which would be within the range of the total that the NLP study recommends could be achieved by a number of additional small schemes. Two such schemes might be additional building as well as acquiring existing housing at the Howe Barracks site and some additional housing nearer the high-speed train service at Canterbury West Station.
Policy SP3 a	778077	Mr Paul Newton		2201	Objecting	I object to the plan for the following reasons: significantly increased congestion in both New and Old Dover Road and around the city to both rail stations; use of prime agricultural land for housing is not appropriate; funding contributions from developers towards community projects will be largely allocated to redeveloping the A2 junction, leading to a lack of community resources; economy cannot support population increase; will place an unsustainable pressure on economic and natural resources	
Policy SP3 a	778402	Mr Mark Hunter		2236	Objecting	I object to the proposed intense local development at South Canterbury. My objection is simply based on the excessive destruction of our countryside. I would beg you to stop these high density developments and consider better use of the existing spaces in our towns and villages, not to mention the use of brownfield sites and the refurbishment or demolition of buildings currently in poor states of repair.	
Policy SP3 a	778492	D H Morgan		2267	Objecting	The huge development between Canterbury and Bridge is scheduled to be built on prime agricultural land, a scarce and diminishing resource. This country is not self-sufficient in food production and the situation will get worse as numbers grow. We should concentrate building on brown field sites. The infra-structure in Canterbury and the South-East is not adequate to support the proposed development.	
Policy SP3 a	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2192	Objecting	Objection to the allocation of land at South Canterbury on the grounds of resulting traffic and congestion, increase in population, loss of agricultural land, destruction of the natural environment and impact on the quality of life enjoyed here.	If the overall development target for the district were reduced from the proposed 15,600 new dwellings to something closer to 10,000, the 4,000 new dwellings proposed for the South Canterbury site would not be needed. If some new development in the city is required, we suggest that the possibilities offered by the Howe Barracks site should be investigated more thoroughly than has so far been done in the draft Plan.
Policy SP3 a	778712	Mr Robert Keen		2186	Objecting	I object to Policy SP3a of the Draft Local Plan	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	778768	Ms Jill Quantrill-Robin		2224	Objecting	The view from this cottage is farmland, green fields once apple orchards and hop fields. Now that landscape is to be a battlefield for houses a battle ground for developers. I plead for houses that have a sense of design using the natural wood for construction rest areas and courtyards for the elderly play areas for the young this landscape should be and could be a good architectural location not a dormitory commuter site. Today sheep graze on the hay fields.	
Policy SP3 a	778770	S Thorne		2233	Objecting	my objection is to south Canterbury being singled out for the largest number of houses to be built (4,000) if the road network is not going to be greatly improved to handle the extra traffic that will result. The number of houses allocated to south Canterbury should be dispersed to other parts of east Kent; the road network even now at busy times is not adequate to handle current levels of traffic.	
Policy SP3 a	779267		East Kent University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	2151	Supporting	This allocation gives the opportunity to deliver a new hospital for Canterbury (see report attached). A hospital use should be mentioned in the policy.	
Policy SP3 a	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		2371	Objecting	Site at South Canterbury. However I also note that any significant development at this location is contingent upon the provision of a new grade separated interchange on the nearby A2 among other related transport improvements. What would be the Council's position in the event that it is not possible to: (a) Complete the necessary Highway Orders for the new interchange? or (b) Fund the design and construction of the new interchange through developers' contributions?	
Policy SP3 a	422982	Cllr Martin Vye		2413	Objecting	Proposals for South Canterbury, certain assets have to be provided on the back of the housing:A2 interchange, schools;community halls, from which key services can be delivered near to where people live. I would want to see how realistic it is to expect that developers will want to afford these expenditures.My other concern is about the traffic that will be generated and that ensuring all the necessary infrastructure will be provided.	
Policy SP3 a	778657	Prof J H Strange		2422	Objecting	Objects to phe proposal for 15,600 new houses, particularly the 4000 in south Canterbury are too many. This is not justified economically. Development except at Hersden will add to congestion and pollution and the destruction of the countryside. Infrastructure will be inadequate. The proposals need to be scaled down.	Scale down proposals
Policy SP3 a	778686	Alan & Britta Pearlman		2431	Objecting	Object to SP2 and SP3a as such a large increase in new dwellings will threaten community life and important community amenities.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	778773	Ms Janet Almead		2331	Objecting	I know that to a certain extent the Council's hands are tied in that they are subject to the dictates of Central Government, but it is completely unnecessary and unsustainable to build what in effect amounts to a whole new town on the outskirts of and around the City.	
Policy SP3 a	778801	A C Strange		2349	Objecting	The proposals for 15,600 new houses, particularly the 4000 in south Canterbury, are, I believe, far more than will be needed. I cannot see that his is justified by economic considerations. Such development in all areas with the possible exception of Hersden will add to congestion and pollution and the unnecessary destruction of the countryside. I am particularly concerned that the proposed infra-structure will be inadequate. I think these proposals need to be scaled down considerably.	
Policy SP3 a	778854	Michael & Elizabeth Avery		2409	Objecting	We formally object to the proposed development of 4,000 houses in South Canterbury. Other than retail and education, it is difficult to see where the economic growth to justify the significant increase in house building (from 550 at present to 780 per annum) will come from. At current levels of building the south Canterbury development would not be needed. It is criminal that grade 1 agricultural land should be given up for development. Traffic congestion and pollution is also major concern.	
Policy SP3 a	778956	Dr Michael Forrester		2484	Objecting	I believe that further destruction of the environment will be the result of policy SP3a and am opposed and object to this.	
Policy SP3 a	779270	Ms Pauline Walters		2463	Objecting	I object to policy SP3a.	
Policy SP3 a	406855	Mrs P Kielty		2666	Objecting	I cannot support the scale of housing development proposed for Canterbury. The total Canterbury housing proposals will lose us an excessive amount of high quality farming land which I consider environmentally unsound and at odds with the claimed 'green' credentials of the local plan. The roads in Canterbury will not cope with the additional housing.	
Policy SP3 a	421429	Mr John Hiscott		2660	Objecting	I object strongly to the proposal for South Canterbury to build some 4,000 new houses on mainly the best and most versatile agricultural land. This contravenes the government's stated intention that development should be sustainable. The proposal which would add some 10,000 additional residents to the city would pose an unsustainable burden on the existing road network.	
Policy SP3 a	778861	David & Teresa Kemsley		2516	Objecting	We have serious concerns about the scale of housing proposed for S Canterbury: No analysis of pop growth and demographic change to support numbers proposed; no explanation how housing stimulates economic growth; student accommodation and office conversion not taken into account; no quantification/delivery assessment of infrastructure requirements; environmental impact negative; road congestion- road cannot absorb more traffic; residents will access Cant West Station though and around the city.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	778868	Mr Tom Tomaszewski		2510	Supporting	I support Policy SP3a	
Policy SP3 a	778870	Leigh Derbyshire		2533	Objecting	I believe that furthur destruction of the environment will be the result of policy SP3a and am opposed and object to this.	
Policy SP3 a	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2568	Objecting	I would like to object the plan as it stands for South Canterbury. I do not agree with building on the agricultural land and would prefer to see brown field sites used. I strongly object to the inclusion the development sites in south Canterbury for housing, retail park and ride ,business and other. I also object to the provision of a new road interchange at Bridge. New and Old Dover Roads are congested with air and noise pollution. How will extra dwellings be accommodated?	
Policy SP3 a	778884	Mr Ian Johnson		2586	Objecting	Having developed a faster rail link at Canterbury West, why is it now proposed to encourage a large development south of Barton? The inevitable transport chaos is obvious and merits little consideration. There is not enough work available for the current population, let alone another 10,000 or more. How can consideration be give to using prime agricultural land; what are the hospital, health, emergency services, transport, water and waste implications?	Why, oh why, is there not a plan for limited growth by use of brownfield sites? Howe Barracks, HM Prison and the front of the Peugeot site in Rheims Way are obvious candidates.
Policy SP3 a	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2620	Objecting	Neither the Plan nor its evidence base demonstrates that these sites are economically viable and can deliver dwelling completions and strategic infrastructure. No mention of the relocation of the P&R site, which is 'essential' and 'integral' to the development. The emphasis is on the provision of the A2 junction at Bridge. No analysis in the Draft as to why South Canterbury has been selected despite this effect on the AHLV. Pylons are a constraint on open space. Wildlife and habitat impact.	Allocate land at New Thanington
Policy SP3 a	779089	Ms Elizabeth Bacchus		2511	Objecting	Object to development proposals at South Canterbury. It would increase traffic and air pollution; there is not enough water to supply the proposed extra homes (Broad Oak reservoir should be built first); and there are not enough jobs. The plan is over ambitious; houses should be more spread out.	
Policy SP3 a	779099	Ms Jennifer Lennard		2645	Objecting	I object to policy SP3a.	
Policy SP3 a	775862	Mr Clive Flisher		2770	Objecting	The sheer scale of the proposed development cannot fail to put more traffic into Old and New Dover Roads and Nackington Road; 4000 houses plus businesses will increase traffic volumes and congestion, whatever improvements are made to the A2 junction, or an eastern by-pass. The draft plans include "amenity" land close to Barton Estate. However, existing open land at Simon Langton Girl's School is to be lost and the amenity land is of course at the expense of agricultural production.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	779100	Mrs Ruth Matthews		2655	Objecting	I wonder what evidence there is that so many new houses are needed in the immediate Canterbury area, and whether all possible brownfield sites have been properly considered. I do not feel there is a case for using agricultural land until all other possibilities are exhausted. The growth in traffic that the proposed South Canterbury site would mean is another point of concern.	
Policy SP3 a	779190	Mr M Mason		2696	Objecting	The landscape around Canterbury, and therefore the setting of the city itself, is defined by the special character of the agricultural surroundings. Our World Heritage City is situated within an area of high grade arable fields. Why then does the City Council have a 'Preferred Option' to fundamentally change the character of the city with the construction of so many houses on land in south Canterbury?	Built development should be directed to brownfield locations and land of lower agricultural value before Grade One and Two agricultural land is ever considered.
Policy SP3 a	779193	Mrs Caroline Winsor		2759	Objecting	I understand that Canterbury City Council has prepared a Preferred Option for the District Local Plan in which hundreds of acres of the best and most versatile agricultural land are proposed for built development in south Canterbury. I wish to object to this proposal. Grades One and Two agricultural land are precious.	
Policy SP3 a	779194	Dr Micheal Parkinson		2762	Objecting	I note that the Preferred Option Draft proposes the situation of some 4,000 dwellings on Grades One and Two agricultural land in South Canterbury. I can see no reason why this should be necessary when much land of lower agricultural value is available for consideration in the Canterbury District. Please do not direct development to our best and most versatile arable land.	Please do not direct development to our best and most versatile arable land.
Policy SP3 a	779195	Mrs Kathy Cobbett		2764	Objecting	Building on farmland reduces area for crops and we are going to need more food production in England. Too much building increases pollution which affects climate change and harms habitats for birds and insects especially bees. Housing figures are too high for South Canterbury - 4,000 is far too many. The three feeder roads into Canterbury would suffer gridlock at the rush hours increasing pollution and grave inconvenience to people driving in the area.	I would like the housing figures greatly reduced for South Canterbury.
Policy SP3 a	779572	Ms Margaret Derbyshire		2773	Objecting	I believe that further destruction of the environment will be the result of policies SP2 and SP3a and am opposed and object to these.	
Policy SP3 a	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2915	Objecting	Probably the biggest risk to deliverability of the Plan is the South Canterbury allocation for 4,000 units and 70,000sqm of employment floorspace. The Submission Plan will need to be much clearer on how the South Canterbury Strategic allocation meets the tests in the NPPF.	The Submission Plan will need to be much clearer on how the South Canterbury Strategic allocation meets the tests in the NPPF.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3016	Objecting	Significant number of ecologically sensitive habitats in the locality. We welcome the 20ha woodland planned for the area. Concened about recreational pressure on Trenley Park Wood. Fodtwich LWS, ancient woodland fragments, Chequers Wood and Old Park SSSI, Stodmarsh, and Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar Site (incombination impacts).	The requirement to provide this quantum of open space (20ha woodland) should be included within the policy to ensure delivery . We would therefore recommend that the following clauses be added to Policy SP3a A network of woodland to be designed through the development and connected into the surrounding woodland network. Contributions to management of the off-site ancient woodland to alleviate the impacts of increased visitor pressure Contributions may be required to alleviate in-combination recreational impacts on Stodmarsh SPA and Ramsar site and Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar Site
Policy SP3 a	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2783	Objecting	4,000 houses(SP3) in south Canterbury is quite unsustainable, chiefly because this is Grade I agricultural land and the area is an area of high landscape value,and it compromises the green gap between Canterbury and Bridge.	
Policy SP3 a	417557	Professor Philip Robinson		3009	Objecting	Objects to 400 homes at south Canterbury, because: wrong to built on grade 1 agricultural land; is suspicious about the annual build figure of 780, no evidence supports it; there is no traffic impact assessment; traffic congestion; on the wrong side of the city for train station and university; sceptical about the garden city idea; Expand city along highspeed 1 to north Hersden, as it is not an attractive community at present.	den city idea; Expand city along highspeed 1 to north Hersden, as it is not an attractive community at present.
Policy SP3 a	775425	Ms Caroline Smith		3032	Objecting	Object to the scale of development at south Canterbury, because: Canterbury can't support development; roads are already congested, it will put intolerable pressure on the network shown by Westgate Towers; unsustainable; environmental and heritage impacts; pollution; stress on water supply and sewage; no potential for job expansion; use of grade 1 agricultural land; supports some development on brownfield sites such as prison, barracks, peugeot garage; proposal ill judged and not thought out.	
Policy SP3 a	775427	Mr Paul Grant		3033	Objecting	Object to the scale of development at south Canterbury, because: Canterbury can't support development; roads are already congested, it will put intolerable pressure on the network shown by Westgate Towers; unsustainable; environmental and heritage impacts; pollution; stress on water supply and sewage; no potential for job expansion; use of grade 1 agricultural land; supports some development on brownfield sites such as prison, barracks, peugeot garage; proposal ill judged and not thought out.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	777540	Dr Julia Dale		2807	Objecting	The building of 15,600 homes will result in an estimated population increase of 40,000 by 2031. There are concerns that healthcare infrastructure has not been properly considered. The existing K&C hospital is out-of-date with poor access and offers little room for expansion. Suggests an alternative proposal for a 'complete medical complex' on the Barton site, which could include a new hospital, nursing college and ambulance depot.	Complete Medical Complex Accommodation A new, state of the art teaching hospital sufficient in size to allow for future expansion that could include residential accommodation for hospital staff. New Ambulance depot Nursing College (from Christchurch University) with residential accommodation Car parking space for staff and visitors (this would generate income). With two rapidly expanding universities in Canterbury it would seem an appropriate time to suggest that the existing nursing degree course be complemented by a medical degree course. Instead of downgrading the hospital it would also be fitting to augment its status. Vehicular and Pedestrian Access Via a new dual carriageway ring road (roughly following the line of the existing pylons) the site would have direct access to the BOTH the A2 and the A28 (in both directions €" Ashford & Sturry). This ring road in turn gives access to all areas:- i. NORTH via A2 ii. SOUTH via A2 iii. EAST via A28 iv. WEST via A2 then A28 at Wincheap. All services (gas; electricity; telephone; water & sewage AND the overhead power lines could but placed underground alongside the new ring road for easy maintenance) All 3 existing Park & Ride facilities could be linked by a shuttle bus service to each other and also to the hospital. All 3 car parks are adjacent to the link roads (Wincheap via the A2 southbound; Sturry via the new link road; Dover Road via the Dover Road). Cost The cost of the new development can be partly offset by the sale of the existing hospital and ambulance depot sites €" both of which are worth considerably more per m 2 than the green field site. These would then be available for housing in
Policy SP3 a	777650	Mrs Felicity Jovan		3031	Objecting	Object to the scale of development at south Canterbury, because: Canterbury can't support development; roads are already congested, it will put intolerable pressure on the network shown by Westgate Towers; unsustainable; environmental and heritage impacts; pollution; stress on water supply and sewage; no potential for job expansion; use of grade 1 agricultural land; supports some development on brownfield sites such as prison, barracks, peugeot garage; proposal ill judged and not thought out.	
Policy SP3 a	778384	Nicholas and Deborah Wells		3004	Objecting	The level of housing for Sth Canterbury is out of proportion. Build houses at Howe Barracks. Large scale building will not create jobs, new residents would commute to London. There is no infrastructure to support the development. Traffic is bad already extra will cause air and noise pollution, A2 slip would impact on residents. Council voted in favour of the plan against public objections and it was release after the elections.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	778400	G Whitehead		3030	Objecting	Object to the scale of development at south Canterbury, because: Canterbury can't support development; roads are already congested, it will put intolerable pressure on the network shown by Westgate Towers; unsustainable; environmental and heritage impacts; pollution; stress on water supply and sewage; no potential for job expansion; use of grade 1 agricultural land; supports some development on brownfield sites such as prison, barracks, peugeot garage; proposal ill judged and not thought out.	
Policy SP3 a	779146	Anthony & Rosemary Relf		2844	Objecting	We are very concerned about the proposed number of houses that would be built in one area under the draft local plan. Brownfield land should be used first; traffic congestion needs to be considered; agricultural land will be lost.	Perhaps more houses could be built in and around the many local villages, and that would take away such a huge concentration proposed for Canterbury.
Policy SP3 a	779274	Mr Graham Duplock	Parish Councillor Parish Councillor Beskesbourne	2826	Objecting	Building on high grade farm land forms too great a proportion of proposed development.	
Policy SP3 a	779350	Mr & Mrs I Cook		2866	Objecting	Object to development proposals for South Canterbury. There is no justification for the level of houses on greenfield land; existing services cannot cope with current demands and there is no strategy for future proofing; long standing transport problems have yet to be resolved; the local road network already struggles with traffic - bus and cycle links are tokenistic; and the area between Nackington and Bridge should be safe guarded to protect ecological, historical and visual amenity value.	
Policy SP3 a	779564	Mr J Tinker		2903	Objecting	I am against the use of all of proposed site 1 (South Canterbury) east of A2 and some to the west of A2, ... as this is prime agricultural land and we need this for food production to ensure that we are not dependent on imports in the future (Kent is supposed to be the Garden of England). There are other sites such as that part of Seasalter east of Seasalter Lane and north of the Thanet Way that would seem suitable for development. This and other areas appear to be scrub land (such as section	
Policy SP3 a	779330	Len & Su Hinksman & Cumber		3127	Objecting	Object to development proposals for South Canterbury. Concerned by the scale of housing without the necessary up-to-date supporting infrastructure; the use of a greenfield agricultural site; the impact on cultural heritage and tourist economy; water supply; and overcrowding - with all new residents expecting education, refuse disposal and healthcare. The other sites highlighted for development around Canterbury will add even more pressure to the utilities too.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	779567	Jane Lingham		2936	Objecting	I am a resident in Barton Road Canterbury, myself and my family are concerned about the planning of 4,000 houses plus which are planned for the area, the reasons for us being concerned are don't need more shops, allotments, traffic problems and pollution, water supply, jobs only likely to be short term in construction, etc.	Perhaps we do require more housing, however, there are many houses empty around the city and surrounding areas and some are in poor condition. The council could buy these to develop, as we do not want our 'open space' destroyed by developers who will provide more opportunity for the greedy landlords in the area to buy houses and then rent out. Many family houses have been bought and have been taken over by students in recent years turning some areas of Canterbury into student ghettos. However, now more student accommodation is being built, more houses will become available, therefore the demand for these homes is questionable. We should not build on valuable green space when the former Howe Barracks already has housing available, the existing houses could be improved or sold to a developer to improve or knock down, this would be far better than using agricultural land.
Policy SP3 a	779571	Ms Pauline Sims		3005	Objecting	Objects to 4000 houses in South Canterbury because: it is too concentrated; affordable houses won't be built; on campus student accommodation will release HMO's; It is grade 1 agricultural land; the bridleway provides open space and the farm wildlife habitat; increased traffic congestion; people will have to cross the city to get to West Station; the hospital couldn't cope with more patients.	
Policy SP3 a	779703	Ms Joan F Sutton		3027	Objecting	Object to the scale of development at south Canterbury, because: Canterbury can't support development; roads are already congested, it will put intolerable pressure on the network shown by Westgate Towers; unsustainable; environmental and heritage impacts; pollution; stress on water supply and sewage; no potential for job expansion; use of grade 1 agricultural land; supports some development on brownfield sites such as prison, barracks, peugeot garage; proposal ill judged and not thought out.	
Policy SP3 a	779705	Ms Joan Charlton		3029	Objecting	Object to the scale of development at south Canterbury, because: Canterbury can't support development; roads are already congested, it will put intolerable pressure on the network shown by Westgate Towers; unsustainable; environmental and heritage impacts; pollution; stress on water supply and sewage; no potential for job expansion; use of grade 1 agricultural land; supports some development on brownfield sites such as prison, barracks, peugeot garage; proposal ill judged and not thought out.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	779728	Desmond & Jane Bishenden & Dash		3017	Objecting	Objects to over development of south Canterbury because: there is no need to build more; the annual increase to 780; homes on the Tannery and Habitat were left empty; strain on already busy rush hour roads; increase in air pollution; stretching sewage and water resources; loss of grade 1 agricultural land; there are other sites available, barracks, prison, Realm Wood, Reed Pond; impact on World Heritage site and loss of tourism; filling a gap in government funding; schools won't be built.	
Policy SP3 a	779732	Mr Richard Bell		3021	Objecting	Objects to over development of south Canterbury because: there is no need to build more; the annual increase to 780; homes on the Tannery and Habitat were left empty; strain on already busy rush hour roads; increase in air pollution; stretching sewage and water resources; loss of grade 1 agricultural land; there are other sites available, barracks, prison, Realm Wood, Reed Pond; impact on World Heritage site and loss of tourism; filling a gap in government funding; schools won't be built.	
Policy SP3 a	779909	Mr & Mrs B Young		3022	Objecting	Objects to over development of south Canterbury because: there is no need to build more; the annual increase to 780; homes on the Tannery and Habitat were left empty; strain on already busy rush hour roads; increase in air pollution; stretching sewage and water resources; loss of grade 1 agricultural land; there are other sites available, barracks, prison, Realm Wood, Reed Pond; impact on World Heritage site and loss of tourism; filling a gap in government funding; schools won't be built.	
Policy SP3 a	780204	Dr S Hasselbach		3006	Objecting	Objects to the scale of the development at south of Canterbury, because: destruction of grade 1 Agricultural land, open space and woodland; loss of residents quality of life; increase traffic congestion; more pollution; lack of water supply. Minimise impact by distributing smaller housing estates throughout city	New housing estates need to be distributed throughout the city area, on a smaller and more sustainable scale.
Policy SP3 a	780209	B O'Byrne		3007	Objecting	Objects to the scale of development at south Canterbury, because: destruction of grade 1 Agricultural land, open space and woodland; loss of residents quality of life; increase traffic congestion; more pollution; lack of water supply. Minimise impact by distributing smaller housing estates throughout city. Limit student housing except for purpose built accomodation.	New housing estates need to be distributed throughout the city area, on a smaller and more sustainable scale. Limit studen housing.
Policy SP3 a	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3066	Objecting	Object to development sites in south Canterbury for housing, retail, park and ride, businesses, community hub, primary school, doctors, CHP, A2 slip. Development driven by levies to fund road infrastructure. They are not NIMBYs. Concerned about intransigence over Kingsmead Field. The fast bus link is a red herring. No funding for new schools. Low useage of park and ride. No planning done with water/sewage companies. Facilities won't be available. Langton girls school is not moving. see document	Remove Simon Langton Girlds School new site from the DLP.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	780299	Professor Paul Strange		3010	Objecting	Has 4 objections to South Canterbury, because: Nackington Rd is very busy at peak times; new houses and A2 Junction will increase traffic; noise pollution; destroy prime agricultural land; no justification for annual allocation of housing as it is already 50% higher than SE average; will change canterbury from attractive to an urban sprawl; no one is in favour of this plan.	
Policy SP3 a	780313	Nikola Petrovic		3015	Objecting	Objects to 4270 homes at South Canterbury because: the roads already suffer from congestion, park and ride has not helped and the cricket ground made it worse, the road have no ability to take more traffic; Loss of grade 1 greenfield land, farmland, cycle and walking paths; local health care and hospital would not cope.	
Policy SP3 a	117499	Mr A Cooke		3309	Objecting	I wish to object to planning policy SP3a - loss of farmland; costly road improvements; destruction of habitat; increased pollution and traffic.	
Policy SP3 a	383359	Ms Judy Seymour - Ure		3313	Objecting	Canterbury is simply not the right place to develop 4000 new homes. Who is going to live in them? Many of the recent developments in the city still have empty properties. What about schools, doctors, hospitals, water and sewerage? All these things don't seem to have been taken into account.	
Policy SP3 a	479400	Dr Doreen Rosman		3301	Objecting	Objects to 4000 houses at south Canterbury because: the needed infrastructure is beyond what developers will provide; will exacerbate traffic problems; water supply and sewage issues; new houses will exceed job creation; population increase of 20-25%; scale of development will put off families moving into the area; need to consider it within current economic climate; won't provide affordable housing; development should be on a smaler scale; only built 100 new houses a year in Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 a	779290	Mr John Christian		3299	Objecting	Object to development proposals for South Canterbury. Concerned about; the scale of housing; the loss of greenfield, agricultural land; the despoiling of an Area of High Landscape Value; an already over stressed traffic system - the new A2 access will do little to mitigate the problem; and a lack of detailed infrastructure planning. Would be more supportive of a more evolutionary / organic approach to reduce the proposed scale with infrastructure problems being addressed ahead of development.	Would prefer a more considered and distributed approach, greater use of brownfield sites, with much more consultation with residents.
Policy SP3 a	779554	Alison & David Wells		3365	Objecting	Object to South Canterbury development on grounds of loss of grade 1 agricultural land; increase in traffic congestion and pollution; impact on lcoal services such as hopsital, primary and secondary schools when their budgets are being curtailed; visual impact on last remaining entry into the city that isn't blighted by urban sprawl; housing stock, not sure this can be justified given current economic situation. propsoals do not address serious traffic and pollution problems will make this worse	
Policy SP3 a	780293	John & Kate Hills		3218	Objecting	We believe that further destruction of the environment will be the result of policies SP2 and SP3a and are opposed and object to these.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	780314	Ms Helen Gardiner		3230	Objecting	The proposals for 15,600 new homes including 4,000 in south Canterbury are more than is needed. If this number of new homes is built it will add to congestion and destroy the local countryside. I therefore object to policies SP2 and SP3a	
Policy SP3 a	780333	Mr Anthony Epps		3272	Objecting	I consider the Draft Local Plan proposing large new developments around Canterbury has not been properly thought out in town planning terms. Where is the infrastructure to service this large & unbalanced increase in population in a civilised way? The development is simply not in keeping with the existing character of this city. The attractiveness of Canterbury as a place to live will be reduced & its existing character will be overwhelmed by urban sprawl.	
Policy SP3 a	13751	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Lower Hardres Parish Council	3377	Objecting	We strongly oppose the proposal to locate 4,000 homes in the area between Nackington Road and New Dover Road. This land is probably the finest Grade 1 brickearth in the United Kingdom, capable of growing the very widest range of crops, and has one of the best micro climates in Kent. T The number is excessive and the transport/highways proposals to support this development are totally inadequate.	
Policy SP3 a	122735	Ms Penny Morgan		3391	Objecting	Opposes developments of 4000 dwellings at south Canterbury, because: cause the loss of agricultural land which is a highly natural resource and global food productions is of concern; agricultural land should be safeguarded; brownfield sites should be targeted and proper analysis made of housing need; building new houses will not lead to more jobs/businesses; Canterbury will become a commuter town.	
Policy SP3 a	479719	Dr Robert Jupe		3507	Objecting	I think the proposal for 15,000 houses is too ambitious, and so oppose policy SP3a.	
Policy SP3 a	481630	Dr R B Mallion		3482	Objecting	Object to the proposal to build 15600 new houses, including 4000 in South Canterbury. I am not at all convinced by the arguments given that so many are needed. It would cause disproportionately increased traffic congestion, irretrievable loss of green-field sites, would increase population of the city by more than 20% and the city cannot support this increase. The 43% increase in annual house building to 780 a year seems excessive when job provision is envisaged as only 225 per year.	I understand that the Ipsos-Mori poll commissioned by the Council showed that 39% would favour the housing target proposed in the Plan but nearly half (48%) thought that the target should be 550 houses per year (or lower) - the historic level of house-building in the city. The Canterbury Society's Vision for Canterbury proposes a housing target of precisely that just referred to - namely, 550 houses per year. In view of the above data, and the fact that no more than 4500 extra jobs are anticipated (equivalent to an average of only 225 annually), this, in my view, is the upper bound of what the target should revert to.
Policy SP3 a	778675	mrs gwyneth linnane		3474	Objecting	Objection to large housing development at Canterbury will impact on traffic congestion and lead to more pollution. Loss of farmland. Use empty shops and houses; lack of support in Canterbury for this level of development; will make Canterbury less attractive to residents and visitors alike.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3409	Objecting	Objects to Policy SP3a because: it will destroy the environment; house density 45/ha will make landscaping hard; the orchards is an amenity and used for walking and cycling; no evidenc to increase building rate; a business park and 4000 houses will exacerbate traffic congestion, junction improvement could not cope; lack of infrastructure planning will ruin the world heritage status; plan is affect by Howe Barrack and eastern bypass; control quality.	If there is to be any development the council should impose strict controls on the quality and visual impact of the buildings.
Policy SP3 a	780207	Pru Cherry	The Whitstable Road Residents Association	3399	Objecting	Object to policy SP3a. The huge housing development will increase traffic congestion in south Canterbury and have an effect on traffic circulation in the rest of the city, increasing congestion and pollution. It is incompatible with Policy T1a. Commuters will need to cross the city to use the high speed rail service at Canterbury West so it incompatible with Policy T1c.	
Policy SP3 a	780451	Mr Ken Stroud		3349	Objecting	4,000 house plus all the other development proposed, packed into that small area in South Canterbury, plus a further 4,400 homes in the surrounding areas is not a good idea at all. Surely, we are already well over populated in the South East, with amenities, infrastructure and resources (water, hospitals, doctors, schools, refuse etc) already stretched to the limits, especially with regard to water and hospitals with A&E shut at K&C.	
Policy SP3 a	780459	Louis De Marigny		3355	Objecting	Please would you note the strong objection I have to your proposed development in South Canterbury. There are better solutions to the proposed plans, and the destruction of prime farming land is sort sighted and will impact on the area very badly.	
Policy SP3 a	780460	Jacqueline De Marigny		3356	Objecting	Please would you note the strong objection I have to your proposed development in South Canterbury. There are better solutions to the proposed plans, and the destruction of prime farming land is sort sighted and will impact on the area very badly.	
Policy SP3 a	780770	Mr & Mrs J K Brooks		3439	Objecting	We would like to object to the local plan which has included the building of 4000 houses in the South Canterbury area. This cannot possibly be a feasible plan, using high quality farm land when there are brown sites available.	
Policy SP3 a	780823	S Suti		3396	Objecting	The system cannot take the additional traffic fromthe proposed development at South Canterbury. The Park and Ride has trebled traffic in the New Dover Road. Every house built on the edge of Canterbury means another two cars added. As there are no big job opportunities in Canterbury, the inhabitants are likely to commute to Ashford, Maidstone or further	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3706	Objecting	Object to proposal for a large number of new houses in S Canterbury is unnecessary, especially in regard to traffic, its unworkable and financially ruinous. Object to A2 Bridge interchange. The proposed fast-track bus service peters out at the Hospital, will increase congestion in South Canterbury Road, Nunnery Fields and Old Dover Road. Its impact on the roundabout at Riding Gate would be catastrophic. We suggest a greatly reduced housing scheme and new traffic impact study under policy T18.	
Policy SP3 a	407886	Mr J and P Booth		3526	Objecting	Traffic is already congested at differing times of day on the approaches to Canterbury from the South; the proposals would make this significantly worse. Access to the train and bus stations from this South side of the city can only be via the town centre ensuring that the congestion seen on the access roads is carried into the city centre. This all greatly increases air pollution.	
Policy SP3 a	773749	Dr Roger Blackman		3573	Objecting	Object to development proposals for South Canterbury because; the majority of houses would be built on greenfield and grade 1 agricultural land; and the scale of development would turn Canterbury into a commuter town.	
Policy SP3 a	780499	Valerie & John Puleston		3579	Objecting	Object to development proposals for South Canterbury because insufficient attention has been paid to infrastructure needs: local roads are already over-used and congested; and no additional secondary school provision has been made. Moreover, the reduction of the green space between Canterbury and Bridge should be prevented; and as an allowance has not been made for student accommodation the number of units proposed should be reduced.	
Policy SP3 a	780502	T E Burke		3585	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for South Canterbury. More attention should be paid to improving the transport infrastructure; and properly consulting with local residents before developer ideas are sought.	
Policy SP3 a	404737	Mr Richard Guest		3826	Objecting	Strategic Site Allocations Policy SP3 a; Proposed Development South Canterbury: I strongly object to the inclusion the development sites in south Canterbury for housing, retail park and ride ,business and other (to include a "Local community "hub"; primary school; doctor's surgery; extended park & ride; combined heat & power facility) I also object to the provision of a new road interchange at Bridge.	
Policy SP3 a	408497	Mr C Mills		3726	Objecting	I object to the proposed development in South Canterbury. This is Grade 1 agricultural land that must not be lost forever from the food chain. The area is also designated an 'area of high landscape value'. Any building here would also compromise the notional green gap between Canterbury and Bridge.A large housing estate in this location would increase traffic congestion and air and noise pollution. (see attached for detailed comments)	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3677	Objecting	Concern that the proposed green circulation route through South Canterbury, which is the North Downs Way National Trail Bridleway, appears to be beside a main road through the site is crossed by other routes for the new housing development. The National Trail's quality would be severely damaged by this and it is contrary to DEFRA's Rights of Way Circular 1/09. The National Trail bridleway should be be diverted onto a route which is set well away from and not crossed by motor vehicular traffic.	Appendix 1: Strategic Development Site (South Canterbury). The National Trail bridleway should be diverted onto a route which is set well away from and not crossed by motor vehicular traffic, or that if new motor vehicular crossings of the Trail cannot be avoided, grade separated crossings for equestrians must be provided.
Policy SP3 a	13752	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Petham Parish Council	3939	Objecting	Almost without exception the main issue of concern is the amount of traffic this South Canterbury development will generate and the impact it will have on Petham and the Southern Villages in accessing Canterbury. The infrastructure of services has not been adequately addressed, and disappointed with the loss of grade one agricultural land. The new fast bus service will not benefit Petham Parish or others to the south of the city.	A substantially improved set of transport / highway proposals is required as is an urgent re-assessment of the use of the land off Nackington Road is required.
Policy SP3 a	414397	Ms Brenda Colthurst		4014	Objecting	I strongly object to the proposed development plan for South Canterbury. I am a resident of South Canterbury and I am already concerned about the current congestion on the roads in the area, and particularly around the Cricket Ground. The plan would make this considerably worse. There are many other areas around Canterbury that could be redeveloped to the benefit of the area - e.g. Hersden.	
Policy SP3 a	780513	Ms Marguerite Beckerlegge		3806	Objecting	In terms of the development proposals for South of Canterbury the following should be considered before taking decision. Sufficient schools, areas for children to just play and express themselves; use of green-belt land; and parking and traffic problems. Canterbury is a small, well visited City with much to offer but it would become burdened with more and more people plus 40,000 University students.	
Policy SP3 a	780273	A D Linfoot		4115	Objecting	Objection to South Canterbury: it is not needed; It is high-quality agricultural land, which the country will regret in near future; Council cannot control where people live and work, so many people living in such a development would work in the centre or north of the City and District, this would add to traffic congestion and problems. Water supply and foul drainage will not support a vast increase in population. Surface water drainage will be a major problem for Barton estate.	
Policy SP3 a	780717	Mrs & Rev'd C & D Crabtree		4006	Objecting	Strong objection to South Canterbury proposals. Need to take account of the national north south divide even at the local level. Impact on the already acute traffic problem in Canterbury and increased commuting - can there be assumed extension of parking facilities at Canterbury West Station. Congestion at Monastery Street is detracting from the Conservation Area. Impact on the character of the cathedral city.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	780993	Dr Amanda Cook		4026	Objecting	I object to the local plan, specifically about the proposed South Canterbury development. There is insufficient detail to explain why an area with minimal likely increase in business needs the number of extra houses quoted. The development would be on prime agricultural land. The planned development area goes underneath some very high voltage electricity transmission cables. Development would need to make sure there is adequate provision made for additional community facilities.	
Policy SP3 a	780995	Mr Dave Colthurst		4067	Objecting	I object to your plans for the housing development in South Canterbury. There is no possible justification for the excessive number of planned houses, there is also no possibility of the current road system being able to accommodate the extra traffic they would generate.	
Policy SP3 a	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4243	Objecting	There is a very strong objection to this policy which seeks to allocate 4,000 dwellings at South Canterbury. The whole allocation is conditional upon the provision of a new junction onto the A2 and this is simply not credible. The South Canterbury allocation should be deleted in its entirety. A significant part of the shortfall should be made up by allocating an urban extension at Thanington.	The South Canterbury allocation should be deleted in its entirety. A significant part of the shortfall should be made up by allocating an urban extension at Thanington. The land at Cocking Farm could be included as a free standing development or, included within a much larger urban extension.
Policy SP3 a	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4255	Objecting	This development is wholly dependent upon the provision of a new grade separated junction on the A2 for which there is no funding and should therefore be deleted in its entirety.	This development should therefore be deleted in its entirety.
Policy SP3 a	779227	Mr Paul Uden		4279	Objecting	The long term annual allocation of housing within the draft plan is arbitrary, unrealistic and overly aggressive. Building on this scale over the next 15 years will have a dramatic effect on the local community in South Canterbury. It means the loss of a significant amount of Grade 1 farmland and increased Traffic, Congestion and Pollution.	Adjust and reduce the level of new homes planned and spread them evenly across the the District of Canterbury.
Policy SP3 a	780847	Miss & Mr H & M Audsley & Dethier		4303	Objecting	The proposal to site 4000 houses in South Canterbury is poorly conceived on the following grounds - transport congestion; loss of best and most versatile farmland; loss of green spaces; and effect on the heritage of the city. Have all alternative strategies been explored? For example, use of brown field sites such as Howe Barracks, Canterbury Motor company site, or construction of new multi-storey car parking facilities to release sites for development within the city.	Have all alternative strategies been explored? For example, use of brown field sites such as Howe Barracks, Canterbury Motor company site, or construction of new multi-storey car parking facilities to release sites for development within the city.
Policy SP3 a	780848	Ms Violet Howard		4311	Objecting	I wish to object to the proposed development of South Canterbury as in the Local Plan. The thinking behind citing this development in South Canterbury is flawed because of the following issues - traffic movement across the city; and loss of green fields and high grade farmland. Building new homes can regenerate regions and within east Kent there are several areas which would benefit economically from such investment. Hersden and Thanet are two regions which fall into this category.	Council should consider that Hersden would benefit economically from new housing.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	780967	Mrs D P Kalideen		4334	Objecting	I wish to register my objection to the proposed housing development, on the South Canterbury site, on the grounds that such a huge building programme will have severe negative impact on the whole of Canterbury city, a world heritage site.	
Policy SP3 a	780983	Mr Martin Ward		4272	Objecting	The proposals for 15,600 new houses in the district must be both questioned and resisted. Building 4000 new houses in South Canterbury is more than can be borne by that area. Overall, building such a large number of new houses will only add to the congestion already experienced in the area and increase the destruction of the countryside. Again, it will destroy the very essence which makes Canterbury unique. I object to Policy SP3a.	
Policy SP3 a	780986	Mr Peter Taylor-Gooby		4288	Objecting	There is no convincing case that the infrastructure will be provided to sustain the number of houses proposed -no real estimate of viability. Concerned about costs implied by new roads, sewerage, public transport and water supply - how can these be met without LA contribution.High speed bus won't work unless railway bridge is widened. It is on good quality farmland. No reason to believe social housing will be provided. The plan will not provide adequate open space -allocate Ridlands Farm	
Policy SP3 a	406328	Mr Daniel Smith		4523	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for South Canterbury because it would result in the loss of greenfield land that forms a visual welcome to the many tourists; the green gap between Canterbury and Bridge must be kept as this maintains the relationship of City and Village; and a large increase in housing is not supported by residents.	
Policy SP3 a	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4418	Objecting	Object to South Canterbury because: unsustainable urban sprawl, 20% increase in canterbury's population and a 1.3km increase in; loss of high quality agricultural land, need to maintain food security; landscape and visual impact, will destroy AHLV, conflicts with DLCABA; transport impacts, is undeliverable due to cost of A2 slip, will increase traffic and congestion, lack of evaluation of impacts. 300 units could be put on SHLAA86.	Put 300 units on ShLAA 86 remove rest of allocation
Policy SP3 a	780987	Jo Cope		4304	Objecting	I am horrified to see the draft. I accept that it is appropriate to build some new homes in the area but the proposal contains far too many and will cause huge problems. I am particularly concerned about more roadbuilding ruining the quality of life for local residents and causing more pollution. This just adds to the traffic. The habitat for wildlife and farmland will be destroyed. Has supply of nurseries, shops, social services and council srevices been considered. Courting disaster.	
Policy SP3 a	781064	Mr Richard Grayson		4323	Objecting	4,000 new homes built in South Canterbury feeding traffic along New and Old Dover Roads into the city centre can only make congestion and pollution worse.	
Policy SP3 a	781067	T J & A Lynch		4356	Objecting	We most emphatically say no to the proposed draft local plan for South Canterbury. We have concerns regarding the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land, water supply and disposal of waste water, traffic congestion and effects on the surrounding countryside.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	781154	Mr A R Blake		4364	Objecting	I am writing to object to the proposal to build 4,000 homes in South Canterbury on Grade 1 land which is an invaluable, productive, agricultural resource. Water supply is of concern and additional vehicles will add to the traffic pollution.	
Policy SP3 a	781156	Mr Andrew Stacey & Family		4383	Objecting	I am particularly concerned by the planning proposals for South Canterbury as outlined in the 'new 10 year plan'. The enormous scale of the proposals are disproportionate to this area and will irreversibly despoil a huge area of grade 1 farmland that has great visual attraction being already designated an area of high landscape value . I am also concerned about future infrastructure.	
Policy SP3 a	781157	Mr Richard Pettman & Family		4386	Objecting	We are particularly concerned by the planning proposals for South Canterbury as outlined in the 'new 10 year plan'. The scale of this proposal is huge to the area and will undoubtedly spoil the natural visual beauty to this grade 1 farmland. If a plan is to go ahead we would be more in favour of a more evolutionary/organic approach to reduce the proposed scale with infrastructure problems being addressed ahead of development.	
Policy SP3 a	781161	N A McDavid		4321	Objecting	The land is currently Grade I agricultural land and has been enjoyed by generations for thousands of years. This generation should not be the one to spoil it. There will be little countryside left to enjoy. 4,000 houses in addition to a business park will add to the already unacceptable congestion. There would be an increase in pollution and a stretch on sewage and water resources. The area should be continued to be agricultural land. Urban sprawl would ruin Canterbury as a World Heritage site.	
Policy SP3 a	781163	Ms Carole Parmiter		4319	Objecting	The scale of additional housing and the pressure on roads, water, sewerage provision (already problematic) and local authority services would be vast, and likely to be problematic. If those who put this plan together have any comprehension of the qualities and virtues of living in Canterbury as it is, they would review the Local Plan and scale it right down.	
Policy SP3 a	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council	4571	Objecting	There are reservations with regard to the size of the South Canterbury development, could the development be more evenly spread around Canterbury	
Policy SP3 a	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council	4675	Objecting	Object to the development proposal for South Canterbury because it will substantially increase traffic and it is felt that insufficient thought has gone into improving the main routes in and out of the District	
Policy SP3 a	121393	CLlr P Vickers		4621	Objecting	I strongly object to draft Policy SP3, South Canterbury. It will go against 6 NPPf statements; against findings of MORI; loss of amenity for existing residents; loss of grade 1 land; destroy setting of historic city; reduce gap between city and Bridge; won't provide 30% affordable homes; strain on existing infrastructure; be additional to needs of District; deprive other areas in need of regeneration; add to traffic problems; devt should be near to HS1, wrong side of City	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	411808	Ms Annette Woods		4605	Objecting	Object to South Canterbury as it is flawed. It will create massive traffic movement across City; any development should be near West Station for access to high speed service. Development should be located along existing rail lines and develop new halts along transport corridor to Ashford Sturry, Hersden and University. New junction will increase traffic. Loss of high quality agricultural and greenfield land. new development should be in areas in E Kent that need regeneration Thanet or Hersden.	
Policy SP3 a	778577	Mrs Laura Spencer		4611	Objecting	Object to S Canterbury because the potential reduction of green gap between Canterbury and Bridge; loss of Grade 1 farmland; destruction of wildlife sites; threat to the historic appeal of the City; loss of visually attractive route into Canterbury will become like Wincheap & Sturry; traffic congestion; pollution; lack of A&E; poor sewerage infrastructure. Should use empty properties, brownfield sites, build student accom. Remove site and locate devt at Herne Bay, Hersden and Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 a	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4644	Objecting	Object to 4000 houses at South Canterbury because: incompatible with other policies in the plan; add to traffic congestion on inadequate infrastructure; use valuable agricultural land when there are food shortage concerns; increase the city by 20-25%; erode the city's character and attractiveness; lose its competitive advantage. Reduce target to 10000 and relocate student accomodation meaning that 4000 houses at St Canterbury not needed. Investigate Chislet and Howe Barracks	Reduce development target to 10,000, the 4,000 new dwellings proposed for the South Canterbury site would not be needed. · Re-housing the student occupants into purpose built accommodation, freeing up 4000 homes making 4,000 new dwellings in S.Canterbury unnecessary. Investigate possibilities offered by · the Howe Barracks site · the Chislet site.
Policy SP3 a	781013	M A Spratley		4601	Objecting	We are totally opposed to this local plan development which is not in the interest of the people locally. IT will cause bad traffic problems and pollution. It will impede access to the local hospital	
Policy SP3 a	781014	Mr & Mrs C & J Stocken		4602	Objecting	Objection to South Canterbury because of impact on the environment, pollution and congestion particularly the Old Dover Road; loss of grade 1 agricultural land; transport lack of easy route from S Canterbury to Cant West station; urban sprawl will ruin historic setting of World Heritage Site. Emphasis should be on better use of empty homes; more purpose built student accommodation;siting smaller devts on several brownfield sites, Hersden Howe Barracks. Plan will have negative impact on residents	
Policy SP3 a	781018	Mr Geoffrey Woods		4609	Objecting	Object to S Canterbury as it is flawed. It will create massive traffic movement across City. Any development should be near west Station for access to high speed service. Development should be along existing rail lines and develop new halts along transport corridors to Ashford, Sturry Hersden and university. New junction will increase traffic. Loss of high quality agricultural and greenfield land. new development should be in E Kent in areas that need regeneration eg Thanet and Hersden	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	781020	Ms Cathy Sales		4617	Supporting	Some limited development of the south area is welcome but the present infrastructure and road and rail network does not make this large scale development of this one site viable. Already there are huge traffic bottlenecks on the New Dover Road in the rush hour, with cars trying to enter the city. No further traffic can be supported - the plan to join the Old and New Dover Roads is blatantly inadequate.	
Policy SP3 a	781255	Robert & Sandra Shine		4502	Objecting	The location proposed for new housing is Grade 1 agricultural land and if the Council were serious about sustainable development it would focus on small scale development on a range of brown field sites and lower grade agricultural land. There is minimum attention to services, it would exacerbate traffic congestion, junction improvements to the A2 would not be able to cope and a business park in this location would not be attractive to businesses. Development should be small scale and sensitive.	
Policy SP3 a	781264	Ms Roberta Johnson		4461	Objecting	While agreeing that more housing is needed for local people, I would urge you to retain the 'green gap' between Canterbury and Bridge and not to allow building on any Grade 1 farmland. We live in an historic city of national importance and must therefore take responsibility for enabling current and future generations to enjoy it. This city's infrastructure is already under pressure, so any development must address that as a priority.	By this I mean improved public transport, a park and ride scheme that further reduces the amount of traffic in the city centre and a road system that actively discourages 'rat runs' through residential streets.
Policy SP3 a	781316	Mr Jon Linnane	Petition received from Jon Linnane for LANRA	4514	Objecting	We petition the council to remove from the Draft Local Plan the allocation of land in Nackington Road and Little Barton Farm for the development of housing and retail, and the site off Nackington Road allocated for a new school.	Remove from the Draft Local Plan the allocation of land in Nackington Road and Little Barton Farm for the development of housing and retail, and the site off Nackington Road allocated for a new school.
Policy SP3 a	781344	Mr James Spain		4524	Objecting	Objections to draft local plan for South Canterbury - 1. The loss of over 70 acres of acres off fertile Grade 1 production farm land by building houses on this land. 2. Extra Traffic,extra queues & pollution in the Nacking Road due to the Building of these of houses will mean many extra cars in the road.	
Policy SP3 a	781353	Mrs K Westcott		4549	Objecting	I am writing to oppose the local plan to build over 4000 new homes between South Canterbury and Bridge for the following reasons - need to use brownfield land; no evidence of need; lack of jobs; more student accommodation needed; water supply; traffic congestion.	Use the brownfield sites first, such as the prison and Howe barracks, which have recently become available.
Policy SP3 a	781398	Mr John Anderson		4600	Objecting	The Simon Langton School for Girls (SLGS) is frequently used for parking by the KCCC for matches and Canterbury Festival events at the ground. Since the club has played its part in increasing housing availability on the land it previously used for parking, there is a danger that parking for events will be a major issue. The Park and Ride [Dover Road] could be expanded as proposed in the Plan, but a more convenient alternative might be to use the land vacated by the SLGS.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	781416	Ms Carol Cotton		4584	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for South Canterbury because there is no consideration towards the provision of the supporting infrastructure i.e. water, drainage, schools, doctors etc, the city is already heavily congested and the Plan has no regard to the wellbeing of residents by trying to join Canterbury with Bridge.	
Policy SP3 a	781418	Mr Brian Robinson		4583	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for South Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 a	124122	Mrs. V Gore		4708	Objecting	Objects to South Canterbury because of loss of high quality agricultural land when in future there may be a shortage. Building a new road will increase traffic. New housing stock is already under sold. Many houses in need of refurbishment CCC should CPO them. Housing need is due to impact of students, Plan should provide for enforced return of student housing stock to family housing. Student levels may decrease in future. Canterbury is a conservation area Ashford is expansion area.	
Policy SP3 a	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4674	Objecting	In our view, the proposed 4,000 house allocation in South Canterbury is unnecessary and should be scrapped. Instead it could be identified as an area of further investigation and public consultation, along with Thanington, if additional housing became necessary in the second half of the Plan period (2021 to 2031).	In our view, the proposed 4,000 house allocation in South Canterbury is unnecessary and should be scrapped. Instead it could be identified as an area of further investigation and public consultation, along with Thanington, if additional housing became necessary in the second half of the Plan period (2021 to 2031).
Policy SP3 a	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4804	Objecting	The first bullet point in the box on page 144 entitled Responses to Climate Change is "giving priority to development in urban or edge of urban locations that are well served by sustainable forms of transport". This is inconsistent with the objective of building 4,000 houses in SE Canterbury when, as part of this deal, policy SP3a says that new infrastructure development needed is a "New junction onto the A2 and modifications to the existing junction arrangement".	
Policy SP3 a	382675	Mr John E Hill		4695	Objecting	Opposes development at south Canterbury because: Mori and NLP showed sample were less keen on large greenfield sites; destruction of Grade 1 agricultural land; detrimental to world heritage site and tourism; alter character of city; no justification/evidence; no negotiation; what are the other options; development just to get A2 junction; no thought given to additional traffic created, bus routes will not solve the gridlock problems.	
Policy SP3 a	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4731	Objecting	No direct impact on designated sites. The site is likely to be grade 1 or 2 Agricultural Land - this loss must be justified in terms of need and alternatives. The AONB Unit may wish to comment on the impact of development on the designated landscape.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	780832	Mrs Jan Munns		4724	Objecting	5000-7000 new homes will put unfair pressure on city facilities and roads. The A2 access will not deal with traffic going into town or to Canterbury West Station. There are no direct buses or easy walking to the station. Funding generated by the development will be used to pay for the new A2 junction none left for schools shops etc. More pressure on A&E's. Will remove only open space in the area. Cycle lanes must be provided. Is there the demand. Use unused land. Will destroy essence of city.	
Policy SP3 a	780837	Mrs Margaret Darby		4728	Objecting	Objects to development at south Canterbury because of: loss of grade 1 agricultrual land; transport and traffic issues; need for cycleway provision; need for 8000 new jobs; mix of houses needed; need for high quality desing.	Revisit plans for South Canterbury
Policy SP3 a	780842	Revd & Mrs Clive & Helen Barlow		4725	Objecting	Objects to South Canterbury, because; it will have traffic congestion, air pollution, sewage disposal, strain on water resources, loss of grade 1 agricultural land as it is needed for food requirements. Houses should be built closer to West Station. Howe Barracks should be examined more closely. Objects to government pressure driving the plan. More local infrastructure and transport planning needed, particularly hospital access. Will have a negative impact on Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 a	780843	Mr Roly Cobbett		4723	Objecting	The farmland at South Canterbury should be protected from development: 1. It is prime agricultural land, which this country will need to feed itself in the future; 2. It is part of the beautiful landscape around the cycle path and wonderful approach for both walkers and cyclists to the city; 3. it is already protected, as part of the Area of High Landscape Value being part of the Pilgrims Way. Throw out plans to build on this land, immediately.	Farmland at South Canterbury should be protected from development. Plans to build on this land, part of the protected lands around the city, should be thrown out immediately.
Policy SP3 a	781040	Ms Dawn Stroud		4802	Objecting	Object to the development proposal for 4000 new houses at South Canterbury because it would mean the loss of grade 1 agricultural land and countryside between Canterbury and Bridge as well as increased traffic on local roads. Canterbury West Station is far less accessible from this side of the City and so are the main road routes to London. Raises doubts about the type and affordability of houses planned and whether the necessary infrastructure can be delivered within the funding available.	
Policy SP3 a	781435	Ms Margaret Young		4691	Objecting	Object to S Canterbury because impact on historic setting of City; traffic congestion and pollution including litter particularly around term time. Developers proposing to build here will not have to take responsibility for the traffic, roads, air quality or infrastructure problems.	
Policy SP3 a	781595	Ms Laura Jowers		4788	Objecting	4000 new houses in south Canterbury, are more than is needed, and will add to congestion and the destruction of the countryside. Loss of grade 1 agricultural land. Traffic congestion, air pollution and water supply issues. No evidence they are needed. Take student housing into account to reduce the amount of housing needed. Concentrate on brownfield sites.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	781608	Carole L Derham		4765	Objecting	Oppose 4000 homes at south Canterbury because: loss of prime agricultural land; pressure on water and sewage; need for medical, social education services; worsening of traffic congestion; difficulty in doing the school run to Bridge; air pollution; need for improved infrastructure.	
Policy SP3 a	781614	Mr Malcolm Cumming		4769	Objecting	Objects to South Canterbury development, because: use of agricultural land; increase in population size; new residents will be commuters, west station on otherside of Canterbury; transport issues and congestion. Not against limited development here but this will impact on the quality of life for all of Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 a	781617	Ms Lucy Tyler		4776	Objecting	Oppose the building in South Canterbury, because; it is on grade 1 agricultural land and people need to eat; lossof countryside; traffic congestion on Nackington Road.	
Policy SP3 a	781637	Mr Brendan Power		4787	Objecting	4000 new houses in south Canterbury, are more than is needed, and will add to congestion and the destruction of the countryside. Loss of grade 1 agricultural land. Traffic congestion, air pollution and water supply issues. No evidence they are needed. Take student housing into account to reduce the amount of housing needed. Concentrate on brownfield sites.	
Policy SP3 a	781712	Mr Colin Vickers		4781	Objecting	Oppose 4000 homes at south canterbury because: use brownfield sites; loss of Green gap; traffic congestion; impact on city setting; lack of public and local support; lack of funding for infrastructure and A2 junction; driven by A2 junction improvements; building more than 500/yr is excessive and unnecessary; West Station is on other side of city; loss of open space; impact on residential amenity. Ill conceived.	
Policy SP3 a	781719	A M Terry		4751	Objecting	Objects to houses at South Canterbury because:- Traffic generated will cause even more problems, water supplies are not adequate, building on agricultural land. Any houses to be built should go on the barracks or at the prison.	
Policy SP3 a	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4856	Objecting	We take issue with the plans to locate 4,000 houses in SE Canterbury on land that is not only Greenfield and of high agricultural quality, but is also within an AHLV. We believe that policy LB2 is contravened with respect to building on AHLV land, especially when there is other more suitable land for development and when such building will affect the "historic setting of the city and the world heritage site€².	
Policy SP3 a	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4948	Objecting	We wish to register the fact that we and many local residents groups are deeply concerned about the Council's preference to allocate some 4000+ houses in the area between the south of the City and the nearby village of Bridge. In our view this would be the worst possible option when measured against our Fundamental Principals.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4893	Objecting	The development proposal for South Canterbury places all eggs in one basket i.e. the cost of the junction improvements, community infrastructure and fast bus route - as such the viability of the scheme is questioned. The NPPF requires sites to be deliverable i.e. "be available now, offer a suitable location for development, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular the site is viable".	
Policy SP3 a	781033	Ms Hazel Brackley		4821	Objecting	The South Canterbury development is another village €" six times bigger than the current size of Hersden!	
Policy SP3 a	781921	National Grid		4912	Objecting	The Canterbury South site is crossed by an existing National Grid high voltage electricity line. NG wishes to retain lines in situ. National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly under overhead lines and statutory clearances must not be infringed. NG encourages high quality development and land beneath the overhead line should be used to make a positive contribution to the development - nature conservation, open space etc. See 'A sense of Place' design guidelines .	
Policy SP3 a	13812	Mr N J Blake		5193	Objecting	Obect to development at S. Canterbury for the following reasons: no account taken of the constraints against development in the LCBA; unspoilt landscpre providing attractive entry to this historic city; detrimental to setting of Pilgrims Way; traffic implications have been underestimated. There is no analysis to show which this sie was selected or why it is so large when there are other SHLAA sites at the edge of the City whih are not SLA's Grade 1 farmland or as unspoilt as this one.	It is appreciated that some housing has to be sited at the fringes if Canterbury city but it is felt that it should be sited in the least visually significant areas, where its impact can be minimised by natural features such as contours and trees together with the proximity of an already urban edge.In South Canterbury it is felt that the least intrusive areas would be south of the Foreland, to the east of Nackington Road and to the north west of the ridge top to the south east of Barton Road. In this latter site it is appreciated that the long distance views from within the city would need to be considered, but unlike the proposed site, the land form would contain development from the valuable views obtained from outside.
Policy SP3 a	406381	Ms Julia Gavriel		5213	Objecting	Why is there an emphasis on building in South Canterbury? This will entail cars travelling across the city to the largest employer at the University of Kent in and Canterbury West station for high speed rail links. Our city is already polluted and gridlocked. The road infrastructure needs to be in place before development in South Canterbury.	The road infrastructure needs to be in place before development in South Canterbury.
Policy SP3 a	411757	Mrs Julie Cox		5000	Objecting	I am writing with regards to the Draft Local Plan and object to the planned development of South Canterbury with over 4000 new homes. The area is currently mostly high grade agricultural land which if built on will be lost forever as a local resource. Alternative brownfield sites could be found for some housing. Is there a need for so many houses in Canterbury? How will our services cope with an increase in residents and what work will there be for so many new residents?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	778627	mr robert thomas		5152	Objecting	Object to the development proposals at South Canterbury because of the existing road, gas/electricity, water and sewage infrastructure problems, the loss of high quality agricultural land; and the impact on the quality of life and sense of belonging of residents. The housing crisis is a result of the over expansion of the universities with a reliance on private landlords rather than providing sufficient student accomodation. The Plan also doesnt state what low cost housing would be available.	
Policy SP3 a	781714	Ms Sally Gibson		5008	Objecting	Objects to 4000 homes at South Canterbury, because: the plan is developer led with them being asked where they wanted to develop; no local consultation or full evidence; NLP shows that many houses are not needed; Mori survey shows people against building on greenfield land; can't afford to build on valuable agricultural land; brownfields sites have been ignored in plan; traffic congestion; fast bus route laughable; take into account view of people of Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 a	781786	D H Evans		5013	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for 4000 new house at South Canterbury because the local roads are already heavily congested, there would be a loss of agricultural land, and the existing water, sweage, power infrastructure are already over-stretched. The Ridlands Farm area needs to be preserved as a 'lung', and the community would best be served by keeping it as open space with a combination of farmland, parkland and woodland.	
Policy SP3 a	782060	Mr Christopher Cox		5033	Objecting	I live at the road called The Foreland. My house is right next to a field that is apparently going to have 4000 plus house built on and this sounds absurd. I'm also wondering how they will get planning permission for a house opposite me because we've got a balcony overlooking a field. Why do they want to do this other than to make more money?	
Policy SP3 a	782430	Ms Maria Welch		5049	Objecting	I am writing to express my grave concern over the plan to build over 4000 houses in South Canterbury over the next few years. My main concern is traffic congestion. My other concerns are water supply for the new houses; the proposed site is grade one farming land; impact on tourism and visitors; the amount of student housing that has been built.	I am writing to express my grave concern over the plan to build over 4000 houses in South Canterbury over the next few years. As a local resident I really do not want this to happen.
Policy SP3 a	782441	Mrs Sally Hopkins		5074	Objecting	The major issue seems to be the proposal to build 4,000 houses at the end of the Old and New Dover Roads. The sheer number of houses being proposed is unsustainable and unnecessary, with no evidence that these houses are actually needed. Other issues are traffic congestion; strain on resources and services; need for green space; worse air quality; Grade 1 farmland.	The Council should concentrate on brown field sites, the Howe Barracks or lower grade agricultural land.
Policy SP3 a	782442	Mr Richard Hopkins		5077	Objecting	The major issue seems to be the proposal to build 4,000 houses at the end of the Old and New Dover Roads. The sheer number of houses being proposed is unsustainable and unnecessary, with no evidence that these houses are actually needed. Other issues are traffic congestion; strain on resources and services; need for green space; worse air quality; Grade 1 farmland.	The Council should concentrate on brown field sites, the Howe Barracks or lower grade agricultural land.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	782448	Mr Grant Buckland		5081	Objecting	This email is to state clearly that I am opposed to the council's proposal to develop the area of South Canterbury with 4000 units. As I local resident I believe this proposal will be detrimental to the area in terms of traffic, services, schools and the historic setting of Canterbury. The whole plan appears ill thought out and requires in depth review before proceeding. I do not believe that South Canterbury is the area that should be selected for the number of houses proposed.	I do not believe that South Canterbury is the area that should be selected for the number of houses proposed.
Policy SP3 a	127115	B.J. Gore		5278	Objecting	Objection to S Canterbury. The Council is being two-faced in its approach. On the one hand it promotes open space as providing health and social well-being, whilst on the other it proposes to take away Kingsmead Field in the City, Dengrove Wood Sturry, Strode Farm and S Canterbury. All the "amenity spaces" in the world cannot compete with nor replace these areas. The areas also assist considerably in air cleansing and improvement of air quality.	
Policy SP3 a	414112	C E Arter		5266	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for 4000 new houses at South Canterbury because it would result in the gap between Canterbury and Bridge being significantly reduced, it would increase traffic, congestion and air pollution, the existing infrastructure would be over-stretched; and there would be a loss of grade 1 agricultural land. It would also threaten Canterbury's heritage value to residents and visitors.	
Policy SP3 a	421400	Mr Ben Knox		5302	Objecting	I oppose the further destruction of the environment will be the result of policies SP3a, the building of 4000 new houses to the south of Canterbury. This will destroy some lovely countryside, add to chronic traffic problems in Old Dover and New Dover Roads, spend most of the monies taken from development (S106 etc) on an unnecessary new A2 junction/new slipway from A2 into Wincheap. It is an area of water scarcity, lack of water infrastructure. Lack of cycling, pedestrian and public transport.	
Policy SP3 a	781544	Mr Kevin Cotton		5303	Objecting	Canterbury is a jewel in the crown of England and must be treated accordingly - yes it must grow but in a controlled way in line with its unique heritage and character. A major responsibility which the present Council appear not to be applying in a sensible and democratic manner. Object to S Canterbury because of lack of infrastructure, pollution, utilities, traffic, abuse of the green belt, traffic congestion, air pollution.	
Policy SP3 a	781545	Ms Sheila Kurowska		5307	Objecting	I attach a letter (already emails to you from my husband) expressing out views on the local plan. I am partiucularly concerned at the loss of farmland in South Canterbury which I feel is unjustified and too dense in terms of planned dwellings. this farmland is also an important amenity in terms of wildlife and green space for walking which is in very short supply in Canterbury. The associated increase in traffic in our area is unacceptable.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	782449	Ms Jayne Ward		5143	Objecting	The proposals for 15,600 new houses in the district must be both questioned and resisted. Building 4000 new houses in South Canterbury is more than can be borne by that area. Overall, building such a large number of new houses will only add to the congestion already experienced in the area and increase the destruction of the countryside. Again, it will destroy the very essence which makes Canterbury unique.	
Policy SP3 a	784483	Miss Penelope Tyler		5257	Objecting	How sad that we are contemplating covering this highly productive land with houses. There is only 2.5% of this highest quality land in the whole country and we will be needing this quality land for our children's future. It is imperative that we save this land for wheat or other crops so that we are not reliant on imports. Grade One Agricultural Land can never be retrieved. This is not a local issue for Kent and Canterbury. It is of national importance.	Simon Langton Boys and Girls Schools could work with a new farmer of this land to understand the land and food on a practical level. Produce could be grown for high quality food for the hospital across the road. It needs joined up thinking to work with the gift we have been given from our forebears so that we may pass it on to ours.
Policy SP3 a	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5225	Objecting	Object to South Canterbury. This is for the following reasons: the area is designated AHLV; it is Grade 1 agricultural land; the Green Gap between Canterbury and Bridge should be preserved; local infrastructure will come under increased pressure; it will lead to further traffic congestion; the presumption that housing generated economic growth and employment is questionable; there are other sites, some of which are brownfield that have not been included. Plan goes against views of local people.	
Policy SP3 a	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5470	Objecting	Object to development at South Canterbury for the following reasons: Grade 1 agricultural land; AHLV; scale of development is inappropriate and overwhelming; impact on the visual approach to the city; lack of rigorous study of the traffic and other infrastructure considerations; traffic choke; use precious resources; will require huge infrastructure investment; no analysis of the costing and viability of junction or CHP. Environmental disadvantages far outweigh the sustainability benefits.	
Policy SP3 a	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5370	Objecting	Objects to S Canterbury as contrary to sustainable development. Opposite side of town to 2 railway stations and hospital; will encourage car use as next to A2; generate large traffic volumes; add to congestion and pollution. Developer contributions to more sustainable measures. Amount of devt should be reduced and other sites eg Chartham should be considered; creation of a segregated cycle route on New Dover Road; residential devt should match or exceed existing densities at least 55/ha	We recommend: a) That the amount of development here be significantly reduced and development at other sites investigated instead. (See Additional Housing Units / Chartham below) b) The creation of a segregated cycle route on New Dover Road from the roundabout at the existing park and ride directly into the city. We believe that New Dover Road is comfortably wide enough to accommodate such a measure. c) Residential development here should at least match or exceed existing development densities to the north of the South Canterbury site. We recommend a density of at least 55 units per hectare.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	781560	Mr Peter Cook		5309	Objecting	I wish to place on record my objection to this ill considered proposal particularly with regard to the likely loss of agricultural land in South Canterbury and elsewhere. When other brown field sites are available the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land would be a travesty.	
Policy SP3 a	781562	Mr Chris Morrissey		5310	Objecting	New Dover, Old Dover and Nackington Roads are already very busy during peak travel times, will not be able to cope with the increased number of vehicles associated with 4,000 extra dwellings. District Transport Strategy Para. 1.73 and Policy SP5 state the we should seek to control 'the level and environmental impact of vehicular traffic' and reduce 'cross-town traffic movements in the historic centre of Canterbury'. no support for greenfield devt in Mori poll. Should be spread across District.	
Policy SP3 a	781622	Mr T Whiting		5402	Objecting	The council spent a fortune changing the traffic flow through the Westgate Towers making congestion worse. This same council that is trying to cut congestion now proposes development on St Stephens field with its associated extra traffic in the city plus 4,000 new houses in south Canterbury, I don't think they have any credibility remaining. I therefore object to policies SP2 and SP3a	
Policy SP3 a	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5351	Objecting	Request two amendments to policy SP3a. Site survey identified insufficient sewerage capacity in the network to accommodate increased demand. Significant new infrastructure to connect the site to the sewerage works would be required to ensure good service. Development should provide this. Sewerage infrastructure crosses the site. This should not be built on a 6-13m easement is required. Development layout should take account of this. Any diversion will be at the developers cost. Amend as outlined	Include the following text in the 'Infrastructure' section of policy SP3a: The development must provide offsite sewerage infrastructure to connect to Canterbury wastewater treatment works. Amend the 'Other' section of policy SP3a as follows: Development proposals must ensure future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.
Policy SP3 a	784579	Ms Ruth Buckland		5411	Objecting	This email is to express my opposition to the proposed 4000 houses in southeast Canterbury. My objection is based on the following factors: traffic congestion, lack of parks, poor services, unsustainable shops, loss of Grade 1 farmland; unclear how plan improves the economy.	
Policy SP3 a	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5526	Objecting	I object strongly to the inclusion of the strategic site at South Canterbury (site 1)	Change required: Removal of site 1. The inclusion of some significant sites in larger villages and along railway corridors in close proximity to railway stations, land to the south at Hersden and development of a sustainable new residential area at Yorkletts on lower grade agricultural land (not on the SHLAA sites investigated there).Commitment is required to more investigative work re-Howe Barracks and Canterbury Prison for potential new housing.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	784610	Chris & Julie Newman		5474	Objecting	this local plan for South Canterbury is ill thought through. This for the following key points:- 1) loss of Greenfield land - there are options to use brownfield sites 2) Transport congestion, access, and road capacity issues 3) Just where are the jobs in Canterbury? 4) if the houses are really needed, maybe a "new town" close to HS rail links or the motorways should be considered.	There are options to use brownfield sites at Howe Barracks and Chislet, and if the houses are really needed, maybe a "new town" close to HS rail links or the motorways should be considered.
Policy SP3 a	784617	Ms Beryl Wilson		5477	Objecting	I acknowledge the plan for new houses but the cost of this one is too much. The city is already crowded and our agricultural land is precious. Please rethink . Howe barracks is available and the prison area these must be factored in. Canterbury is a great city and desperately needs creative and original progress not the easy quick throwing up of houses only for profit and not quality of life. Come on Canterbury Council lead the way. Imagination and sensitivity.	
Policy SP3 a	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5742	Supporting	Support development at South Canterbury, consider it well thought out in location, retention of green gap, A2 access and provision of significant business space. Would be concerned if entertainment or fast food outlet were given permission due to impact on town centre. The business space will support economic growth, jobs and inward investment. Need to ensure businesses don't relocate from city centre.	
Policy SP3 a	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5770	Objecting	Previous experience, such as at Homersham, shows that the Council has a poor record of community creation as well as in responding to community wishes. The DLP fails to consider the impact a development the size and scale of South Canterbury would have on community development. Visually and socially this will change the city dramatically. This lack of concern shows that the plan is unlikely to achieve its aims of creating 'well-designed new communities'.	
Policy SP3 a	784705	Ms Catherine Spratley		5772	Objecting	Objects to South Canterbury, because: Grade 1 farmland; should built on brownfield; traffic congestion; too many houses; pressure on utilities; on-going sewage capacity issues; not localism; local government should represent the majority not minority; it is a wealth area with high land prices so is the choice of developers not locals; conflicts of interest.	
Policy SP3 a	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5893	Objecting	Indicates a requirement for community facilities. Please include: fully accessible community facilities that caters for all age groups and vulnerable people. €" This will cater for FSC clients. All community facilities to be determined in conjunction with parish, district councils and KCC service providers. This paragraph only indicates the provision of one primary school €" which will not be sufficient. KCC Education will provide updated evidence for the provision of additional school facilities	Indicates a requirement for community facilities. Please include: fully accessible community facilities that caters for all age groups and vulnerable people. €" This will cater for FSC clients. All community facilities to be determined in conjunction with parish, district councils and KCC service providers. This paragraph only indicates the provision of one primary school €" which will not be sufficient. KCC Education will provide updated evidence for the provision of additional school facilities.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5847	Objecting	Proposals for S. Canterbury will result in the loss of agricultural land, sensitive landscapes, and the Canterbury-Bridge gap. If the DLP aims to develop high tech industries, housing would be better suited nearer Canterbury West and UKC, reducing cross city traffic. There is concern about the impact on existing infrastructure, and whilst there are promises of new community facilities, these are not in the Council's gift. The allocation is motivated by other considerations i.e. government funds.	
Policy SP3 a	784807	Mr John Pike		5934	Objecting	Generally I do not think Canterbury has sufficient infrastructure to cope reasonably with more housing. Environmentally Canterbury is already overcrowded, the further destruction of the environment as a result of policies SP2 and SP3a cannot be justified - I strongly object on environmental grounds: traffic congestion; lack of infrastructure provision; loss of agricultural land.	No proposal on housing in the South Canterbury area should be approved until there is a decision on this proposed road link.
Policy SP3 a	784811	Dr Emily Blake		5835	Objecting	Object to development at South Canterbury: totally in excess of what the can reasonably and sustainably support; would place further intolerable pressure on the road network; there is no evidence of recent traffic surveys or projected traffic levels; pollution risk; impact on environment and fabric of World Heritage City; would place more stress on current water/sewerage facilities; there is no potential for major job expansion; Grade 1 farmland should only be considered as a last resort.	I recognise the need locally and nationally to provide housing to meet current and expected population growth estimates, and would support moderate development on Brownfield sites to help facilitate this. Brownfield sites should be used in preference to Grade 1 farmland.
Policy SP3 a	414968	Ms Deirdre Hawkes		6213	Objecting	Object to S Canterbury: do we really need as many houses? More pollution/congestion in Canterbury; lack of general infrastructure; not sustainable. Many houses being built in District. More student accom is being built which frees up family housing; will spoil Canterbury and affect visitor numbers as sprawling metropolis; green gap between Bridge and Canterbury should be preserved to help reduce pollution/traffic congestion; Grade 1 farmland should be preserved to avoid food shortages in future.	
Policy SP3 a	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6030	Objecting	Concerned that the allocation of houses in Canterbury are all concentrated into one segment of the city. The allocation of 4000 new houses at South Canterbury will result in the loss Grade 1 agricultural land and an AHLV. It will also exacerbate existing traffic congestion and air pollution with few remediation measures likely.	
Policy SP3 a	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	5994	Objecting	Building 4000 new dwellings on the South Canterbury site would be incompatible with other policies in the Plan - more traffic congestion; loss of agricultural land; impact on the natural environment; growth at city would damage some of its advantages.	If the overall development target for the district were reduced from the proposed 15,600 new dwellings to something closer to 10,000, the 4,000 new dwellings proposed for the South Canterbury site would not be needed. If some new development in the city is required, we suggest that the possibilities offered by the Howe Barracks site should be investigated more thoroughly than has so far been done in the draft Plan, plus consideration of the Prison site.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	784809	Ms Jeannette Field		5986	Objecting	Please note that I am strongly opposed to the 4000 unit development southeast of the city. The majority of Canterbury residents are opposed to this plan which is developer-led. It will increase traffic in the town adding to the current congestion and building to this extent should not take place on green-field sites.	
Policy SP3 a	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5999	Objecting	South Canterbury. Positive factors: including access to amenities and facilities, employment floorsapce, open space and woodland, improvements to the A2, not in a flood plain. Uncertainties: including access to rail network, delivery of infrastructure, infrastructure relieving congestion, delivery of employment. Negatives: incl loss of greenfield land, loss of an area of high landscape value, loss of agric land, impact on Bridge, employment provision unproven, water stress, local objection.	
Policy SP3 a	781578	Dr Maria Summerson		6140	Objecting	Object to South Canterbury. Wealth of research that documents the crucial importance of such spaces for the mental health/wellbeing of citizens, I would also like to know how these plans can possibly be justified in light of the (also) well documented unsafe and excessive levels of traffic fumes pollution in the Canterbury area? City needs green spaces. EU are suing LAs for failing to reduce air pollution levels. Women are twice as likely to develop breast cancer in areas of high air pollution.	
Policy SP3 a	784478	Dr N Reza		6212	Objecting	I live just off the New Dover Road in Canterbury and wish to object to the plans to build 4,000 homes on Grade I land in South Canterbury. I would be grateful if you could note my objection	
Policy SP3 a	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6439	Objecting	Object to S Canterbury. Unsustainable concentration of new houses will damage attractiveness of City; impact on peak time traffic congestion/air quality; Junction improvements to A2 could not cope; developer must pay for junction but will be to detriment of community provision; need for affordable housing yet area is usually very expensive; Impact on hospital, sewage and water resources; public opinion is against; loss of grade 1 land; impact on AHLV/WHS green gap; incompatible with HE1,HE2,HE3	Changes sought. More appropriate brownfield sites should be considered such as Howe Barracks, the site of the former colliery to the south of Hersden, or lower grade agricultural land such as at Yorkletts. As previously stated in our answers to Question 4 above, if the overall development target for the district were reduced as we suggest new dwellings proposed for the South Canterbury site would not be needed.
Policy SP3 a	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6708	Objecting	Object to development proposals for 4000 houses at South Canterbury as it would be at odds with Policy LB2, it is located within an AHLV, and the Local Plan (2006) Planning Inspector stated that if the development envisaged at Little Barton Farm did not take place with(in) a reasonable period, the site will not be regarded as suitable for other forms of development, and will be returned to agricultural use.	
Policy SP3 a	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	6482	Supporting	Previous submission and transport feasibility study attached. Support the inclusion of the site in the South Canterbury development and are keen to work with the Council and other parties to bring the site forward quickly. There site could come forward on a stand alone basis. They have appointed highway engineers to look at congestion and high speed bus links in relation to the site.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	6491	Objecting	While they support the south Canterbury development and the inclusion of their site they would like changes: the Development brief and phasing plan will have to have a high degree of flexibility to maintain completions; their site could come forward as a stand alone site; a dedicated access to their site will not inhibit the full site; plan should make specific reference to need for range of simultaneous development locations; amend format of SP3 sub policies so first para applies to all parts	
Policy SP3 a	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6765	Supporting	Support the allocation and development of south Canterbury Policy SP3a. The site is available under the control on one company, can be delivered in plan period, other sites rely on this site to deliver infrastructure. It is a sustainable location, has the potential for non car transport links, will provide improved A2 junction and new hospital. The site is deliverable, will require only modest initial enabling development, potential hold up is highway/A2 sign-off, has funding in place.	
Policy SP3 a	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6766	Objecting	Relocate Kent and Canterbury Hospital to a new Campus alongside the new A2 junction on the South Canterbury Development site. This is needed because; the current site has poor access; current buildings deteriorating; provides ability to replace all buildings and may increase services; employment space will be retained; additional housing land could be brought forward. Redevelop hospital site for housing.	We therefore recommend that policy SP3 is amended to incorporate the possibility of relocating the Kent and Canterbury Hospital to the South Canterbury strategic allocation and that housing is identified as a possible future land use for the existing campus if it is to be redeveloped.
Policy SP3 a	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6768	Supporting	Support allocation of 18-20ha of land for employment use at South Canterbury. Will give 70000m2 of new employment floor space. Although they do suggest some alternative ratios than those referred to in the employment land review.	
Policy SP3 a	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6830	Objecting	DTZ Report does conclude with an argument that explains why NLP Report has pushed for an increase from 2000 to 4500 homes in Canterbury. We do not reject this outright, but believe it must be balanced with other factors. The cost of the infrastructural elements of a project need to be analysed in detail to justify each case. High cost of A2 junction will consume most of S106/other monies. High cost of school moves, employment land. Impact of cross town movements on traffic pollution congestion.	
Policy SP3 a	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6887	Objecting	The ability of S Canterbury to absorb the new development is not demonstrated. Mitigation should be set at high level: no net increase in pollution or congestion affecting existing areas. Worry that requirements will be relaxed when affects viability. Do not deal with increase congestion & pollution as traffic will cross city. Proposed fast bus route is not credible as routes are congeted now. No plans to increase ring road capacity/divert traffic. Water resources impact, loss of grade 1 land	A complete review and rethink of this policy as it is considered wholly impractical or indeed unnecessary to build the proposed 4,000 new dwellings (see General Statement above). Indicate the enforceable penalties that would be put in place to ensure against development proposals not being met.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 a	13835	Mr Michael Steed		7000	Objecting	Objects to allocation of land at South Canterbury for new houses, because: of its location on the wrong side of Canterbury from the train station and University of Kent; Transport links are poor no train links and poor bus service; within an AHLV: will ruin historic setting of city; conflicts with policy HE3.	
Policy SP3 b	766720	Mr Tim King		7	Objecting	Alternative to the proposed sturry railway crossing.	Why could the complete station not be moved approx. 1 mile towards Hersden? This would enable the existing Sturry crossing to be retained but operated very similar to the Broad Oak crossing which opens and shuts very quickly with virtually no delays to traffic. There would be no need for very expensive new road schemes or new bridges. The existing station space could be used to substantially improve the road junction from Herne Bay and Margate. I am sure part of the cost of moving the station and upgrading the signalling to improve the Sturry crossing operation could be met by the railways. This proposal would be far less disruptive and significantly less expensive for the local community, Canterbury city council and the KCC.
Policy SP3 b	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		14	Objecting	Adding add. population at Sturry will make Canterbury's traffic problems even worse. P&R will not magic away increased traffic. If Sturry crossing is closed, it will sever the link between the two parts of the community and services including the doctors' surgery and shoppnig. How can the development provide a road, bridge and affordable housing. Foul drainage infrastructure and run-off from Sturry Hill are significant problems in this area and are set to cause trouble again under draft plans.	
Policy SP3 b	765582	Mrs Sarah Murray		132	Objecting	The proposal to build 1000 houses at Broad Oak is contrary to previous Kent & Medway Structure Plan to protect the appearance and character of the landscape and rural environment. The proposed site has sandy soil which has precedent of structural collapse and underpinning of houses. New housing could cause flooding. The proposal will effect Ancient Woodland and Burial Ground, both of which are protected under EEC legislation and the NPPF and Localism Bill. Also insufficient infrastructure.	Reassessment of the land site proposed . If going ahead inspite of poor building land, a prudent plan with fewer, quality character housing in keeping with rural environment. Distance buffers to protect the woodland. Native Oaks planting. Planning in conjunction with Natural England report. Traffic congestion consultation to resolve current and future needs. Council planning communications in conjunction with National Grid new pylons and Water Reservoir plans to work together with the public to a positive outcome. School provision,Sports facilities, play areas for children, pharmacy, parking and seating and picnic areas. Information boards on wildlife.and pond protection.
Policy SP3 b	117585	Cllr Nick Eden-Green		194	Supporting	Focus development at Sturry to deliver the Sturry level crossing bypass	Remove South Canterbury and other sites not listed above.
Policy SP3 b	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		330	Objecting	Development of this land allocation must include provision for non-motorised modes of transport, which is not detailed at all in the illustrative plan.	(See attached annotated plan) Provision of links into the heart of Canterbury for both cyclists and pedestrians. This must include a link to the riverside cycling and walking path.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	155	Supporting	It is recommended that the following site be considered which is in the draft Local Plan: Rural Site- Land at Sturry/Broad Oak, 1000 dwellings	
Policy SP3 b	771779	Mrs Patricia Kane		395	Objecting	I object to the wholesale destruction of beautiful countryside and the loss of prime agricultural land. A development of this size will completely change the character of the city of Canterbury and is out of proportion with the developments proposed for the surrounding areas. Canterbury has already experienced a much higher level of housebuilding since 2000 than Herne Bay or Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 b	773048	Mrs J Moran		264	Objecting	The proposed sites in Hersden and Sturry, shown in the 2013 District Local Plan, are not suitable for housing development because of land instability issues resultant from past sand and gravel extraction. There are also concerns that developers will only want to build on the most stable sections of the proposed sites and that if the entire proposed development in Sturry Parish does not proceed, there will be no relief road built.	
Policy SP3 b	773139	Dr David Vernon		275	Objecting	Improved infrastructure. This means roads and dedicated [safe] cycle paths. This infrastructure needs to improve access to the city not limit it to a single route.	Build a new bridge over the rail line into Canterbury and keep both the rail crossings at Sturry and Broad Oak open as well as their current access routes. This would increase access to the city by adding a 'third stream' which could link with the park and ride for those wishing to access the centre.
Policy SP3 b	773168	Mrs Elisabeth Gay		878	Objecting	I felt that the plan for the new housing development for Sturry and Broadoak was well thought through and if it was carried out as planned would be successful. I can see that the road through the development would help to ease traffic through Sturry village but I was amazed that anyone could think it would be a good idea to close the Sturry level crossing.	
Policy SP3 b	776051	Mr Rick Strange		865	Objecting	Development at Sturry/ Broad Oak is on an area adjacent to ancient woodland (AW) and in places cuts through AW. Much of the area, would also qualify as wood pastures according to NE. Much of the development, and including the road, would be illegal, as development does not outweigh loss of AW. There are Great Crested Newts which would substantially delay development and historically nighingales as well. If the road cannot be built and the crossing closed then the other devpmnts are in jeopardy	
Policy SP3 b	777485	Miss Janet Wilson-Sharp		1075	Objecting	I am very concerned about the proposals for over 1,000 new homes in this area. This will have a very serious effect on the local community. There are several practical issues which have not been given due consideration: existing sewerage facilities are inadequate; water shortage exacerbated by building on greenfield sites; congestion will increase; due to economy there is a risk of many empty homes; what jobs will there be after construction?; not enough school capacity.	These are very serious issues which must be resolved before any building work is started.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1244	Objecting	There many negatives associated with new housing. The closure of Sturry Crossing would isolate the village and businesses from their customers. The Broad Oak site is smaller than Hersden, yet seeks to accommodate 20% more units. How? Higher buildings or smaller units? More than 2.5 stories would be out of keeping. It is important for motorists to use the new roads. Further traffic congestion leads to an increase in pollution, which affects residents (incl lung cancer) and wildlife (RAMSAR/SSSI)	The crossing should not be closed.The reservoir at Broad Oak needs to be considered.
Policy SP3 b	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1251	Objecting	The Council understands that National Grid's preferred corridor is the north corridor and is the corridor with existing pylons. Additionally, the National Grid current options for the connection to the sub-station are at odds with the CDLP draft and site 2 at Sturry/Broad Oak. They may make open housing less attractive. There is a link between proximity to pylons and an increase in childhood leukaemia. The site may need to be revisited to examine whether both can be accommodated.	
Policy SP3 b	778387	Mr David Smith		1331	Objecting	I feel that the proposal of 1,000 new homes in this area is too many. I also have concerns about the proposed re-routing of traffic.	I do not have sufficient knowledge of Sturry to make any suggestion, but I would ask that you take account of the representation made by Sturry Parish Council please, as they represent residents who do have indepth knowledge of their area.
Policy SP3 b	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1206	Objecting	We have some concerns about this proposal in its current form, particular insofar as it would involve the closure of the Sturry railway crossing and the re-routing of traffic around Sturry. There is a danger that this would simply move traffic congestion to locations further into Canterbury, in particular Sturry Road, Broad Oak Road, and the St Stephen's Road roundabout.	A more detailed traffic impact study.
Policy SP3 b	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1306	Objecting	The proposed northern end of the South Canterbury relief road would appear to necessitate ruining Sturry. The town would be cut in half, like Berlin, and the extra houses, stretching up to Broad Oak would place too much extra burden on the town's infrastructure and inconvenience too many people for very little benefit.	I should like to see the Council reduce the extra housing it plans to a level the town can accommodate.. A tunnel or a bridge to ease traffic flow past the level crossing would be a simpler solution to the problem.
Policy SP3 b	778625	Mr David Wadmore		1353	Objecting	The proposed infrastructure should not be developer dependent. A new crossing and roads to service 1000 dwellings will add to current traffic jams. When complete, at least 1200 cars will be added to the local roads. Road closures at Broad Oak will force more traffic to the congested roundabouts at Vauxhall Road. The delays caused by the level crossing closures alleviate the traffic queues, causing a natural break that allows traffic to move. Building a station car park will add inbound traffic.	An independent, state funded bypass, not relying on housing development
Policy SP3 b	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1731	Objecting	Site 2 (SP3b) does not meet the sequential approach to the allocation of land for development and the settlement hierarchy set out at paragraphs 1.67 - 1.70 of the Local Plan. The significant reliance that the Local Plan strategy places on delivery of this site within the Plan period is unsound.	Include under Policy SP3 the allocation of an additional Strategic Site at Bodkin Farm, Chesterfield, Whitstable (as per the site details provided under our representation to Policy SP3a).

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	779124	Marsh		1651	Objecting	Sturry and Broad Oak cannot cope with the volume of new dwellings proposed without it adversely affecting the current residents. The infrastructure will not cope with the increased amount of traffic or number of inhabitants. The proposal is not sustainable.	The number of houses proposed should be drastically reduced. The level crossings should remain open.
Policy SP3 b	779148	Mr Robert Smethurst		1707	Objecting	Sturry & Broad Oak must remain separate. Too many houses. Details of type/style. Transport an undefined mess, A28 to A2? Sturry rail car park is of dubious use. Relief road will divide Sturry - no pedestrian provision. Shalloak Road Crossing closure requires more details as to how community transport will be accommodated. No details of how old and new Broad Oak will be integrated. Too many houses for such a hilly site. needs to be small groups of quality. Inadequate facilities in B/O already.	BROAD OAK : Less houses, better separation from Sturry, Garden City type of concept. Consider the appropriate mix of housing for a village with special characteristics. Guarantee bus routes to provide for elderly majority (the Litchfield Report specifically mentions an ageing population). Provide a green link through the development via the village ponds onto Sweechgate to link with the two pubs and countryside. There are fields available adjacent the B.O Farm site to allow this (SHLAA/055 and 141) . GP surgery (fully subscribed?) and Primary school (full) are more than 800m from the B.O. Farm site. How will Shalloak Road be treated at the crossing? If the crossing closes then there must be a slip road (with restricted access) on to the new relief road. This could service Broad Oak residents, emergency vehicles, busses and act as a detour during incidents on the main road. Must the development impinge on the garden views of 40% of the brick houses in the village? STURRY : Interesting site. Keep the Greenfield Lodge as an amenity/social centre/pub. Not enough information about how the Crossing corner will be handled with respect to local traffic and pedestrians. Define exactly how the relief & restriction of the Sturry Crossing will work. pedestrians/disabled/elderly are not in the equation. Sturry is on both sides of the crossing. Too many houses, discrete enclaves of quality houses needed. The whole Greenfield site appears to be littered with shooting 'clay' debris and logically lead shot. OVERALL : Keep villages seperate, define all the ideas/suggestions about footpaths/cyclepaths. Where will all the busses go - through the new village houses hopefully, not
Policy SP3 b	778752	Ms Jean Anthony		2179	Objecting	I strongly oppose the plan to build between Sturry and Broad Oak. We are separate villages and do not want to be a Canterbury suburb. People need open spaces. Canterbury would be gridlocked and suffer terrible pollution.	
Policy SP3 b	779262	Mr John Bailey		1953	Supporting	Perfect place for home development as long as transport improvements are made.	
Policy SP3 b	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1922	Objecting	Concerned about the proposal in its current form, insofar as it would involve the closure of the Sturry railway crossing and the re-routing of traffic. There is a danger that this would simply move traffic congestion to locations further into Canterbury, in particular Sturry Road, Broad Oak Road, and the St Stephen's Road roundabout.	A more detailed traffic impact study.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	778402	Mr Mark Hunter		2237	Objecting	I object to the proposed intense local development at Sturry and Broad Oak My objection is simply based on the excessive destruction of our countryside. I would beg you to stop these high density developments and consider better use of the existing spaces in our towns and villages, not to mention the use of brownfield sites and the refurbishment or demolition of buildings currently in poor states of repair.	
Policy SP3 b	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2194	Objecting	We have some concerns about this proposal in its current form, particular insofar as it would involve the closure of the Sturry railway crossing and the re-routing of traffic around Sturry. There is a danger that this would simply move traffic congestion to locations further into Canterbury, in particular Sturry Road, Broad Oak Road, and the St Stephen's Road roundabout.	A more detailed traffic impact study.
Policy SP3 b	778648	Sharon & Stephen Sayers		2269	Objecting	With the proposed development at Sturry, there are serious issues relating to Water supply, Jobs, Infrastucture, Wildlife and Environment, Quality of life and Open spaces.	
Policy SP3 b	778747	Mrs Vivienne Lorimer		2306	Objecting	I am therefore writing to oppose this developer-led building of 1,000 houses in Broad Oak, Hersden and Sturry on green land which threatens agriculture and future food production, and jeopardizes ancient woodland. Also concerns over protected species. Traffic will be a major problem nad pressures on schools, hospital, water, drainage nad sewage facilities.	
Policy SP3 b	778771	P Kelk		2317	Objecting	Object to development at Sturry/Broad Oak: do not have the roads in Broad Oak or Sturry this side of Canterbury for more development; traffic bottlenecks at Vauxhall and Broad Oak Road; closure of rail crossing would cut off local access and bus service; roads are narrow in parts of broad oak; no guarantee amenities and infrasture will be delivered; village will lose its identity. No answers why Broad Oak is selected.	Was Island Road near the Convent on the A28 purposed as this ground was condensed many years ago to develop this would not have any effect on woods as this ground has just been left for over 25 years. Once good farming land would make a good development the same as Fairview Garden. How many houses stand empty in the Canterbury district? Some of them could and should be used by people on your housing list. You are building or the college is building more flats for students which will in turn let some of housing stock be able for people to rent.
Policy SP3 b	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2458	Objecting	Further objection to proposed new roads, bridges and junctions in the area of - Sturry Road, Canterbury and Sturry. At a massive cost, all this will do is move the queue of traffic trying to get into Canterbury from the level crossing in Sturry to Vauxhall Road. There will be a lot more traffic at this point because the alternative route for most Herne Bay traffic which currently uses Shalloak Road will be closed. The money would be far better spent on bus and cycle lanes.	
Policy SP3 b	773048	Mrs J Moran		2633	Objecting	The proposals to develop more areas in Herne and Herne Bay along with the proposed sites in Sturry Parish, will put a considerable strain on all the local infrastructure, but a road bypassing Sturry and joining the A28 as suggested, will not solve the City Councils traffic problems. Will the utility services, schools, medical and other services be able to cope?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	778558	Ms Roshna Ahmad & Family		2356	Objecting	Objects to broadoak/sturry site because: of the massive increase disproportionate to and will swamp the current community; brownfield sites are not earmarked while farm and woodland areas are; the road improvements will not help because of the loss of 2 routes (Broadoak Rd and the A28); the closing of the crossing will split the community and disadvantage local businesses; the road cuts through woodland; no provision of services/schools etc; concerns with respect to consultation.	
Policy SP3 b	778773	Ms Janet Almead		2332	Objecting	In Sturry and Broad Oak in particular, the number of houses to be built will completely swamp the existing villages, destroy (not enhance, as claimed by the developers!) ancient woodland, outstrip the number of school places available, likewise numbers of patients able to be adequately treated by doctors.	
Policy SP3 b	778934	Mr C T Marchant		2380	Objecting	Objects to the development proposals at Broad Oak as it would have a detrimental change on the character of the village; it is outside the confines of the linear settlement; and would have sustainability problems.	
Policy SP3 b	779085	Mr Keith Arnold		2439	Objecting	Object to development proposals at Broad Oak. The village will lose its identity; local properties will be de-valued by the quantity and quality of new housing; it is also likely the new housing will be rented by students; stopping the bus route through the village would isolate old and disabled residents; closing Broad Oak and Sturry Crossings would cut off access; it will increase noise and air pollution; and there is no guarantee the developer will provide the supporting infrastructure.	
Policy SP3 b	776803	Mrs Kathleen Warner		2540	Objecting	I strongly object to the local plan for Broad Oak. There are at present 355 homes in the village, another 450 will more than double its size and will destroy the character of the village altogether. The sewerage farm struggles now to cope with the amount of human waste it has to deal with and what about drainage and fresh water supplies? If you close Broad Oak level crossing we will lose our bus service, isolating the majority of the village that live in Shalloak road and Mayton Lane.	
Policy SP3 b	777707	Mr Paul Waller		2536	Objecting	Object to the development proposals at Broad Oak. It would destroy the separate nature and character of the village; access from Shallock Road would be dangerous; and it would generate additional traffic on a busy residential road. Issues concerning the existing fire and A&E services and water supply need to be tackled prior to any development. Offers of local amenities are 'out of touch' with needs of the community. The plan has many flaws / contradictions and requires proper consultation.	There must be a significant green corridor between the existing buildings and any new houses to maintain the individual character, as promised in the stated objectives.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2621	Objecting	The proposed strategic allocations are all dependent upon significant strategic infrastructure. However, neither the Local Plan nor its evidence base demonstrates that these sites are economically viable and can deliver not only dwelling completions but the necessary essential strategic infrastructure. These policies all refer to contributions to the Sturry Bridge over the railway. However, this is not proposed to be a provision for "soft" modes only, to seek to shift the balance of travel modes	Allocate land at New Thanington
Policy SP3 b	779086	Mrs C Reynolds		2630	Objecting	We object to the plan for Sturry/Broad Oak. We have concerns about traffic, we feel the introduction of 700/800 houses, would completely alter ours and other lives in an unpleasant way, and dread to think about increased vandalism and petty crime.	
Policy SP3 b	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2918	Objecting	In some cases the risk of non-delivery of individual strategic sites could undermine the achievement of other strategic plan objectives, where for example the provision of a piece of strategic infrastructure is dependent upon a site coming forward in a timely manner. This is an issue for Land at Sturry Oak / Broad Oak (Site 2).	
Policy SP3 b	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3020	Objecting	Concerned about recreational pressure on Stodmarsh SPA and Ramsar site, Blean Complex SAC, West Thornden SSSI and ancient woodland network, Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar Site (in-combination impacts).	To ensure that appropriate protection and mitigation is provided to alleviate impacts on the ancient woodland we would recommend that the following additional safeguards are included within the final policy: No ancient woodland habitat will be lost as a result of the proposed development A 15m buffer free from development will be established around the on-site ancient woodland in line with Natural England's Ancient Woodland Standing Advice. All woodland will be retained and incorporated into the design of the development where possible with any woodland lost being replaced within the landscaping scheme. Off-site contributions will be considered to mitigate impacts on the West Blean and Thornden Wood SSSI. Sustainable Access and Monitoring Strategies should be prepared for Stodmarsh, Blean Complex and Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay (if it is shown there is an impacts from visitors from the Sturry area). Contributions may be required.
Policy SP3 b	777540	Dr Julia Dale		2832	Objecting	Suggests that the Sturry / Broad Oak site should be a 'self build' area, along the lines of Almere in the Netherlands and Ashley Vale in Bristol. Following such examples would set a high standard in housing solutions as opposed to the alternative out-dated profit-led developer packages.	Self Build v. "Developer-Led" Proposal If the Council were really serious about low income housing rather than a percentage of "low-cost" (= poor quality) in each area which perpetuates developer-led estates, then it should consider SELF BUILD areas €" e.g. the whole of the Hersden (400 homes) and Broad Oaks (Sturry) (1,000) could be allocated into plots for self build. This could be an award winning and very dynamic solution €" e.g. a) Ashley Vale, Bristol €" mixed development including office & community use b) Almere, Holland €" 3,000 homes on 250 acre site in 'themed' areas.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	779271	Ms Ruth Arnold		2811	Objecting	I have lived in Broad Oak for 13 years & moved here because I wanted to live in a small rural village. I strongly object to the plans the the basis that Broad Oak isn't part of Sturry; traffic; property will be devalued; affect bus services and the Sturry crossing; no guarantee of infrastructure provision.	
Policy SP3 b	779660	Mrs Renard		2779	Objecting	Objects to 450 new homes at Broadoak because: the village is small and it is too many houses; the closing of the Broadoak level crossing will mean the loss of a bus service; Broadoak will become part of Sturry.	
Policy SP3 b	779160	Mrs S M Marchant		2934	Objecting	Strong objection to the housing development proposal on the Broad Oak Farm site for the following reasons: It would have a detrimental impact on character of village; proposed development is outside confines linear settlement; there would be sustainability problems.	
Policy SP3 b	779293	Mr Brian Rigden		3203	Objecting	Object to development proposals at Sturry / Broad Oak. Concerned that the scale would spoil its character as a semi-rural village. Traffic would increase and with it noise and air pollution. The new Sturry bypass would simply move congestion and the closure of the Sturry / Broad Oak crossings would have a detrimental effect on residents, High Street traders and those catching a bus from Shalloak Rd. What assurances are there that the necessary infrastructure would be fully implemented?	
Policy SP3 b	779715	Andrew & Anne Goodwin		3145	Objecting	Object to development at Broad Oak and Sturry. Reasons include the following: Poorly maintained and overused roads are already congested, would lead to increased road noise and pollution, destruction of farming land, and ancient woodland, impact on local flora and fauna, drainage and sewerage are at a maximum, the school cannot meet the expected intake, K & C hospital is unable to cope, there are no plans for new doctors surgeries. No consideration for existing residents.	Remove a thousand family homes from use as student accommodation by building more on campus accommodation. If however there is a need for more housing then we have identified two areas ourselves that would be better suited to accommodate 1000 homes, with either the now redundant Howe Barracks site or land further to the south of the proposed Canterbury development at Kingston near Barham. The village is of a larger size than Broad Oak and is far better suited as it already has good infrastructure of road networks including the A2, with links to the southern and western areas, Old Dover Road and Wincheap, and onto the M2 and London. This will require no new major roads, no closures of level crossings, good integration into a better suited areas, also with no new bridges. The land is also of a poorer farming quality than that around Broad Oak as it is high weald chalk land.
Policy SP3 b	765582	Mrs Sarah Murray		3273	Objecting	As a resident of Broad Oak I have grave concerns as to how the local plan will affect the village and residents on the following grounds - increased crime, too much development in a small village, increased noise and traffic congestion, affect bus services, devaluation of existing property, renting to students, damage to ancient woodland and wildlife, insufficient water supply, no guarantee of amenities and infrastructure.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		3257	Objecting	May we be told why and how we have the three developers already lined up? Is it political? If so, is the Consultation process really a sham and will the administration approve things for the benefit of the developers to the detriment of the people? So again it appears that CCC is favouring developers to the detriment of the residents.	
Policy SP3 b	777850	Mrs Karen Plumb		3346	Objecting	Objection to Broad Oak for the following reasons: bus service restrictions; loss of village identity; Carbon footprint; highways commission costs not in place; infrastructure not in place; traffic congestion; closure of access to Broad oak; affordable housing will create a student environment; devaluation of property; crime rate will increase. This development did not show on searches in the last 18 months.	
Policy SP3 b	779163	Sarah Nops		3321	Objecting	Objection to Hillborough Is this amount of development really necessary? Sufficient work on forecasts; insufficient business development for the proposed allocation of homes; too much pressure has been put on Herne by the surrounding development; increase in traffic; insufficient information on road improvements eg Bullockstone; No plans for infrastructure; lack of info from Highways Dept; no info on ration of affordable versus luxury housing; difficult to find info on proposals on CCC website	
Policy SP3 b	779168	Mr & Mrs D Newlyn		3343	Objecting	Object to Broad Oak becoming an urban estate which could be used by students. the thought of change is very upsetting. Additional homes and traffic would increase the amount of air and noise pollution. Broad oak should be kept a rural village and not become part of Sturry. Additional homes would affect house prices.	
Policy SP3 b	779527	Mr Bob Plumb		3342	Objecting	Objects to Broad Oak due to traffic congestion, impact on wildlife, landlords buying up houses and the letting them out to students; increase carbon footprint due to increased journey length; property devaluing; increased noise and traffic pollution; loss of village community; increase in crime. The local plan did not show up on searches before moved here in 2012. Many other sites around Canterbury with better road infrastructure and amenities already in place.	
Policy SP3 b	779917	Mrs Rachel Moffat		3250	Objecting	I strongly object to the Broad Oak site for the following reasons - volume of traffic; closure of crossings will cut off access; traffic bottleneck on other side of Sturry; Broad Oak will lose its independence and should be separate; conversion of new homes to student lets; devaluation of my property; insufficient infrastructure and amenities; other sites in the vicinity have been rejected and stopping bus service would affect many older residents.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	780743	Mr & Mrs E Todd		3444	Objecting	Objects to level of development at Broad Oak. 1000 homes will rui village atmosphere, 200 would be more appropriate; 1000 homes will attract a supermarket which will impact on local shops; roads cannot take it, developers will build houses and then wriggle out of obligations for road improvements; bypass should follow earlier Sturry bypass route; level crossing closure impact on village; Broad Oak crossing closure makes Canterbury inaccessible to Broad Oak residents.	
Policy SP3 b	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3232	Objecting	The RSPB is concerned about the following strategic allocation: Sturry/Broad oak strategic housing development for 1,000 residential units. This site lies immediately adjacent to West Blean and Thornton Woods SSSI, approximately 0.4km from Stodmarsh SSSI and 0.7km from Stodmarsh SPA/Ramsar site. As acknowledged in the screening of HRA, increased urbanisation associated with residential development is likely to lead to recreational activity on or adjacent to European sites and disturbance impacts.	This should be fully assessed as part of an AA in relation to these sites.
Policy SP3 b	780802	Mrs K D Thompson		3491	Objecting	Proposal for 1,000 homes in and around Broad Oak. This would destroy the rural character of the village and will hopefully be scaled back when the local plan is reviewed. The plan pledges to protect wildlife, the natural environment etc but this proposal is bound to have a negative impact.	
Policy SP3 b	780502	T E Burke		3587	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Sturry and Broad Oak. More attention should be paid to improving the transport infrastructure; and properly consulting with local residents before developer ideas are sought.	
Policy SP3 b	780525	Ms Katharine Rist	Campaigner - Ancient Woodland The Woodland Trust	3824	Objecting	Object to development proposals for Sturry and Broad Oak because it will have an adverse impact on an area of ancient woodland within the allocation boundary called Den Grove. The site allocation should not be taken forward unless the protection of the ancient woodland is taken into consideration and that there is no loss of ancient woodland. A buffer area of 50m provided to ensure that there are no detrimental impacts due to any proposed development.	Site allocation Sturry and Broad Oak should not be taken forward unless the protection of the ancient woodland is taken into consideration and that there is no loss of ancient woodland. The ancient woodland should also have a buffering area of 50m provided to ensure that there are no detrimental impacts due to any proposed development.
Policy SP3 b	780272	Councillor Tony Austin	Councillor Canterbury City Council	4151	Objecting	Sturry has a rural character which would be changed by this allocation. The increase is unfair because it is 4xs the proposed housing increase percentage for the whole district, already had significant expansion. Against destruction of woodland on Sturry Hill. A modest amount of devt north of woodland might be acceptable. Proposed road pattern cuts off Broad oak village impact on elderly person accommodation if lack of public transport, impact on local businesses at Goose Green Estate.	
Policy SP3 b	780990	Ms Imelda Purdy		4003	Objecting	I have serious concerns about the development of Broad Oak, which appears, mistakenly, to have been considered as part of the much larger village of Sturry. I have concerns about the traffic proposals and access to local facilities.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4257	Objecting	There is no viable infrastructure implementation plan for this allocation. Key components have not been costed and there are multiple ownership constraints. The land should be deleted.	This site should be deleted.
Policy SP3 b	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4245	Objecting	There is strong objection to this undeliverable housing allocation. None of the proposed 1,000 dwellings can be delivered during the plan period. There are also significant land ownership constraints. The remedy is for the draft allocation to be deleted. Alternative provision should include allocation of the land at Cockering Farm and the wider Thanington Urban Extension.	The remedy is for the draft allocation to be deleted. Alternative provision should include allocation of the land at Cockering Farm and the wider Thanington Urban Extension.
Policy SP3 b	780846	Ms Helen Applegarth		4261	Objecting	Surely small local developments nationwide at the point of need are appropriate. I fear that the unsympathetic ubiquitous housing estate will be plonked down in an arbitrary fashion. I strongly object to that. The Council needs to sanction only sensitively designed, architect designed, sustainable housing. I would welcome a small development at Broad Oak of 50 Eco Homes to cater for local need. The homes should be setting an example for future sustainable development.	I would welcome a small development at Broad Oak of 50 Eco Homes to cater for local need.
Policy SP3 b	780980	Ms Cecilia Duggan		4236	Objecting	The Broad Oak/Sturry development appears to be particularly disruptive to ancient woodland. I believe there are also concerns regarding the adequacy of water supplies for such developments.	
Policy SP3 b	780982	Mr John Hedington		4256	Objecting	Concerned about the proposal to build 1000 new homes and other developments adjacent to Sturry Hill/Herne Bay Road. This will disproportionately increase the population of Sturry, will cause major problems to the local infrastructure and environment and put more pressure on the roads. Of similar concern is the proposal for "commercial" development within this area. Any business development needs to be sensibly built and to blend with the existing structure of the village.	The level of new build in Sturry should therefore be significantly scaled down. Brown field sites and empty spaces elsewhere within the District should be fully exploited, particularly the old prison and army sites. There is still plenty of room within the development at Hersden for large retail type units. The are between Canterbury amd Whitstable should be explored as a possible location for new housing.
Policy SP3 b	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4379	Objecting	The development of the site behind Sturry village is of concern -impact of surface water runoff on the A28, railway line and River Stour. The water treatment plan will need expanded significantly and is adjacent to the open area envisaged - this would not raise the quality of life. Wrong open space in the wrong place. The colouring on the maps is disingenuous. Conflicts with Broad Oak reservoir constuction vehicles and the Powergen Pylon proposed route need resolved.	
Policy SP3 b	779664	Ms Heather Stennett		4476	Objecting	Representation raises various concerns about different aspects of the proposed transport measures for Sturry/Broad Oak.	Increased development in Herne Bay, Hersden, Sturry and Broad Oak will put an even greater strain on the flow of traffic, getting to the Broad Oak Road should be a considered option.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4445	Objecting	Object to allocation of Land at Sturry/Broad Oak because: against policies in plan and corporate plan; Impact on landscape, AHLV; effect on Sturry, Broad Oak, urban Canterbury, Fordwich, urban sprawl; transport and deliverability of road infrastructure; air quality; loss of agricultural land, food security; pylons and health impacts; effect of development on residents and others in the villages, from additional buildings and traffic.	
Policy SP3 b	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patribourne Parish Council	4677	Objecting	Object to the development proposal for Sturry and Broad Oak because it will substantially increase traffic and it is felt that insufficient thought has gone into improving the main routes in and out of the District	
Policy SP3 b	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4557	Objecting	Concerned about this proposal in its current form, particularly as it involves the closure of the Sturry railway crossing and the re-routing of traffic around Sturry. This would simply move traffic congestion to locations further into Canterbury, in particular Sturry Road, Broad Oak Road, and the St Stephen's Road roundabout. A more detailed traffic impact study needed.	A more detailed traffic impact study
Policy SP3 b	780004	Ms Heather Stennett	Secretary The Society of Sturry Village	4578	Objecting	450 homes does not constitute minor development or infill in accordance with SP4. why is Broad Oak being treated differently to other villages in the same category as identified in the Rural Settlement study. No good reason for treating the 3 separate developments as one site. There is a danger that this will result in less rather than more protection. New road will bring noise and light pollution. Level of development will dramatically change character of village. More congestion on A291 & A28.	
Policy SP3 b	780528	Patrick & Moira Austin		4534	Objecting	Object to the development proposals at Sturry & Broad Oak because there is no justification for taking large greenfield sites when a majority of new properties in the recent development on Fordwich Road remain unsold; there is also no information as to the type of housing proposed; and the additional industrial units would not guarantee new businesses or jobs as similar units in the area are already lying empty.	
Policy SP3 b	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4732	Objecting	The indicative layout intrudes on Dengrove Wood - measures for the protection and management of ancient woodland are a prerequisite of development. The impact on Chequers Wood, Old Park and Stodmarsh SSSIs needs to be assessed and considered. The site is grade 2/3 Agricultural Land - this loss must be justified in terms of need and alternatives. The new link road across the railway to Sturry Road cuts across the Great Stour - any impact on habitat needs to be avoided, or mitigated and justified.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	13753	Mr Jeremy Bellamy		4981	Objecting	Sturry Parish Council rejects the proposals for Sturry & Broad Oak because of concerns regarding the ability of the existing road, water and sewage infrastructure to support new homes; the population increase would be disproportionate to the rest of the district, proposals fail to conserve or enhance the rural and agricultural character of the parish, which is integral to the heritage and cultural identity of the village; a known floodplain, as well as a notable lack of community facilities.	
Policy SP3 b	13753	Mr Jeremy Bellamy		4983	Supporting	Sturry Parish Council support proposals for increased employment opportunities in the Parish in the form of new designated business sites but seeks clarification as to what sort of units these might be.	
Policy SP3 b	781921	National Grid		4913	Objecting	National Grid is proposing new electricity transmission infrastructure between Richborough and Canterbury and will confirm the route connection and route corridor later in 2013. The Broad Oak/ Sturry site interacts with the proposed route corridor options and sub-options. The NPPF (para 162) requires that LAs take account of the need for strategic infrastructure and plan proactively to accommodate this through the recognition of electricity infrastructure within allocations and policies.	National Grid requests that reference is made to the Richborough Connection Project in relation to this allocation and note that provision for electricity infrastructure through masterplanning may be required if the sites prove to be affected by the chosen route corridor option.
Policy SP3 b	13812	Mr N J Blake		5197	Objecting	Object to development at Sturry / Broad Oak: Detrimental to the setting of the village, the imp. Green Gap between Canterbury and Sturry is diminished, particular impact of development on prominent rising ground; fragmentation of woodland; detrimental to visual amenity and quality of the environment. The dvlpmnt runs counter to Council policy. Closure of the Sturry crossing would be detrimental to the environment, dividing the village. Broad Oak Road needs to be linked to the intended by-pass.	Plan of alternative development submitted. The major suggestion is to preserve the rural aspect of the south and west face of the woodland and to remove the housing from its centre. It also moves the by-pass to adjoin the railway, a widely used principle to concentrate the noise and intrusion in one area. The alignment of the new road north, is kept towards the existing, especially where it abuts the existing housing, which has service road to protect it from the additional traffic. It is submitted that this requires a smaller land take and is thus cheaper and less intrusive. At the south east corner of the site a circular route is proposed to enable the existing level crossing to be retained with local traffic using that route. This enables local queuing traffic to wait without blocking the route for through traffic.
Policy SP3 b	782064	Somerlee Homes Ltd & ED Sturry Ltd		5035	Supporting	Our detailed statement in support of the Proposed Strategic Development Site Allocation at Site 2, land at Sturry/Broad Oak, is attached, together with the draft Masterplan.	
Policy SP3 b	782439	Mr Alan Holden	Chairman Broad Oak Preservation Society	5071	Objecting	This scale of development will effectively create a single large urban area linking Broad Oak to the existing boundary of Sturry village, destroying the identity of both in the process. As currently drafted, the Local Plan sees Broad Oak as a dormitory extension to Canterbury. There are no proposals for local employment opportunities or for the services and facilities which comprise a sustainable community.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	782439	Mr Alan Holden	Chairman Broad Oak Preservation Society	5073	Objecting	The new allocation is of concern because it doesn't deliver local services, or deal with water or sewerage issues, will cause wider traffic congestion issues, and the proposal to close the crossing would have a detrimental impact on the village. Also concerned about proposal to close Broad Oak crossing, and its impact on local traffic.	The new roads have to be in place in advance of any new housing construction, both to provide access for construction vehicles without blighting the existing communities, and to ensure the new infrastructure is built. Why is there no will to utilise public money to resolve this long-standing problem? Canterbury is rightly recognised as a world heritage site, which contributes significantly to UK earnings from tourism. Other communities are able to rely on public funding for improved transport infrastructure.
Policy SP3 b	127115	B.J. Gore		5279	Objecting	Objection to Sturry/Broad Oak. The Council is being two-faced in its approach. On the one hand it promotes open space as providing health and social well-being, whilst on the other it proposes to take away Kingsmead Field in the City, Dengrove Wood Sturry, Strode Farm and S Canterbury. All the "amenity spaces" in the world cannot compete with nor replace these areas. The areas also assist considerably in air cleansing and improvement of air quality.	
Policy SP3 b	781721	Ms Lynne Broadbent		5174	Objecting	The draft Local Plan needs to be far more balanced in terms of the number and location of new houses i.e. access to services, more specific in terms of business and employment opportunities and much clearer in terms of addressing existing traffic and infrastructure issues.	
Policy SP3 b	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5473	Objecting	STURRY The beautiful and distinctive Den Grove Wood is seriously threatened €" this woodland & the surrounding green gap do constitute such a valuable green wedge relieving the existing extensive areas of housing in Sturry on the A291 approach and preserving the separation from the Shalloak Road and the Canterbury urban area.	
Policy SP3 b	780831	Shelby & Peter Fitzpatrick		5466	Objecting	Oppose development at Sturry, because: it will split the community; community views not sought; no transport study - issues should be resolved from start; cummunlative impact of development on traffic bottleneck at Sturry; by-pass funding only from developers; closing the crossing will separate residents from services and shops; where will the jobs come from; who will provide schools and medical facilities: pressure on limited water supplies; drainage issues and flooding; air quality reductions	
Policy SP3 b	780840	Mrs J Collins		5457	Objecting	Opposes the development of 1,800 houses at Sturry, Broad Oak and Hersden, because: requirements are met through provision of student housing; the housing has been allocated only to get the Sturry by pass built at no cost to the Council and to hell with the effect on the area; increased traffic; further schools; more GP's; only jobs during construction; mass development will lead to an area where no one wants to live; greenfield; Canterbury district is at capacity.	CCC stands up for itself and the people it represents, and says, enough is enough, and admit Canterbury district is now at capacity.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	780844	Mr Paul Inwood		5442	Objecting	Rejects completely the proposal for housing in and around Sturry, Broad Oak and Hersden. These areas are unsuitable for the scale of proposed development. The infrastructure needed would change the sites detrimentally, the houses would add to the fracturing of the community. The quantity of compensatory enhancement could not pay back the original community for changes wrought.	Restrict greatly plan to develop land in and around Sturry, Broad Oak and Hersden
Policy SP3 b	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5386	Objecting	a) CAST agrees that Sturry is a good location for new development and that housing placed within walking distance of the railway station will limit car use and congestion. We disagree, however, with the scale of development at this site. e) car parking spaces along Sturry Rd be removed to enable a fast bus lane/cycle lane all the way to the Military Rd/Tourtrel Rd roundabout f) That a cycle route be created from new development to city centre along riverside g) Cycle lane on A28 to roundabout	
Policy SP3 b	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5354	Objecting	Request 3 amendments to policy SP3a. Site survey identified insufficient sewerage capacity in the network to accommodate increased demand. Development should connect instead to the nearest point of capacity. Sewerage infrastructure crosses the site. Development layout should ensure this is not built on and a 6-13m easement. Diversions at the developers cost. Ensure an adequate separation from wastewater works and odours (NPPF 109). Amend as outlined	Add to the 'Infrastructure' section of policy SP3b: The development must provide a connection to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by Southern Water. Add the following to the 'Other' section of policy SP3b: Development proposals must ensure future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes. Add the following to the 'Other' section of policy SP3b: There must be adequate separation between Canterbury wastewater treatment works and the development to allow odour dispersion.
Policy SP3 b	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5529	Objecting	I object strongly to the inclusion of the strategic site at Sturry/ Broad Oak (site 2)	Change required: Removal of site 2. The inclusion of some significant sites in larger villages and along railway corridors in close proximity to railway stations, land to the south at Hersden and development of a sustainable new residential area at Yorkletts on lower grade agricultural land (not on the SHLAA sites investigated there).Commitment is required to more investigative work re-Howe Barracks and Canterbury Prison for potential new housing.
Policy SP3 b	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5425	Objecting	Any changes to the level crossings should ensure that: 1 The village of Sturry is not divided by closing the level crossing 2 Strategically it is imperative that the traffic using the A28 has a back up means of crossing the railway. 2 The proposal of bypassing the Sturry level crossing will just move the current bottleneck at Sturry level crossing to Sturry Road. 3 The illustrative layout actually makes the situation worse by introducing two 90 degree turns at Sturry.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	784603	The Hawker Family		5469	Objecting	I strongly object to the plan for Broad Oak for the following reasons - Broad Oak is separate from Sturry; loss of bus services; change the nature of the village; other sites near Broad Oak excluded; impact on the environment.	
Policy SP3 b	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5744	Supporting	This scheme seems well thought through and the aggregating of 'developer contributions' to deal effectively with the level crossing issue has been handled creatively.	
Policy SP3 b	776362	Dr Lisa Delamaine		5783	Objecting	SHLAA did not allow other sites forward for reasons that would equally apply to the Sturry Broadoak site including: small rural village of linear design; protected species; AHLV; traffic capacity pollution problems; land contamination; pylons; ancient woodland; amenity of residents impacted on. Council have ignored these reasons and will place a huge development on a small rural village, which plan says should not be done. What deals have been done?	
Policy SP3 b	784704	Mrs D Potts		5778	Objecting	Object to the proposals for Sturry, because: they are disastrous; too many houses; business will fail if level crossing access restricted and new shops in the development are built; the road layout is ludicrous traffic from Herne Bay Rd will meet that from A28 creating a bottleneck; one incident would bring traffic to a standstill with no alternative route; pollution levels.	
Policy SP3 b	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5851	Objecting	Conflict between policies LB8 and LB12 relating to Ancient woodland and Sturry/Broad Oak site. Devt adjacent and link road are likely to have detrimental impact on ancient woodland contrary to NPPF. Devt will need to meet test in para 10.66. There are also fragmented areas of ancient woodland within or near to sites proposed for allocation. Potential for loss or deterioration will need to be adequately assessed.	
Policy SP3 b	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5894	Objecting	Paragraphs 1.57 to 1.61 indicate a total target of 15,600 dwellings over the Local Plan period. However, while reference is made to one primary school (for Site 1 South Canterbury) and variously to the provision of "community facilities" it should be clear that this level of residential development will require significant additional schools. This needs to be explicitly acknowledged, particularly in regard to the allocation of potential sites and the funding with which to provide them.	It should be clear that this level of residential development will require significant additional schools. This needs to be explicitly acknowledged, particularly in regard to the allocation of potential sites and the funding with which to provide them.
Policy SP3 b	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	6000	Objecting	We have some concerns about this proposal in its current form, particular insofar as it would involve the closure of the Sturry railway crossing and the re-routing of traffic around Sturry. There is a danger that this would simply move traffic congestion to locations further into Canterbury, in particular Sturry Road, Broad Oak Road, and the St Stephen's Road roundabout.	A more detailed traffic impact study.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 b	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6010	Objecting	Positives: improved junction for A291/A28, less traffic at Sturry Hill, protection and management of ancient woodland, perception that traffic congestion would ease. Uncertainties: including impact on retail, ancient woodland, jobs, needs of businesses, implications for traffic. Negatives: including congestion, damage to communities, insufficient employment, amenities, health services & school places , open space undefined, impact on flooding, sewerage, wildlife, impact of changes at crossing.	
Policy SP3 b	784475	Mr Roger Mullaley		6216	Objecting	Object to Excessive housing development at Broad Oak. will joint two villages which are distinct at moment; impact on current residents; No facilities in Broad Oak, no indication of if or when facilities will be built. Transport issues: existing bottleneck and developments here + Hersden and Herne Bay will add to traffic volume. Bypass is a prerequisite to development. Need more control over traffic flows incentives to use public transport P&R, rail; provide pedestrian and cycle routes from here	
Policy SP3 b	13835	Mr Michael Steed		7002	Objecting	Object to the allocation of the Sturry/Broad oak sites, because: the southern part is in a flood plain; the wooded slop is visually important; the green gap will be halved.	
Policy SP3 b	784495	P Manser		6964	Objecting	Any changes to the level crossings should ensure that: - The village of Sturry is not divided by closing the level crossing - Strategically it is imperative that the traffic using the A28 has a back up means of crossing the railway. 2 The proposal of bypassing the Sturry level crossing will just move the current bottleneck at Sturry level crossing to Sturry Road. 3 The illustrative layout actually makes the situation worse by introducing two 90 degree turns at Sturry.	
Policy SP3 b	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6912	Objecting	Suspicion about the 'extras' mentioned by the Council and developers. Suggestions for the benefit of the commnuity - The protection of Sturry village High Street as a commercially viable centre. A kindergarten, a day care centre for the elderly and a sports hall (tennis, basketball etc.), a good size multi-purpose hall with easy access for all by bus. Parking in Sturry village, road and pavement repairs, more road crossings and better cycle paths. Retention of Sturry Farm Shop, butcher welcomed.	
Policy SP3 c	769177	Mrs Helen Langridge		62	Objecting	Why is money from this going towards the Herne by pass and Sturry crossing? It should be going towards issues in Herne Bay.	Put the money from this policy towards Herne Bay and Beltinge which it will most affect.
Policy SP3 c	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		74	Objecting	There is no mention of provision of open space; no mention of provision of additional public transport facilities; no mention of provision of walking and cycling routes.	
Policy SP3 c	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		333	Objecting	The pedestrian and cycle infrastructure included at the site should be more extensive and contiguous than is shown in this Local Plan's illustrative layout. Bus route provision must be provided.	(See attached annotated map) The pedestrian and cycle infrastructure included at the site should be more extensive and contiguous than is shown in this Local Plan's illustrative layout. Bus route provision must be provided.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 c	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	153	Supporting	It is recommended that the following site be considered which is in the draft Local Plan: Herne Bay Site -Land at Hillborough, Herne Bay -1000 dwellings	
Policy SP3 c	769850	Ms Jean White		176	Objecting	Concerned about is losing the identity between the areas Greenhill/Herne/Hillborough/Broomfield. How can you envisage these large developments before a reservoir is built! What consideration has been given to schools which are already oversubscribed. What support would new shops recieve? If people wanted to come to Herne Bay why hasn't the area by Homebase been developed? Where are the jobs, can new residents commute?	Thanet is one of the most deprived areas, so only London would offer job prospects. Please give more thought to ruining to area.
Policy SP3 c	775396	Mrs Rachel Blair		456	Objecting	Objects to additional houses because there are no schools mentioned and the current Herne School is full, there is a lack of new roads and Herne is already a bottleneck for traffic, School Lane is too narrow to take additional traffic, the widening of Bullockstone Road will be inadequate and the area will lose its identity becoming one huge housing estate.	
Policy SP3 c	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1245	Objecting	The Council does appreciate the positives associated with new housing as this will enliven the area and meet future housing needs, but there are many negatives. Development at these strategic sites will result in an increase in traffic volume for both the A28 and the Sturry/Broad Oak area north of Sturry Crossing. Further traffic congestion leads to an additional increase in air pollution, which affects residents (incl lung cancer) and wildlife (RAMSAR/SSSI).	All five strategic sites converge on the A28 and the Sturry level crossing. It is important that incentives for motorists to use the new roads be put into place.
Policy SP3 c	777483	Mrs E E Kenward		1435	Objecting	Concerning the proposal to build 1,000 properties on the former Golf Course, Strode Farm, Greenhill and Hillborough. I have concerns regarding transport facilities, schools and affordable housing and doctors, dentist and hospitals being overstretched.	
Policy SP3 c	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1732	Objecting	Site 3 (SP3c) requires the delivery of significant new road infrastructure, the funding and delivery of which is uncertain given the current economic climate, land ownership issues and lack of available public funding. The significant reliance that the Local Plan strategy places on delivery of this site within the Plan period is unsound and not consistent with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (especially at para 47-55, 157 and 173 - 177).	Include under Policy SP3 the allocation of an additional Strategic Site at Bodkin Farm, Chesterfield, Whitstable (as per the site details provided under our representation to Policy SP3a).
Policy SP3 c	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1710	Objecting	Any and all Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL, aka S106 Developer Contributions) raised in Herne Bay must be spent in Herne Bay. In the unlikely event that CIL revenue exceeds Herne Bay's needs - we do have a Pier to build, after all - the money should retained for future Herne Bay requirements.	CIL raised in Herne Bay must be spent in Herne Bay.
Policy SP3 c	778228	Mrs Ann Blatherwick		1869	Supporting	Should further housing have to be included in the locality a greatly reduced development at Hillborough would be more acceptable	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 c	778402	Mr Mark Hunter		2234	Objecting	I object to the proposal for local intense development at Hillborough. My objection is simply based on the excessive destruction of our countryside. I would beg you to stop these high density developments and consider better use of the existing spaces in our towns and villages, not to mention the use of brownfield sites and the refurbishment or demolition of buildings currently in poor states of repair.	
Policy SP3 c	778664	Mrs Kathleen Harrington		2275	Objecting	I would like to submit my concerns and objections to the proposed development to Herne and Broomfield. The amount of traffic that it will generate through Herne will increase to unacceptable levels. Where will all these new residents find jobs ?. Schools, Doctor's surgeries, dentists and hospitals are already overstretched. Loss of countryside. Please, Please, reduce this development and protect the village of Herne.	
Policy SP3 c	778711	Mr Simon Dyson		2288	Objecting	Concerns over proposal to build 1,000s of new houses in and around the Herne village. I believe the Council has not given anything like enough consideration to just how much extra traffic will be added to the A291 should the new housing plans go ahead. Concerns over additional schools places required and employment for the buyers of the new houses.	
Policy SP3 c	778763	G E & B P Clifton		2260	Supporting	I object strongly to the proposed development of thousands of houses etc next to Herne and Broomfield. The local roads could not cope with the increased traffic, the sewers can't cope, water shortage at times of drought, local schools - 30 plus in classes! Doctors full.	
Policy SP3 c	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2396	Objecting	There is no mention of provision of open space; no mention of provision of additional public transport facilities; no mention of provision of walking and cycling routes.	
Policy SP3 c	773048	Mrs J Moran		2634	Objecting	The proposals to develop more areas in Herne and Herne Bay along with the proposed sites in Sturry Parish, will put a considerable strain on all the local infrastructure, but a road bypassing Sturry and joining the A28 as suggested, will not solve the City Councils traffic problems. Will the utility services, schools, medical and other services be able to cope?	
Policy SP3 c	778771	P Kelk		2324	Objecting	Increase noise and traffic pollution due to huge volume of traffic that will come from the village of Herne and Herne Bay developments that you say must come towards Canterbury and come through Broad Oak. You must find other routes on the Thanet Way to take that traffic not bring it towards Sturry and Broad Oak.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 c	778852	Mr John Pye		2405	Objecting	I object to the proposed development planned for Herne and Broomfield. The objections I have are as follows. Herne will lose its identity as a village and won't have the "green gap" any longer. The volume of traffic will increase greatly. The proposals for Bullockstone Road and Sturry Crossing are unclear. Infrastructure doesn't appear to have been given any thought, with extra housing comes the requirement for improved sewerage, schools, doctors, transport and all the other amenities required.	
Policy SP3 c	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2725	Objecting	The housing provision in Herne and Broomfield and surrounds is excessive. All of the sites will impact on Herne Village, roads, schools, shops, environment. Concerned about road improvements, compulsory purchase, the by-pass being fit for purpose and funding availability. Few jobs will be provided where people live so car use will be high. Hillborough is too large results in loss of agricultural land. Reduce numbers to 500.	The amount of development we feel should be reduced by 50% from 1000 dwellings to 500
Policy SP3 c	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2622	Objecting	The proposed strategic allocations are all dependent upon significant strategic infrastructure. However, neither the Local Plan nor its evidence base demonstrates that these sites are economically viable and can deliver not only dwelling completions but the necessary essential strategic infrastructure.	Allocate land at New Thanington
Policy SP3 c	779129	J Robinson		2661	Objecting	Whilst appreciating the need for additional housing in the Canterbury and District area, I am alarmed at the proposals for the large number of properties to be built in the Herne and Herne Bay areas. The present infrastructure is inadequate for the current population. The road system could not possibly cope with the additional traffic.	
Policy SP3 c	779130	Mrs D Phippard		2717	Objecting	Raised concerns about a sewage spill. Objects to the huge housing developments in Herne Bay, Herne Village, Bullockstone Rd, Greenhill, Strode Farm and the golf club, because: some are on flood plain; no plans for sewage, the system is under strain now; planners should create a new village further inland with enough space for services, include Sturry or Canterbury.	create a new village further inland with enough space for services, at Sturry or Canterbury.
Policy SP3 c	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2916	Supporting	The inclusion of Land South of Hillborough is strongly supported.	Site 3 at Hillborough has the capacity to provide some additional residential development in the event of non-delivery elsewhere. Kitewood would advocate that this higher level of allocation should be provided for in the Plan, with an acknowledgement that delivery above 1000 units on the site, would be subject to under or late delivery on other strategic allocations.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 c	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3023	Objecting	We welcome the extensive areas of open space that appear to be present within the indicative masterplan. This will provide alternative opportunities to recreate, providing a significant amount of the space is natural or semi natural habitat. Concened about recreational pressure on Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay (potentially severe individual and in-combination impact - Canterbury, Dover and Thanet housing in close proximity), Blean Complex SAC and East Blean Woods SSSI (in-combination impacts).	We would recommend that within the site specific policy the quantum of natural open space to be delivered as part of the development is specified to ensure adequate on-site mitigation is provided. To ensure that the integrity ofthe Thanet Caost and Sandwich Baysite is not compromised there is a need to collect visitor and disturbance data in relation to existing pressure and formulate a Strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy to ensure visitor control is adequate within the SPA and sufficient natural open space is available to detract visitors from using the coast for dog walking. Blean Complex SAC and East Blean Woods SSSI will also require a Strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy.
Policy SP3 c	779334	Loraine & Robert Gardiner		2875	Objecting	Object to development proposals at Hillborough. It would merge Herne with Herne Bay and lose its identity; there are already not enough school places to meet demand - this would only get worse; it would become more difficult to see a doctor; and traffic would increase significantly. Herne should be left as a village, the village does not have the amenities to sustain the level of development proposed.	
Policy SP3 c	779564	Mr J Tinker		2905	Objecting	I am against the use of all of proposed site 3 (Hillborough) as this is prime agricultural land and we need this for food production to ensure that we are not dependent on imports in the future (Kent is supposed to be the Garden of England). Other sites of lesser agricultural quality eg E of Seasalter lane, Herne Bay Road, around Broad Oak and Chartham. Concerned at impact on water pressure which is already low in this area.	
Policy SP3 c	779590	Mr Trevor Davis		2890	Objecting	Objects to the large developments at the: golf course, Strode Farm and Hillborough. Keep Herne and Herne Bay separate as we do not want to be a suburb. The roads are busy and accidents happen often at the junction of Bullockstone and Canterbury Rds and near Herne Grove Farmhouse. M cars will make this worse.	
Policy SP3 c	780330	Mr Nigel Unknown		2893	Objecting	Objects to large developments next to Herne & Broomfield. Necessary infrastructure improvements will not be completed in time to avoid disruption. Beltinge Road is nearly impassable near the local shops. It will spoil the rural character of the coastal resorts which could bring economic benefit to the community and will be a blot on the landscape.	
Policy SP3 c	777509	Mrs Monica Blyth		3153	Objecting	The Hillborough site should be reduced by at least 50%,	The Hillborough site should be reduced by at least 50%,

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 c	779276	Ms Susan Harvey		3197	Objecting	Object to development proposals in the Herne and Bloomfield area. Concerned that the large amounts of housing would overstretch the existing infrastructure; increase traffic and congestion; extend waiting times for doctors and dentists; increase competition for school places; exacerbate water supply and drainage issues; and result in the loss of green space. Many houses in the area are empty and unsold, as mortgages are difficult to get and prices are often unaffordable for local residents.	
Policy SP3 c	779287	Ms Daphne Jenness		3207	Objecting	Object to the development proposals next to Herne and Broomfield. Concerned about the increased traffic through Herne (esp. if the bypass take a long time to deliver); employment opportunities; attracting businesses to fill the new industrial units; and infrastructure issues such as school places, water supply and flooding etc. Herne should retain its identity as a village .	
Policy SP3 c	779163	Sarah Nops		3317	Objecting	Objection to Hillborough Is this amount of development really necessary? Sufficient work on forecasts; insufficient business development for the proposed allocation of homes; too much pressure has been put on Herne by the surrounding development; increase in traffic; insufficient information on road improvements eg Bullockstone; No plans for infrastructure; lack of info from Highways Dept; no info on ration of affordable versus luxury housing; difficult to find info on proposals on CCC website	
Policy SP3 c	779317	Edward & Moria Hughes		3289	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Hillborough. Concerns raised about; the use of greenfield, agricultural land; the lack of industry / employment opportunities; whether the existing water supply / drainage infrastructure can cope; and anti-social behaviour and crime. There have been several new developments in the area in recent years (some still unfinished) which have already put increased strain on local schools, doctors; and roads.	
Policy SP3 c	779602	Mr J Abernethy		3339	Objecting	I am writing this in order to voice my concerns over the proposed building of new homes in our district, notably around the Herne Bay/Herne/Broomfield areas. Not only will the community spirit erode but the current infrastructure cannot sustain such large scale changes. Rather than building large expanses of new homes, more must be done to improve, modernise and rejuvenate the more urban areas of our communities and those which we live side by side with.	Rather than building large expanses of new homes, more must be done to improve, modernise and rejuvenate the more urban areas of our communities and those which we live side by side with.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 c	779603	Mrs S Abernethy		3336	Objecting	I am writing this in order to voice my concerns over the proposed building of new homes in our district, notably around the Herne Bay/Herne/Broomfield areas. Not only will the community spirit erode but the current infrastructure cannot sustain such large scale changes. Rather than building large expanses of new homes, more must be done to improve, modernise and rejuvenate the more urban areas of our communities and those which we live side by side with.	
Policy SP3 c	779912	Eileen & Danny Dwyer		3246	Objecting	Object to the development of land at Hillborough.	We are not happy with the proposed development and urge the Council to reject the proposal before it is too late.
Policy SP3 c	779914	David & Ann Bowley		3494	Objecting	The local plan will mean the end of village life in Herne. Lower Herne Rd is subject to flooding, extra houses etc will mean surplus rainwater and less space for natural soakage. Herne Bay does not have the industry to accommodate a large workforce. A super road will increase congestion. Local schools are already full. Doctors and dentist services would be out of control. Reconsider plan.	
Policy SP3 c	779918	Mr Brian Root		3493	Objecting	The local plan states that green gaps should be retained between villages and towns. Herne existed long before Herne Bay so 1000's of houses will be contrary to this. Where is the infrastructure? Roads, public transport, doctors, carers, dentists, police and schools are already overstretched. New residents will exacerbate the high unemployment problem. Object to proposed development, leave Herne as it is.	
Policy SP3 c	780005	K Seed		3369	Objecting	Objects to Hillborough. Numbers too high and would change the character of Herne village become a conurbation putting extra pressure on resources, roads and transport systems, schools health services. No infrastructure delivery plan or traffic figures which is not very reassuring. No costs of new infrastructure- viable? what happens if developer cannot pay. Existing flooding problems will worsen. Impact on conservation area. Do new homes create new jobs? Cost of new homes beyond locals.	
Policy SP3 c	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3233	Objecting	The RSPB is concerned about the following strategic allocation: Hilborough, Herne Bay Strategic housing development for 1,000 residential units. This site lies approximately 0.5km from Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SSSI/SPA/Ramsar site. As acknowledged in the screening of HRA, increased urbanisation associated with residential development is likely to lead to recreational activity on or adjacent to European sites and disturbance impacts.	This should be fully assessed as part of an AA in relation to these sites.
Policy SP3 c	780803	Mr & Mrs T Coleman		3484	Objecting	We wish to register our objection to the proposals to build vast amounts of housing etc in the area of Herne and Herne Bay.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 c	780809	Mr J F Day		3512	Objecting	The development will generate extra traffic and there is no indication of when road improvements will be done. Bullockstone Rd improvements are unclear and costly with little money available. Concerns about flooding, water supply, sewage, school places, doctors. Hillborough traffic will come via Altira and Blacksole roundabouts causing congestion. Heart in Hand Rd will have to be improved. Some development needed but this is too much.	The numbers should be reduced significantly.
Policy SP3 c	755187	Mrs M E Pottinger		3551	Objecting	Objects to development in and around Herne because: changing the character of the villages via population increase of 1/3; new houses have not been taken up on Talmead; no green buffer zones; will not create new jobs; increased traffic; traffic plan not sound, Bullockstone Rd will be dangerous as will other proposed exits from new developments; schools in wrong places and won't be built; loss of farming land; lack of open spaces provided for.	
Policy SP3 c	780300	R & J Fullford		3554	Objecting	Protests in the strongest terms. The development will destroy the village environment. Concerned about: local schools are at capacity where are the additional children to be educated; traffic chaos; water supplies; flooding at Stode Farm, inadequate sewers and raw sewage flooding, local doctors surgeries at capacity. If development is necessary then it needs to be significantly reduced to be acceptable.	If development is necessary then it needs to be significantly reduced to be acceptable.
Policy SP3 c	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3537	Objecting	I wish to object to the proposals for Hillborough, it will erode the Green Gap between Herne Bay and Broomfield and be detrimental for both Herne and Broomfield.	
Policy SP3 c	780976	Mr Malcolm White		4275	Objecting	It is unreasonable in the extreme to continue to expand the east side of Herne Bay and the immediate area around the junction of the A291 with the south side of Herne Bay in particular. Herne itself had its street plan laid down before the advent of motorised transport. There has been recent road building elsewhere in Kent, but very little in Canterbury District. The New Thanet Way is a mixed blessing, but restricts access to two exits southwards, one through Herne.	The only passport to further expansion in East Herne Bay is a relief road for Herne. See Plan. This route for a Herne Relief Road would allow Home Farm to survive, would allow some housing within the curve of the new road and Lower Herne Road, would be a good way from the Hamlet of Bullockstone and be a better arrangement for traffic, with less impact. I therefore submit that the housing developments are deferred until the plight of Herne is addressed.
Policy SP3 c	406328	Mr Daniel Smith		4525	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Herne Bay because the area has already been significantly damaged by excessive building. The town needs focused employment opportunities via improved transport links to London and the development of sites in the town centre that are under-used or unused.	
Policy SP3 c	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4446	Objecting	Object to Hillborough Site, because: site is too large and makes extravagant use of undeveloped land; loss of high quality agricultural land, against NPPF and impacting on food security; costly new infrastructure, at £20000/house making site unviable and undeliverable, significant traffic generation. Locate 300 houses at rear of Highfields Avenue, Churchill Avenue and Osborne Gardens	Locate 300 houses at rear of Highfields Avenue, Churchill Avenue and Osborne Gardens

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 c	781164	Miss Susanne Stebbing		4313	Objecting	I am writing to comment on the Local Plan and object to anymore major developments in the Hillborough/Beltinge Area on Greenfield sites or farmland. This area is already overdeveloped and it would have bad effect on wildlife and traffic problems already overstretched. The government is hell bent on building extensive amount of houses without proper environmental consideration and infrastructure and bad planning with immigration	
Policy SP3 c	781240	Mr & Mrs Mark Kim Kirby		4336	Objecting	I am concerned about these developments as i feel it will change the village of Herne, generate an increase amount of traffic and have a large impact on local services ie doctors and school places. Although i understand housing is needed the amount proposed are too high for Herne & Broomfield. Another concern is the road improvements that will be needed. I would appreciate that our comments can be noted.	
Policy SP3 c	781019	Mr & Mrs B Morgan		4613	Objecting	Object to amount of housing currently propsoed for Herne Bay. Developments will cause huge problems presure on nursery school places, doctor surgeries. herne will lose its village status and join it with other communities. create further traffic problems.	
Policy SP3 c	781038	Mr T J Fallon		4647	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Hillborough because it would result in the village of Herne losing its identity, the existing infrastructure can barely serve the needs of the existing community, and it would lead to an increase in traffic and noise pollution in the Bullockstone Road area.	
Policy SP3 c	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4734	Objecting	No direct impact on designated sites. The impact of the development on the Thanet Coast SSSIs needs to be assessed and considered. The site is grade 2/3 Agricultural Land - this loss must be justified in terms of need and alternatives.	
Policy SP3 c	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4889	Objecting	The strategic development site in Herne Bay are to share the costs of a relief road. Locking these sites together, to fund such a scheme, regardless of their individual situation seems complex and high risk.	
Policy SP3 c	784123	A E Estates Developers		5082	Objecting	Support the site at Hillborough. However we set out our disagreement with the Site Assessment that Highfield Avenue and Chartwell Avenue are not suitable for additional traffic. The site can therefore be developed independently from the strategic site - it is not dependent upon strategic infrastructure and will help ensure good land supply. Open space should be proportionate to the extent of the site that is to be developed and the brief should specify no 'ransom strips' between ownerships.	Acknowledge that part of the site can be developed independently. Open space should be proportionate to the extent of the site that is to be developed and the brief should specify no 'ransom strips' between ownerships.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 c	784123	A E Estates Developers		5078	Supporting	We support the principle of allocation of the representation site for residential development as part of Strategic Site 3 - Hillborough - under policy SP3 (this site forms part of Hillbough site). Should the strategy of the plan be changed, and the strategic Hillborough site no longer be proposed for development, the representation site can remain as an independent allocation under Policy HD1 and on the Proposals Map.	
Policy SP3 c	781721	Ms Lynne Broadbent		5177	Objecting	The draft Local Plan needs to be far more balanced in terms of the number and location of new houses i.e. access to services, more specific in terms of business and employment opportunities and much clearer in terms of addressing existing traffic and infrastructure issues.	
Policy SP3 c	781738	Anne & Francis Entwistle		5163	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for 3000 new houses in and around the Herne and Herne Bay area. Concerned that the village of Herne will lose its identity and community, the existing infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional demands; as well as cause environmental destruction on a huge scale.	
Policy SP3 c	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5355	Objecting	Request 3 amendments to policy SP3a. Site survey identified insufficient sewerage capacity in the network to accommodate increased demand. Development should connect instead to the nearest point of capacity. Sewerage infrastructure crosses the site. Development layout should ensure this is not built on and a 6-13m easement. Diversions at the developers cost. Ensure an adequate separation from wastewater works and odours (NPPF 109). Amend as outlined	Add to the 'Infrastructure' section of policy SP3c: The development must provide a connection to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by Southern Water. Add the following to the 'Other' section of policy SP3c: Development proposals must ensure future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes. Add the following to the 'Other' section of policy SP3c: There must be adequate separation between Canterbury wastewater treatment works and the development to allow odour dispersion.
Policy SP3 c	784623	Sheila Tapsell		5483	Objecting	Disapproves of the large amount of proposed development around Herne and Broomfield. The strong village identity will merge into Herne Bay. It will make traffic issues worse. Developers will have to pay for road improvements before the development is built. What if money runs out? More development would have to mean a new school, Herne Bay High is packed to capacity.	
Policy SP3 c	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5895	Objecting	Paragraphs 1.57 to 1.61 indicate a total target of 15,600 dwellings over the Local Plan period. However, while reference is made to one primary school (for Site 1 South Canterbury) and variously to the provision of "community facilities" it should be clear that this level of residential development will require significant additional schools. This needs to be explicitly acknowledged, particularly in regard to the allocation of potential sites and the funding with which to provide them.	it should be clear that this level of residential development will require significant additional schools. This needs to be explicitly acknowledged, particularly in regard to the allocation of potential sites and the funding with which to provide them.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 c	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6014	Objecting	Hillborough site: Positives: including benefits of Herne by-pass, employment floor space, speciefied amenities and facilities, funding for infrastructure changes. Uncertainties: including sufficient funding for infrastructure, delivery of jobs close to the houses, meeting the needs of local communities. Negatives: the strength of local feeling, increased traffic on the A291/A28 in Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 d	766613	Mrs G Clifton		5	Objecting	Totally opposed to the building of an estate of housing and shops on farmland, plus on a golf course at Herne. There is not capacity on the local road, the local primary school if full, the doctors surgeries are booked up, the water supply in this area is critical and there is precious wildlife in this area.	Reconsider the proposal
Policy SP3 d	766236	Ms Liane Farrier		28	Objecting	Object to development at Herne Bay Golf Club. Any new development would need 2 new schools, doctors and dentist, the local area is already struggling to cope. The whole area needs jobs created before development is allowed, the proposal will not eliminate the traffic problem in Herne and will increase volume, pollution, noise and accidents. Herne and HB would make one large urban sprawl, there are protected species and the area is regularly flooded. There is a need for leisure space.	Concentrate on the development of Canterbury, with more affordable properties built in Canterbury maybe it would help the gridlock situation as people could walk to school and work. They have also got the resources such as schools to cope with the numbers.
Policy SP3 d	769177	Mrs Helen Langridge		63	Objecting	Why is some of this land being given to Herne Bay High School where we are in great need for a coastal Grammar School or perhaps a satellite Grammar school as is being suggested elsewhere in the county - the Weald of Kent Grammar School, Tonbridge for Sevenoaks.	A new Grammar School or satellite on this site to allow coastal children to go to a local grammar school
Policy SP3 d	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		75	Objecting	No mention of public transport provision	
Policy SP3 d	14082	Mr George Johnson		218	Objecting	Too many houses proposed in Herne Bay and not enough infrastructure. It will cause problems.	Much less housing of high quality which will be unsuitable for the rental sector.
Policy SP3 d	268778	Mrs Janet Hall		170	Objecting	We do not need any more supermarkets so why can't the old golf course include a much needed Health Centre and the much talked about Grammar School.	
Policy SP3 d	761820	Ms Ann Gibbs		450	Supporting	Supports the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		337	Objecting	This land allocation should also fund additional cycle and pedestrian infrastructure as detailed. This includes a crash remedial measure which was deferred in 2009 due to a funding shortfall.	Provision of additional cycle and pedestrian infrastructure as detailed on in my answer to Q2 and on the attached annotated map.
Policy SP3 d	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	152	Supporting	It is recommended that the following sites be considered which are in the draft Local Plan:Herne Bay Site - Land at Herne Bay Golf Club, Herne Bay-400 dwellings	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	769850	Ms Jean White		177	Objecting	Concerned about is losing the identity between the areas Greenhill/Herne/Hillborough/Broomfield. How can you envisage these large developments before a reservoir is built! What consideration has been given to schools which are already oversubscribed. What support would new shops recieve? If people wanted to come to Herne Bay why hasn't the area by Homebase been developed? Where are the jobs, can new residents commute?	Thanet is one of the most deprived areas, so only London would offer job prospects. Please give more thought to ruining to area.
Policy SP3 d	772459	Mr & Mrs Pete and Joan Mayhew		222	Objecting	Development of Herne Bay Gold Club and Strode Farm will merge the village of Herne and the town of Herne Bay destroying the rural environment enjoyed by residents.	
Policy SP3 d	772443	Mrs Jillian Johnson		260	Objecting	Too many houses proposed for the Bullockstone Road area. Insufficient amenities. Ensure affordable housing is above the benefits cap.	Affordable housing should be of a high quality, at least three bedrooms and have a good garden; so as to obtain a rental value over the benefits cap. Preferably houses unsuitable for the rental sector.
Policy SP3 d	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		279	Objecting	Sites 4 and 5 should not be considered separately as they are either side of the same road. The area has a parkland character and gives a visually attractive approach to a historic village which has already been over-developed.	Removal of this site
Policy SP3 d	775242	Ms Sue Toye		448	Supporting	Supports the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. The development will provide jobs and opportunities.	
Policy SP3 d	775384	Ms Louise Tucker		449	Supporting	Supports the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will provide provide needed employment, housing, shopping, education and sports facilities.	
Policy SP3 d	775390	Ms Diana High		451	Supporting	Supports the allocation of Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring needed sporting facilities, housing and jobs.	
Policy SP3 d	775393	Mrs Anja Stileman		455	Supporting	Supports allocation of Herne Bay Golf Club. The facilities (school, sports, housing) will bring massive community benefits.	
Policy SP3 d	775396	Mrs Rachel Blair		457	Objecting	Objects to additional houses because there are no schools mentioned and the current Herne School is full, there is a lack of new roads and Herne is already a bottleneck for traffic, School Lane is too narrow to take additional traffic, the widening of Bullockstone Road will be inadequate and the area will lose its identity becoming one huge housing estate.	
Policy SP3 d	776288	Mr Graham Miles		547	Supporting	Supports re development of Herne Bay Golf Club. The sports hub and housing will, create employment and provide needed sports facilities.	
Policy SP3 d	776298	J R Keates		575	Supporting	Has no exceptions to new housing being developed at Herne Bay Golf Club but is concerned about accesses and roads.	
Policy SP3 d	776608	Mr Martyn Sexton		600	Supporting	Supports development proposals for land at Herne Bay Golf Club.	
Policy SP3 d	776759	Mr Sullivan Forwood	Director Survey Design Services	613	Supporting	Supports development of residential, sports & superstore at Herne Bay golf club. The jobs are needed, sporting activities will help youngsters, bring, games & tournaments and revenue for local businesses.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	776761	Ms Karen Sexton		616	Supporting	Supports allocation of Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring sporting facilities which will benefit people as well as children from the local football club. It will bring jobs to the local community.	
Policy SP3 d	776763	Mr Nigel Cripps		617	Supporting	Supports allocation of Herne Bay Golf Club. It will provide sporting facilities, quality housing in a sustainable location and provide jobs.	
Policy SP3 d	776764	Ms Anne Cripps		618	Supporting	Supports allocation of Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring sporting facilities.	
Policy SP3 d	776825	Mr Dennis Rampley		614	Objecting	1. Rear of 28 Lower Herne Road. In the 1960s Herne Bay UDC wanted the money up front for a pumping station due to localised flooding. 2. On my side the water goes into the ditch alongside the Public Right of Way (PROW) which then goes right the way to underneath the coastal road as far as Eddington Lane which could cause sinkage of the coastal road and traffic disaster. 3 The PROW has not been considered. What is going to happen? 4 The contract should be scrutinised by the public auditor.	
Policy SP3 d	776852	Mr David Ralph		625	Supporting	Supports development proposals for land at Herne Bay Golf Club.	
Policy SP3 d	777182	C Nash		693	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	777185	Ms Anna unknown		694	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	777189	Ms Caroline Packer		695	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The scheme will bring massive community benefits to the people of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	777191	Mr Barry Sallis		706	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. This site will provide well needed high quality housing to the area and also bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	777231	Mrs Kathleen Moore		795	Objecting	Objects to development proposals at Herne Bay Golf Club.	Allocate housing along the A299 out to Sturry.
Policy SP3 d	777244	Mr Michael Smith		708	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	777249	Janet & David Horton		709	Supporting	We would like to offer our support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208, because the site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay and surrounding communities.	
Policy SP3 d	777256	Mr Ian Cooke		710	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	777270	Mrs Dawn McLean		712	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	777303	Ms Pauline Pierce		720	Supporting	I should like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club. Planning ref. SHLAA/208 I believe it will be of huge benefit to the community and play an important part in the regeneration of Herne Bay It will give an opportunity for the much needed creation of jobs and housing and also provide the added benefit of improved sporting facilities.	
Policy SP3 d	777408	Miss Linda Hill		729	Objecting	Herne does not need a new Tesco, a sports hub, a doctors'surgery or a care home or dwellings. We are a village not a town. The residents in Bullockstone Road will be inconvenienced if the village is given a relief road, as much as we could do with one to avoid the village centre.	Do not build on the Herne Bay golf club site
Policy SP3 d	777233	E V Moore		797	Objecting	Objects to development proposals in the Herne vicinity [Herne Bay Golf Club and Strode Farm). Concerned about infrastructure provision i.e. roads, sewers, utilities etc.	
Policy SP3 d	777306	Miss Claire Sears		825	Supporting	Supports allocation of Herne Bay Golf Club. It will provide jobs and opportunities to the local area.	
Policy SP3 d	777308	Mr Daniel Walker		827	Supporting	Supports allocation of Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community.	
Policy SP3 d	777386	Ms Sarah Pout		822	Supporting	I should like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. This scheme will bring massive community benefits to the people of Herne Bay and excellent much needed sporting facilities not just for Herne Bay but for the surrounding area.	
Policy SP3 d	777389	Mrs Sharon James		826	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	777515	Mr Paul Spratt		979	Supporting	Supports allocation of Herne Bay Golf Club. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay, that will benefit the youth of the area.	
Policy SP3 d	777577	Ms Carol Frost		852	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	777579	Mr John Frost		855	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	777687	Ms Christine Hanson		856	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf club: reference SHLAA/208.The site will bring excellent sporting facilities and community benefits to the people of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	777706	Ms Suzanne Davies		859	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay and I am interested in the possibility of school satellite being incorporated.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	778049	Ms Emma-Louise Chamberlain		1031	Supporting	Support for development proposals at Herne Bay Golf Club.	
Policy SP3 d	778050	Mrs H Lowry		1032	Supporting	Support for development proposals at Herne Bay Golf Club.	
Policy SP3 d	778053	Mr S Lowry		1033	Supporting	Support for development proposals at Herne Bay Golf Club.	
Policy SP3 d	778041	Mrs Rani Ulyett		1167	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club (SHLAA/208) as the site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	778068	Ms Hayley Parpworth		1145	Supporting	Support for development proposals at Herne Bay Golf Club.	
Policy SP3 d	778070	Mr Robert Jack		1143	Supporting	Support for development proposals at Herne Bay Golf Club.	
Policy SP3 d	778072	Mr Ross Pressnell		1142	Supporting	Support for development proposals at Herne Bay Golf Club.	
Policy SP3 d	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1246	Objecting	The Council does appreciate the positives associated with new housing as this will enliven the area and meet future housing needs, but there are many negatives. Development at these strategic sites will result in an increase in traffic volume for both the A28 and the Sturry/Broad Oak area north of Sturry Crossing. Further traffic congestion leads to an additional increase in air pollution, which affects residents (incl lung cancer) and wildlife (RAMSAR/SSSI).	All five strategic sites converge on the A28 and the Sturry level crossing. It is important that incentives for motorists to use the new roads be put into place.
Policy SP3 d	778046	Mr Andrew Chamberlain		1238	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay and The development will provide jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay which I think is vital for the Town's future.	
Policy SP3 d	778582	Mr Laurence Muston		1326	Objecting	The development of all of these extra houses would put a strain on the infrastructure of Herne and would contribute to the destruction of Herne as a separate village	Reduce the number of houses planned for the site. Also a proper plan for the infrastructure is needed so that Herne is bypassed.
Policy SP3 d	776825	Mr Dennis Rampley		1362	Objecting	The contactors who are presumably going to start the work may not have sufficient funds to complete the exercise and therefore they should be aware of the Insolvency Act 1986 of disqualification for 15 years as directors. I would like to see indemnity that was required that was requested by Herne Bay Urban District Council to satisfy the residents that the work would be completed.	
Policy SP3 d	777483	Mrs E E Kenward		1436	Objecting	Concerning the proposal to build 1,000 properties on the former Golf Course, Strode Farm, Greenhill and Hillborough. I have concerns regarding transport facilities, schools and affordable housing. Also doctors, dentists and hospitals being overstretched.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	778179	Mr D Cowell		1499	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at herne bay golf club SHLAA/208. The site would be excellent facilities to the community of the herne bay.	
Policy SP3 d	778180	Mrs A Waldron		1500	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at herne bay golf club SHLAA/208. The site would be excellent facilities to the community of the herne bay.	
Policy SP3 d	778181	Mr R Waldron		1501	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at herne bay golf club SHLAA/208. The site would be excellent facilities to the community of the herne bay also the development will provide jobs and opprtunities to local area which required for regeneration of herne bay.	
Policy SP3 d	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1733	Objecting	Site 4 (SP3d) will result in the loss of recreational open space and requires new transport infrastructure on third party land, the funding and delivery of which is uncertain given the current economic climate, land ownership issues and lack of available public funding. The significant reliance that the Local Plan strategy places on delivery of this site within the Plan period is unsound.	Include under Policy SP3 the allocation of an additional Strategic Site at Bodkin Farm, Chesterfield, Whitstable (as per the site details provided under our representation to Policy SP3a).
Policy SP3 d	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1709	Objecting	Any and all Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL, aka S106 Developer Contributions) raised in Herne Bay must be spent in Herne Bay. In the unlikely event that CIL revenue exceeds Herne Bay's needs - we do have a Pier to build, after all - the money should retained for future Herne Bay requirements.	CIL raised in Herne Bay must be spent in Herne Bay.
Policy SP3 d	778188	Mr L Whittington		1531	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay and much needed jobs for local people.	
Policy SP3 d	778375	Mr Alan McManus		1580	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club. The site will bring excellent sporting facillites to the community of Herne Bay. The development will also provide jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of the town.	
Policy SP3 d	778533	Karen & Robbie Douglas		1646	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208.The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	778210	A F Dilnot		1854	Objecting	The access road from the Golf Course site will be dangerous and cause congestion back onto the roundabout at Eddington which is already very busy at peak times, also there have been several bad accidents at the existing junction from the housing estate that exists, don't make it more dangerous, this would be made even worse if the sports facilities were built and the construction of a school.	
Policy SP3 d	778228	Mrs Ann Blatherwick		1871	Supporting	I consider that the development of the former golf club would be acceptable	
Policy SP3 d	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1900	Objecting	Too much development planned for Herne Bay. Any development money should improve Herne Bay, not Canterbury.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	778644	Mrs Dawn Beckett		1660	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	778645	Mr Nigel Wright		1661	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring superb sporting facilities to the area, which will prove a valuable resource, especially for the younger members of our community.	
Policy SP3 d	778939	Mr Brian Underhill		1644	Supporting	As a resident of Herne Bay I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	778402	Mr Mark Hunter		2130	Objecting	I object to the planned developments in the draft local plan for the Canterbury district. My objection is prompted by the proposal for local intense development of the former golf course. I would beg you to stop these high density developments and consider better use of the existing spaces in our towns and villages, not to mention the use of brownfield sites and the refurbishment or demolition of buildings currently in poor states of repair.	
Policy SP3 d	778669	Mrs C Clark		2178	Supporting	We support the proposal on the former site of Herne Bay Golf Club. It will provide much needed housing and job opportunities for people and also teh idea of having a sports hub is fantastic as it is line with Governments plans to get children healthy.	
Policy SP3 d	778075	Mr Mike Shaw		2197	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of land at Herne Bay Golf Club Ref SHLAA/208. This site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay & Surrounding areas.	
Policy SP3 d	778078	Ms Tara Sutton		2205	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208.The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	778648	Sharon & Stephen Sayers		2270	Objecting	With the proposed development on the Golf Course there are serious issues relating to Water supply, Jobs, Infrastucture, Wildlife and Environment, Qulaity of Life and Open spaces.	
Policy SP3 d	778655	Ms Nikki Ward		2272	Objecting	I strongly object the large development being proposed at Herne bay Golf club, wildlife effected especially. Also will there be enough employment locally for new residents of these estates? There will be an impact on infrastructure - roads/traffic/schooling/utilities nad noise/air pollution/ traffic etc will be increased. There will be a loss of 'open space nad overall impacts on people's quality of life.	
Policy SP3 d	778664	Mrs Kathleen Harrington		2278	Objecting	I would like to submit my concerns and objections to the proposed development to Herne and Broomfield.The amount of traffic that it will generate through Herne will increase to unacceptable levels.Where will all these new residents find jobs ?.Schools, Doctor's surgeries, dentists and hospitals are already overstretched. Loss of countryside.Please, Please, reduce this development and protect the village of Herne.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	778711	Mr Simon Dyson		2292	Objecting	I have concerns over proposal to build 1,000s of new houses in and around the Herne village. The Council has not given anything like enough consideration to just how much extra traffic will be added to the A291, any housing development at Herne Golf Club would greatly increase the traffic levels and so add to an already existing problem. Also concerns over school places nad employment for people in the new houses.	
Policy SP3 d	778750	Mrs E Sharpe		2308	Objecting	I wish to express my deep concern over the plans for the large development proposed for the Golf Course.I cannot see that the proposals will adequately ensure the necessary infrastructure of drainage, sewerage, and water supplied etc. Schools, surgeries etc would need to be vastly increased to cope with the numbers proposed.	
Policy SP3 d	778763	G E & B P Clifton		2261	Objecting	I object strongly to the proposed development of thousands of houses etc next to Herne and Broomfield. The local roads could not cope with the increased traffic, the sewers can't cope, water shortage at times of drought, local schools - 30 plus in classes! Doctors full.	
Policy SP3 d	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2397	Objecting	No mention of public transport provision	
Policy SP3 d	773048	Mrs J Moran		2635	Objecting	The proposals to develop more areas in Herne and Herne Bay along with the proposed sites in Sturry Parish, will put a considerable strain on all the local infrastructure, but a road bypassing Sturry and joining the A28 as suggested, will not solve the City Councils traffic problems. Will the utility services, schools, medical and other services be able to cope?	
Policy SP3 d	778759	Mr G D Quinton		2329	Objecting	I oppose the Golf Course scheme.800 houses will generate at least 1,200 cars to add to the chaos and to funnel more into Eddington, 'Slip' roundabout (ER) is a recipe for collisions.The existing sewage/drainage systems cannot cope.It will lead to the loss of valuable farmland and impacts on schools and infrastucture..	
Policy SP3 d	778762	Mrs Wendy Dinley		2335	Objecting	The farmland that you are proposing to build over 12,000 homes on with roads that will exit onto Bullockstone Road, which is already a rat run to Canterbury and could become a major accident black-spot.There is a lack if infrastructure including schools in Herne Bay to accommodate the families that will move into these proposed new homes.	
Policy SP3 d	778771	P Kelk		2326	Objecting	Increase noise and traffic pollution due to huge volume of traffic that will come from the village of Herne and Herne Bay developments that you say must come towards Canterbury and come through Broad Oak. You must find other routes on the Thanet Way to take that traffic not bring it towards Sturry and Broad Oak.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	778783	A Briant		2337	Objecting	Housing provision proposed at Herne Village is disproportionate. There are no traffic figures; no information on the proposals for the relief road; there are no details of cost of proposals; the village will lose its identity; green gaps will be lost; flooding problems in the past; how accurate are the growth predictions in the current economic climate; there are few details of house type proposed and infrastructure phasing; concerns related to school provision, doctors, dentists and hospitals.	
Policy SP3 d	778852	Mr John Pye		2406	Objecting	I object to the proposed development planned for Herne and Broomfield. The objections I have are as follows. Herne will lose its identity as a village and won't have the "green gap" any longer. The volume of traffic will increase greatly. The proposals for Bullockstone Road and Sturry Crossing are unclear. Infrastructure doesn't appear to have been given any thought, with extra housing comes the requirement for improved sewerage, schools, doctors, transport and all the other amenities required.	
Policy SP3 d	778937	Ms Deidre MacKinnon		2489	Supporting	Supports development proposals for land at Herne Bay Golf Club as it will bring excellent, and badly needed sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	778940	Alistair & Deidre MacKinnon		2491	Supporting	Supports development proposals for land at Herne Bay Golf Club as it will bring excellent, and badly needed sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	778952	Ms Claire Manning		2494	Supporting	Support development proposals for land at Herne Bay Golf Club as it will bring excellent, and badly needed sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779269	Mr Nick Gilbert		2493	Supporting	Supports allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. The development will provide jobs and opportunities to the local area needed for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779282	Sue & Robin Cathcart		2503	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay as well as jobs and opportunities which are required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779288	Mr Jeremy Loader		2504	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. The scheme will bring community benefits.	
Policy SP3 d	779294	Cat Gilbert		2492	Supporting	Supports allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. The development will provide jobs and opportunities to the local area needed for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779296	Ms Vanessa Webb		2468	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779298	Mr Geoff Greenhall	Community Sports Development Manager Herne Bay High School	2485	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay golf club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities, high quality housing, jobs, opportunities and regeneration to the local community and Canterbury.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	779300	Ms Judy Greenhall		2487	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay golf club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities, high quality housing, jobs, opportunities and regeneration to the local community and Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 d	779302	Mr Geoff Greenhall		2488	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay golf club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities, high quality housing, jobs, opportunities and regeneration to the local community and Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 d	779321	Che Wong		2496	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779322	Susan Wong		2495	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779325	Mr Nick Barton		2471	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779326	Koon Wong		2498	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779327	Ms Diane Barton		2474	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779328	Mr James Barton		2473	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779329	Ms Holly Barton		2472	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779353	Ms Trudi Whittington		2479	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779523	Ms Sheena Butterworth		2477	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779524	Ms Michelle Bennett		2478	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779544	Briony Bruce-Johnson		2476	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779555	Ms Caroline Hames		2475	Supporting	Supports allocation of land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities to Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2727	Objecting	The housing provision in Herne and Broomfield and surrounds is excessive. All of the sites will impact on Herne Village, roads, schools, shops, environment. Concerned about road improvements, compulsory purchase, the by-pass and funding, nil CIL, infrastructure provision, no visum. Limited school places for locals. Few jobs will be provided where people live so car use will be high. Need play area, open space, green gap. Golf course site may be acceptable.	Need play area, open space, green gap.
Policy SP3 d	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2728	Supporting	The parish council accepts that some development in the parish will be necessary but the proposals for so much development both within and on the borders of Herne Village, is just not acceptable. Therefore they are prepared to accept the proposal for the Golf Course (SHLAA/208) This development will meet the future needs of Herne and Herne Bay; retaining a large area of open space.	Need play area, open space, green gap.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	778856	Miss B T Busby		2585	Objecting	I feel that the amount of housing proposed at the Golf Course sites is far too high. As we all know new housing requires the necessary infrastructure and I have grave concerns regarding water supplies and whether the sewers could cope. Also there is a lack of school places and doctors surgeries.	
Policy SP3 d	778879	Mrs Jenny Payne		2543	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2624	Objecting	The proposed strategic allocations are all dependent upon significant strategic infrastructure. However, neither the Local Plan nor its evidence base demonstrates that these sites are economically viable and can deliver not only dwelling completions but the necessary essential strategic infrastructure.	Allocate land at New Thanington
Policy SP3 d	779358	Mrs Sharon Bender		2647	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities for the community.	
Policy SP3 d	780317	Ms Sarah Hopkins		2648	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities for the community.	
Policy SP3 d	778714	Keith & Bette Odams		2722	Objecting	Concerned about plans for Strode Farm. Herne is a small village seperate to Herne Bay, 1000 new homes would ruin the village. How will roads cope with extra traffic? How will schools, drs, dentists cope? The thought of new houses fills them with dread.	
Policy SP3 d	779129	J Robinson		2662	Objecting	Whilst appreciating the need for additional housing in the Canterbury and District area, I am alarmed at the proposals for the large number of properties to be built in the Herne and Herne Bay areas.The present infrastructure is inadequate for the current population. The road system could not possibly cope with the additional traffic.	
Policy SP3 d	779130	Mrs D Phippard		2718	Objecting	Raised concerns about a sewage spill. Objects to the huge housing developments in Herne Bay, Herne Village, Bullockstone Rd, Greenhill, Strode Farm and the golf club, because: some are on flood plain; no plans for sewage, the system is under strain now; planners should create a new village further inland with enough space for services, include Sturry or Canterbury.	create a new village further inland with enough space for services, at Sturry or Canterbury.
Policy SP3 d	779131	I C Belsom		2714	Objecting	Concerned about the development on the Herne Bay Golf Club, because: building unwanted houses on countryside is not the answer to the Country's problems; they will become townies; no plans for hospitals, doctors, dentists or schools; without the facilites pressure will be put on NHS and teachers.	
Policy SP3 d	779577	Mr Martin Beckley		2652	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring community benefits, sporting facilities, regeneration, jobs and housing.	
Policy SP3 d	780318	Mr Steve Fulks		2654	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. The development will provide jobs and opportunities to help regeneration.	
Policy SP3 d	780319	Miss A S Mason		2649	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities for the community.	
Policy SP3 d	780322	Mr Ashley Horwell		2650	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities for the community.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	780325	Mr Gary Smith		2653	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring community benefits.	
Policy SP3 d	780443	Ms Sarah Symons		2651	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay Golf Club. It will bring excellent sporting facilities for the community.	
Policy SP3 d	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3024	Objecting	We welcome the extensive areas of open space that appear to be present within the indicative masterplan. This will provide alternative opportunities to recreate, providing a significant amount of the space is natural or semi natural habitat. Concened about recreational pressure on Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay (potentially severe individual and in-combination impact - Canterbury, Dover and Thanet housing in close proximity), and Blean Complex SAC and East Blean Woods SSSI.	We would recommend that within the site specific policy the quantum of natural open space to be delivered as part of the development is specified to ensure adequate on-site mitigation is provided. It will be important within any masterplanning that the Plenty Stream which runs through the site is sufficiently buffered and the riparian habitat is managed.To ensure permeability through the site we recommend that further corridors are planned through the built environment present on both sites. To ensure that the integrity of the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay site is not compromised there is a need to collect visitor and disturbance data in relation to existing pressure and formulate a Strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy to ensure visitor control is adequate within the SPA and sufficient natural open space is available to detract visitors from using the coast for dog walking. Blean Complex SAC and East Blean Woods SSSI will also require a Strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy.
Policy SP3 d	779266	Mr Clive Cripps	Chairman Herne Bay Hockey Club	2778	Supporting	I am writing as Chairman of Herne Bay Hockey Club I to express my support in the old Golf Club development which includes the sports hub development. This will give Herne Bay and its children substantial high quality new sports facilities. This will be a lasting legacy for the town.	
Policy SP3 d	779564	Mr J Tinker		2906	Supporting	Support for redevelopment of Golf Club as it is not prime agricultural land but is concerned about the amount of space for local shopping.	
Policy SP3 d	779569	Ms Caroline Dennis		2889	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay golf club.The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779590	Mr Trevor Davis		2891	Objecting	Objects to the large developments at the: golf course, Strode Farm and Hillborough. Keep Herne and Herne Bay separate as we do not want to be a suburb. The roads are busy and accidents happen often at the junction of Bullockstone and Canterbury Rds and near Herne Grove Farmhouse. M cars will make this worse.	
Policy SP3 d	780284	Mr Stephen Cornthwaite		2888	Supporting	Supports allocation of Land at Herne Bay golf club.The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	780330	Mr Nigel Unknown		2894	Objecting	Objects to large developments next to Herne & Broomfield. Necessary infrastructure improvements will not be completed in time to avoid disruption. Beltinge Road is nearly impassable near the local shops. It will spoil the rural character of the coastal resorts which could bring economic benefit to the community and will be a blot on the landscape.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	777509	Mrs Monica Blyth		3152	Supporting	Support the development of the Golf Course.	
Policy SP3 d	779276	Ms Susan Harvey		3200	Objecting	Object to development proposals in the Herne and Bloomfield area. Concerned that the large amounts of housing would overstretch the existing infrastructure; increase traffic and congestion; extend waiting times for doctors and dentists; increase competition for school places; exacerbate water supply and drainage issues; and result in the loss of green space. Many houses in the area are empty and unsold, as mortgages are difficult to get and prices are often unaffordable for local residents.	
Policy SP3 d	781788	Mr Alan Dock		2992	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	781789	Mr Calum Dock		2991	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	781792	Mr Alan Barry		2990	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	781793	D Boddily		2989	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	781795	Mrs Jackie White		2993	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781796	Mr Josh Mirams		2988	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	781798	Mr John Argyrides		2987	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	781799	Mr Michael Archer		2986	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	781800	Mr Jack Duncalf		2994	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781801	Dionne Holmes		2978	Supporting	To Whom It May Concern I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781803	Ms Julie Archer		2979	Supporting	To Whom It May Concern I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	781805	Jo Senft		2985	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781806	Mr Tim Gilbert		2995	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781807	Mr Joe Walters		2980	Supporting	To Whom It May Concern I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781808	Mr Lewis Blamire		2996	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781809	Mr Stanley Allan		2997	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781810	Mrs M Reddock		2981	Supporting	To Whom It May Concern I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781811	P A Reddock		2999	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781813	Mrs Mary Sykes		2998	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781814	Mr Malcolm Sykes		2983	Supporting	To Whom It May Concern I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781816	J Bavier		2982	Supporting	To Whom It May Concern I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781817	C Sexton		3000	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781818	Mr Toby Sexton		2984	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	779163	Sarah Nops		3320	Objecting	Objection to Hillborough Is this amount of development really necessary? Sufficient work on forecasts; insufficient business development for the proposed allocation of homes; too much pressure has been put on Herne by the surrounding development; increase in traffic; insufficient information on road improvements eg Bullockstone; No plans for infrastructure; lack of info from Highways Dept; no info on ration of affordable versus luxury housing; difficult to find info on proposals on CCC website	
Policy SP3 d	779542	L R Blake		3360	Objecting	Objects to Golf Club on grounds of extra traffic through Herne; loss of village identity; loss of green gaps; essential services will not be able to cope. Accept some development but numbers are too high and should be significantly reduced.	
Policy SP3 d	779602	Mr J Abernethy		3340	Objecting	I am writing this in order to voice my concerns over the proposed building of new homes in our district, notably around the Herne Bay/Herne/Broomfield areas. Not only will the community spirit erode but the current infrastructure cannot sustain such large scale changes. Rather than building large expanses of new homes, more must be done to improve, modernise and rejuvenate the more urban areas of our communities and those which we live side by side with.	Rather than building large expanses of new homes, more must be done to improve, modernise and rejuvenate the more urban areas of our communities and those which we live side by side with.
Policy SP3 d	779603	Mrs S Abernethy		3337	Objecting	I am writing this in order to voice my concerns over the proposed building of new homes in our district, notably around the Herne Bay/Herne/Broomfield areas. Not only will the community spirit erode but the current infrastructure cannot sustain such large scale changes. Rather than building large expanses of new homes, more must be done to improve, modernise and rejuvenate the more urban areas of our communities and those which we live side by side with.	Rather than building large expanses of new homes, more must be done to improve, modernise and rejuvenate the more urban areas of our communities and those which we live side by side with.
Policy SP3 d	779725	Mr David Hawkes		3245	Objecting	The only area I consider viable with in the Herne Bay Area is the now defunct Herne Bay Golf Club land. Providing the infrastructure is properly in place, I am of the opinion that the balance of proposals as suggested by recent indications for the development of this "brown land" area with housing, with an area for recreational facilities, and some retail should be acceptable. I fully support the inclusion of the Herne Bay Golf Club Site as a Strategic Development Site.	
Policy SP3 d	781825	T A Wait		3110	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781826	A Wait		3112	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781828	C Wait		3113	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	781833	Ms Julie Duffy		3114	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781834	Mr B Milne		3115	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781837	E Blackmore		3116	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781842	M Vass		3117	Supporting	.I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781844	Ms Gemma Vass		3118	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781845	P Vass		3119	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781848	Occupier		3120	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781849	Occupier		3121	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781850	Occupier		3122	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781853	Occupier		3123	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781856	Occupier		3124	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781857	PJV		3125	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781859	C Vass		3126	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	781862	Occupier		3128	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781863	T Bartlett		3129	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781866	Mr Dave Silk		3130	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	779914	David & Ann Bowley		3499	Objecting	The local plan will mean the end of village life in Herne. Lower Herne Rd is subject to flooding, extra houses etc will mean surplus rainwater and less space for natural soakage. Herne Bay does not have the industry to accommodate a large workforce. A super road will increase congestion. Local schools are already full. Doctors and dentist services would be out of control. Reconsider plan.	
Policy SP3 d	779918	Mr Brian Root		3490	Objecting	The local plan states that green gaps should be retained between villages and towns. Herne existed long before Herne Bay so 1000's of houses will be contrary to this. Where is the infrastructure? Roads, public transport, doctors, carers, dentists, police and schools are already overstretched. New residents will exacerbate the high unemployment problem. Object to proposed development, leave Herne as it is.	
Policy SP3 d	780005	K Seed		3371	Objecting	Objects to Hillborough. Numbers too high and would change the character of Herne village become a conurbation putting extra pressure on resources, roads and transport systems, schools health services. No infrastructure delivery plan or traffic figures which is not very reassuring. No costs of new infrastructure- viable? what happens if developer cannot pay. Existing flooding problems will worsen. Impact on conservation area. Do new homes create new jobs? Cost of new homes beyond locals.	
Policy SP3 d	780629	Mr Stuart Elliott		3495	Supporting	I would like to register my support for the development of the former Herne Bay Hockey Club SHLAA/208.	
Policy SP3 d	780631	Ms Bethany Elliott		3496	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208.	
Policy SP3 d	780803	Mr & Mrs T Coleman		3485	Objecting	We most strongly object to proposed building on Herne Bay Golf Course	
Policy SP3 d	780809	Mr J F Day		3514	Objecting	The development will generate extra traffic and there is no indication of when road improvements will be done. Bullockstone Rd improvements are unclear and costly with little money available. Concerns about flooding, water supply, sewage, school places, doctors. Hillborough traffic will come via Altira and Blacksole roundabouts causing congestion. Heart in Hand Rd will have to be improved. Some development needed but this is too much.	The numbers should be reduced significantly.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	755184	Mr Ian Sargent		3558	Supporting	I know we have to accept some building, I do not have such a problem with herne bay golf course development if it has to go ahead, as it is sadly now 'derelict land'.	
Policy SP3 d	755187	Mrs M E Pottinger		3552	Objecting	Objects to development in and around Herne because: changing the character of the villages via population increase of 1/3; new houses have not been taken up on Talmead; no green buffer zones; will not create new jobs;m increased traffic; traffic plan not sound, Bullockstone Rd will be dangerous as will other proposed exits from new developments; schools in wrong places and won't be built; loss of farming land; lack of open spaces provided for.	
Policy SP3 d	777366	G & M Goodfellow		3524	Objecting	Agree with parish council comments: housing provision for Herne is disproportionate; no infrastructure delivery plan, costings/funding/phasing; no traffic figures; No details about Bullockstone Rd improvements, will have negative impact on us; loss of Herne's identity; loss of green gaps conflicts with plan; flooding; impact on conservation area; insufficient jobs; unaffordability; lack of school places; overstretching of medical services.	
Policy SP3 d	780300	R & J Fullford		3555	Objecting	Protests in the strongest terms. The development will destroy the village environment. Concerned about: local schools are at capacity where are the additional children to be educated; traffic chaos; water supplies; flooding at Stode Farm, inadequate sewers and raw sewage flooding, local doctors surgeries at capacity. If development is necessary then it needs to be significantly reduced to be acceptable.	If development is necessary then it needs to be significantly reduced to be acceptable.
Policy SP3 d	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3541	Objecting	I wish to object to development at Herne Bay Golf course, although I welcome the proposals for sports provision , I am concerned that the pitches are to be artificial and therefore of no benefit whatsoever to wildlife and will not hold rainwater for gradual absorption. Impermeable surfaces on pathways, roads etc will increase run-off into Plenty Brook, causing both pollution and potential flooding further downstream.	
Policy SP3 d	780625	Ms Sue Heatlie-Elliott		3743	Supporting	Support the development proposals for Herne Bay Golf Club because; it will provide sporting facilities; high quality housing; and job opportunities for the local area, which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3784	Objecting	Proposals at Herne Bay Golf Club (and Stode Farm) will destroy the Green Gap between Herne Bay and the west side of Herne Village and effectively join up the two communities. There is no reason for including commercial facilities or retail. It would kill off for good any town centre plan. There has been a lack of sensible thinking about road structures and the junction with both the Thanet way and Bullockstone Road would be dangerous. A route through Mandaline land would receive objections.	If there is a need for commercial premissis include the two plots of land between Eddington Lane and the Thanet Way - they could do with some tidying up.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	784931	Mr Charlie Silk		3902	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the lcoal community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	784932	Ms Hayley Silk		3903	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784932	Ms Hayley Silk		3904	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784933	Ms Abbie Silk		3905	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784934	Ms Nina Roberts		3906	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784935	Chris Silk		3907	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784937	T Grove		3908	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784941	Mr Neil Ford		3909	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784942	Ms Theresa Mitchell		3910	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784943	Mr Michael Lee		3911	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784946	Ms Jane Emslie		3912	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784949	Mr C Mitchell		3913	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	784950	Mr Matt Grove		3914	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784952	Mr Philip Wright		3915	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784967	Mr Dylan Davies		3916	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784970	Mr Harry Moody-Smith		3917	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784972	Mr Nathan Emslie		3918	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784974	Mr Harry Foad		3919	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784977	Mr James Hawkins-Fin		3920	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784978	Mr Cullum Cook		3921	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784979	Mr Nathan Silk		3922	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784981	Mr Jack Silk		3923	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785086	Mr George Grosvenor		3924	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785089	Ms Bev Grosvenor		3925	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	785092	Ms Christine Ould		3926	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785096	Mr Harry Prebble		3927	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785097	Ms Sharon Prebble		3928	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785101	Mr Jack Nesbitt		3929	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785104	Mr Nathan Mitchell		3930	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785105	Mr Michael Davey		3931	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785106	Mr Andrew Robinson		3932	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785108	Mr Scott Lee		3933	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785112	Ms Heidi Cuthbert		3934	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785114	Mr Stewart Cuthbert		3935	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785116	Mr Liam Kennedy		3936	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785117	Mr Tyler Kennedy		3937	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	785119	Mr Callum Kennedy		3938	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785276	Mr A Mannings		4064	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785278	F Smith		4068	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opprtunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785435	Mrs V Sallis		3947	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785436	Miss Y Elder		3949	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785437	Ms Sarah Flack		3951	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785438	Mr E A Flack		3952	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785440	Ms Donna Macleod		3953	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785441	Ms Ann Stacem		3954	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785442	Ms Katie Middleton		3956	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785446	Carly		3957	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785450	T Middleton		3958	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	785452	I C Spearing		3961	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785456	Ms Tanya Mills		3964	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785457	Ms Claire Eastley		3965	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785459	Billy Middleton		3967	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785464	Occupier		3969	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785466	Sam Hawkins		3970	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785467	Ms Gail Barnes		3971	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785474	Ms Vanessa Helily		3972	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785476	W R Gunner		3973	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785480	Mr Jason Payne		3974	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785485	Mr Robert Dengate		3975	Supporting	I woluld like to offer my support for the allocation of the land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785627	Mr Colin Smith		4033	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	785631	Occupier		4035	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785632	B Cooper		4036	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785633	S J Cooper		4037	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785635	Ms Nicola Stubbs		4038	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785640	Occupier		4039	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785645	Mrs Lisa Supple		4040	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785654	Mr Lee Supple		4041	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785658	Ms Kath Farr		4043	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785677	Mrs Susan Turner		4045	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785680	Ms Lyndsey Turner		4046	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785681	Mr John Farr		4048	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785683	Ms Jody Turner		4050	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	785684	Lesley Horton		4052	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785686	S Skinner		4053	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785706	J Hughes		4054	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785713	Cydney Byrne		4056	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785717	Kyle West		4057	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785719	Mr Graham Horton		4058	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785726	Mr Dennis Turner		4060	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	780735	Mr Alex Kazakeos		4212	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	780737	Mr Jim Holgate		4213	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay and will provide well needed high quality housing to the area in a sustainable location. It should also jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	780976	Mr Malcolm White		4273	Objecting	It is unreasonable in the extream to continue to expand the the immediate area around the junction of the A291 with the south side of Herne Bay in particular. The reason behind this is the village of Herne itself which had its street plan laid down before the advent of motorised transport. There has been recent road building elsewhere in Kent, but very little in Canterbury District. The New Thanet Way is a mixed blessing, but restricts access to two exits southwards, one through Herne.	I therefore submit that the housing developments are deferred until the plight of Herneis addressed.
Policy SP3 d	785282	C Tanner		4092	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	785288	Mr Gary Turner		4093	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The Development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785290	Mr & Mrs Scott & Julie Proctor		4095	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The Development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785292	M Wait		4097	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The Development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785293	Mr P Wait		4098	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The Development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785294	L Wait		4100	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The Development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785295	O Wait		4102	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The Development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785298	Mr Philip Wegener		4105	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The Development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785300	Occupier		4107	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The Development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785311	J Silh		4108	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The Development will provide much needed sports facilities, jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785316	J Lasme		4109	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay	
Policy SP3 d	785793	Ms Beth Cope		4188	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785796	K Brown		4189	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	785797	Ms Laura Wells		4190	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785798	Mr Adrian Coombs		4191	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785801	Mr Paul Gibson		4192	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785803	Ms Olivia Newman		4193	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785804	Ms Jenni Dalton		4194	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785807	Ms Lauren Brooks		4195	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785808	A M Butterworth		4196	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785813	Ms Cally Nelder		4197	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785815	A Farley-Marsh		4198	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785823	K Henderson		4199	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring much needed sporting facilities to the local community and wider areas of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	406328	Mr Daniel Smith		4527	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Herne Bay because the area has already been significantly damaged by excessive building. The town needs focused employment opportunities via improved transport links to London and the development of sites in the town centre that are under-used or un-used.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4465	Supporting	Accept allocation of site, provides an opportunity to meet the future needs of Herne Bay. Should include SHLAA sites 12 and 199, giving an extra 75 units. Also the access and traffic concerns will need to be resolved.	Include SHLAA sites 12 and 199 in allocation
Policy SP3 d	781159	Mr D R Budd		4389	Objecting	A great deal of planning is required by experts in all aspects of flooding, highway construction, all mains services, danger, conservation, hospitals, elderly, schools, employment, local and main transport services. Disproportionate housing provision, no traffic figures, lose village identity, loss of green gap, insufficient jobs, overstretched services, infrastructure provision unclear. The proposal should be discussed by the Government and each individual department.	
Policy SP3 d	781237	Ms Alison Watson		4335	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay. I believe that this site will provide well needed high quality housing to the area in a sustainable location and therefore will provide jobs and opportunities to the local area which is required for the regeneration of Herne Bay. Which can only be a positive for the community.	
Policy SP3 d	781240	Mr & Mrs Mark Kim Kirby		4337	Objecting	I am concerned about these developments as i feel it will change the village of Herne, generate an increase amount of traffic and have a large impact on local services ie doctors and school places. Although i understand housing is needed the amount proposed are too high for Herne & Broomfield. Another concern is the road improvements that will be needed. I would appreciate that our comments can be noted.	
Policy SP3 d	781017	Mr Gerry Atkin		4607	Supporting	I support the 2013 plan in its entirety especially the development on the old Herne Bay Golf course	
Policy SP3 d	781019	Mr & Mrs B Morgan		4612	Objecting	Object to amount of housing currently proposed for Herne Bay. Developments will cause huge problems pressure on nursery school places and doctor surgeries. Herne will lose its village status and join it with other communities. create further traffic problems.	
Policy SP3 d	781038	Mr T J Fallon		4651	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Herne Bay Golf Club because it would result in the village of Herne losing its identity, the existing infrastructure can barely serve the needs of the existing community, and it would lead to an increase in traffic and noise pollution in the Bullockstone Road area.	
Policy SP3 d	781258	Ms Katie Stamp		4512	Objecting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781401	Mr Simon Pout		4590	Supporting	Support for the development proposals for Herne Bay Golf Club.	
Policy SP3 d	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4735	Objecting	No direct impact on designated sites.The impact of the development on the Thanet Coast SSSIs needs to be assessed and considered. The site is grade 3 Agricultural Land - this loss must be justified in terms of need and alternatives.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	781444	Mr Tony Symons		4703	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	781702	Mr Peter Thompson		4758	Supporting	Supports the golf club because: it will create a desperately needed sports hub/facilities, more needed housing and a facility to be proud of.	
Policy SP3 d	766602	Mr John Elson		4895	Objecting	Object to the development proposals at Herne Bay Golf Club because there would be a loss of amenity space and productive farmland, a harmful effect on established wildlife; and the village of Herne would lose its identity. The site is prone to surface water flooding, and if developed the risk to other areas, upstream and downstream would increase. Finally, too little emphasis is being placed on infrastructure to support the proposed development i.e. schooling and medical facilities	
Policy SP3 d	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4890	Objecting	The strategic development site in Herne Bay are to share the costs of a relief road. Locking these sites together, to fund such a scheme, regardless of their individual situation seems complex and high risk.	
Policy SP3 d	781930	Neil Yates & family		4923	Objecting	Object, to plan to build 1800+ new homes between Herne, Herne Bay and Greenhill. Our number one concern is the lack of road capacity to deal with such a large influx of new residents and development related traffic. We have not been given clear details of how and when developers will meet these costs. Concerned that Herne will completely lose it's village identity, as there will be nothing seperating the three communities. Proposed numbers are in excess of what is feasible and necessary.	
Policy SP3 d	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5024	Objecting	Council has not allocated sufficient land to meet assessed housing requirement. Making efficient use of allocated greenfield sites, of lesser environmental value and support the delivery of sustainable development (SA), is the most appropriate strategy and accords with NPPF. To make DLP 'Effective' and 'Sound', Policy SP3d should be amended to refer to 600 dwellings to be secure a more sustainable development and contribute towards meeting the housing deficit. Amend table as outlined.	Changes Housing - change 400 to 600 Employment - add 'Approximately', and 'including B1a (office) and A2 (financial services)' retail - add 'and local centre services' and 'including A1 (shops), A4 (drinking establishments) & A5 (food takeaway) Other - Delete '1.25ha set aside for Herne Bay High School, add 'provision of a' and '/extra care/sheltered accomodation
Policy SP3 d	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5030	Objecting	Section 2 of this Statement refers to, preparation of amended site Sustainability Appraisal (Appendices 2 & 3) based on the revised development proposals (para 2.3). Amended SA demonstrates that the development proposals (revised) represent more sustainable development. To make DLP 'Effective' and 'Sound', Policy SP3d should be amended to refer to 600 dwellings to be secure a more sustainable development and contribute towards meeting the housing deficit. Amend as outlined.	Amend illustrative layout to reflect master plan as attached - to increase housing and change retail/commerical/leisure facilities and site access.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5031	Objecting	Section 2 of this Statement refers to, preparation of amended site Sustainability Appraisal (Appendices 2 & 3) based on the revised development proposals (para 2.3). Amended SA demonstrates that the development proposals (revised) represent more sustainable development. To make DLP 'Effective' and 'Sound', Policy SP3d should be amended to refer to 600 dwellings to be secure a more sustainable development and contribute towards meeting the housing deficit. Amend as outlined	Extend/amend allocation boundary to reflect updates to the development area. Include additional land along Thanet way to provide access and extend to include additional areas.
Policy SP3 d	782023	Mr Graham P Jackson		4961	Supporting	Support development at Herne Bay Golf Club. Housing is needed in the locality; the number of dwellings is proportionate to the size of the site; the proposed supermarket offers significant amenity and convenience to Herne Bay residents; and the provision of sports facilities will provide much needed activity for children and teenagers. The proposed highway access with proposed traffic control at the new junction will have no discernible impact on the community as a whole.	
Policy SP3 d	781721	Ms Lynne Broadbent		5178	Objecting	The draft Local Plan needs to be far more balanced in terms of the number and location of new houses i.e. access to services, more specific in terms of business and employment opportunities and much clearer in terms of addressing existing traffic and infrastructure issues.	
Policy SP3 d	781738	Anne & Francis Entwistle		5165	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for 3000 new houses in and around the Herne and Herne Bay area. Concerned that the village of Herne will lose its identity and community, the existing infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional demands; as well as cause environmental destruction on a huge scale.	
Policy SP3 d	781787	Mrs D Hills		5261	Objecting	Object to the development proposals at Herne Bay Golf Club because the roads would not be able to cope with the increased traffic, the existing infrastructure i.e. gas, electric is already at capacity at would require investment, it would result in the loss of grade 3 agricultural land and is within a flood risk zone; and there is no mention of any additional health care facilities.	
Policy SP3 d	780844	Mr Paul Inwood		5455	Objecting	Rejects completely the proposal for housing in and around Sturry, Broad Oak and Hersden. These areas are unsuitable for the scale of proposed development. The infrastructure needed would change the sites detrimentally, the houses would add to the fracturing of the community. The quantity of compensatory enhancement could not pay back the original community for changes wrought.	Restrict greatly plan to develop land in and around Sturry, Broad Oak and Hersden

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5356	Objecting	Request 2 amendments to policy SP3a. Site survey identified insufficient sewerage capacity in the network to accommodate increased demand. Development should connect instead to the nearest point of capacity and any new infrastructure provided. Sewerage infrastructure crosses the site. This should not be built on a 6-13m easement is required. Development layout should take account of this. Any diversion will be at the developers cost. Amend as outlined	Include the following text in the 'Infrastructure' section of policy SP3a: The development must provide a connection to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by Southern Water. Amend the 'Other' section of policy SP3a as follows: Development proposals must ensure future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.
Policy SP3 d	784601	R & D Hill		5415	Objecting	We wish to record our objections to the inclusion of the Herne Bay Golf Course in the local plan.	
Policy SP3 d	784622	Mr Paul R Tapsell		5480	Objecting	Opposed to the building of hundreds of houses in the green area between the village of Herne and Herne Bay town. Herne has been a village for over 800 years, far longer than Herne Bay has existed. Filling the clear area between Herne and Herne bay would instantly destroy Herne's ancient identity as a separate village by turning it into a district of Herne Bay: a fate which has been allowed to happen to other Kent villages, such as St. Peter's in Thanet. Please do not destroy our village	Please do not destroy our village
Policy SP3 d	784623	Sheila Tapsell		5482	Objecting	Disapproves of the large amount of proposed development around Herne and Broomfield. The strong village identity will merge into Herne Bay. It will make traffic issues worse. Developers will have to pay for road improvements before the development is built. What if money runs out? More development would have to mean a new school, Herne Bay High is packed to capacity.	
Policy SP3 d	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5896	Supporting	We welcome and support the inclusion of this additional land for the expansion of Herne Bay High School. The precise location and shape of the site will need to be more fully discussed and agreed.	
Policy SP3 d	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5899	Objecting	Indicates the requirement for care home. On what basis (evidence of need) has this infrastructure been identified as required on this site?	
Policy SP3 d	784803	Mr Peter Elsdon		5771	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The scheme will bring massive community benefits to the people of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785169	Ms Susan O'Leary		5987	Objecting	I would like to express my opposition to the proposed development at the above sites. I feel that development of the above areas would have a detrimental effect on the locality and is not in keeping with the area in general. The intensity of the proposed developments is a great concern, particularly the impact they will have on Herne Village in terms of its identity; level of housing disproportionate to the village; traffic congestion and impact on the environment.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 d	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6016	Objecting	Herne Bay Golf Club: Positives: including benefits of Herne by-pass, employment floor space, speciefied amenities and facilities, funding for infrastructure changes. Uncertainties: including sufficient funding for infrastructure, delivery of jobs close to the houses, meeting the needs of local communities. Negatives: the strength of local feeling, increased traffic on the A291/A28 in Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 d	784816	Mr Darren Ansell		6211	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	784817	Mrs Amy Ansell		6210	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785417	Ms Danielle Miles		6190	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785418	Dr Paul Glynn		6191	Supporting	I would like to offer my support for the allocation of the Land at Herne Bay Golf Club SHLAA/208. The site will bring excellent sporting facilities to the community of Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 d	785831	Mr L Whittington		6192	Supporting	Please find attached 53 letters of support for the allocation of land at Herne Bay Golf club SHLAA/208. (logged individually)	
Policy SP3 e	766613	Mrs G Clifton		6	Objecting	Totally opposed to the building of an estate of housing and shops on farmland, plus on a golf course at Herne. There is not capacity on the local road, the local primary school if full, the doctors surgeries are booked up, the water supply in this area is critical and there is precious wildlife in this area.	Reconsider the proposal
Policy SP3 e	765257	Mrs Margaret Clark	on behalf of Mr and Mrs Dodd	8	Objecting	Object to the development of Strode Farm at Lower Herne Road for the following reasons: There are: severe flooding and drainage issues in this area, traffic problems on Bullockstone Road, impact on Estuary View minor injuies unit, difficulties in policing this area, development will make the road more dangerous for horse riders and agricultural land should be retained for food production.	
Policy SP3 e	766236	Ms Liane Farrier		30	Objecting	Object to development at Stode Park Farm. Any new development would need 2 new schools, doctors and dentist, the local area is already struggling to cope. The whole area needs jobs created before development is allowed, the proposal will not eliminate the traffic problem in Herne and will increase volume, pollution, noise and accidents. Herne and HB would make one large urban sprawl, there are protected species and the area is regularly flooded. There is a need for leisure space.	Concentrate on the development of Canterbury, with more affordable properties built in Canterbury maybe it would help the gridlock situation as people could walk to school and work. They have also got the resources such as schools to cope with the numbers.
Policy SP3 e	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		76	Objecting	No mention of open space provision, nor of public transport.	
Policy SP3 e	14082	Mr George Johnson		219	Objecting	Too many houses proposed in Herne Bay and not enough infrastructure. It will cause problems.	Much less housing of high quality which will be unsuitable for the rental sector.
Policy SP3 e	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		338	Objecting	The foot and cycle path provision must be extended to improve the permeability of the site by these means.	The foot and cycle path provision must be extended as detailed on the attached annotated map to improve the permeability of the site by these means.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	150	Supporting	It is recommended that the following site be considered which is in the draft Local Plan: Herne Bay Site - Strode Farm, Herne Bay, 800 dwellings	
Policy SP3 e	769850	Ms Jean White		178	Objecting	Concerned about is losing the identity between the areas Greenhill/Herne/Hillborough/Broomfield. How can you envisage these large developments before a reservoir is built! What consideration has been given to schools which are already oversubscribed. What support would new shops recieve? If people wanted to come to Herne Bay why hasn't the area by Homebase been developed? Where are the jobs, can new residents commute?	Thanet is one of the most deprived areas, so only London would offer job prospects. Please give more thought to ruining to area.
Policy SP3 e	772459	Mr & Mrs Pete and Joan Mayhew		223	Objecting	Development of Herne Bay Gold Club and Strode Farm will merge the village of Herne and the town of Herne Bay destroying the rural environment enjoyed by residents.	
Policy SP3 e	772443	Mrs Jillian Johnson		261	Objecting	Too many houses proposed for the Bullockstone Road area. Insufficient amenities. Ensure affordable housing is above the benefits cap.	Affordable housing should be of a high quality, at least three bedrooms and have a good garden; so as to obtain a rental value over the benefits cap. Preferably houses unsuitable for the rental sector.
Policy SP3 e	773146	Dr Peter Thomas		265	Objecting	I believe that the proposed development at Strode Farm [Policy SP3e Site 5] is particularly inappropriate for the following reasons: Development on this site would represent the first substantial urban development south of the Thanet Way (A299) The Plan should aim to consolidate Herne Bay's urban footprint, rather than extending its urban perimeter even further. A relief road for the village of Herne is quite inadequate. There is an urgent need to address the acute congestion problems	
Policy SP3 e	773154	Mr J C Baylis		272	Objecting	Do not include Strode Farm in the Local Plan unless you go the whole hog and give it a conservation designation.	Do not include Strode Farm in the Local Plan unless you go the whole hog and give it a conservation designation.
Policy SP3 e	775225	Mr & Mrs Carden & Family		549	Objecting	Object to proposals at Strode Farm as it will adversely impact the viability of Home Farm. Increased dog walking across farmland will result in sheep worrying and parasite infestations €“issues already being experienced from the Canterbury Fields estate to the extent where animals cannot be grazed on adjoining fields. No opportunities for diversification. Furthermore, if Bullockstone Rd is upgraded it will no longer be suitable for horse riding meaning the loss of another part of the business.	
Policy SP3 e	775396	Mrs Rachel Blair		458	Objecting	Objects to additional houses because there are no schools mentioned and the current Herne School is full, there is a lack of new roads and Herne is already a bottleneck for traffic, School Lane is too narrow to take additional traffic, the widening of Bullockstone Road will be inadequate and the area will lose its identity becoming one huge housing estate.	
Policy SP3 e	776287	Mrs C A Cousins		528	Objecting	She is utterly against the houses and roads at Strode Farm. It is a country area with a lot of wildlife, horse riders and a lovely farm which all will be lost. Also a lot of disabled people use the lane with their buggies. Talk to people to see what they want.	Come and ask people what they want.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	776298	J R Keates		584	Supporting	Has no exceptions to new housing being developed at Strode Farm but is concerned about accesses and roads.	
Policy SP3 e	776825	Mr Dennis Rampley		620	Objecting	1. Rear of 28 Lower Herne Road. In the 1960s Herne Bay UDC wanted the money up front for a pumping station due to localised flooding. 2. On my side the water goes into the ditch alongside the Public Right of Way (PROW) which then goes right the way to underneath the coastal road as far as Eddington Lane which could cause sinkage of the coastal road and traffic disaster. 3 The PROW has not been considered. What is going to happen? 4 The contract should be scrutinised by the public auditor.	
Policy SP3 e	776869	Mr Alan Breck		831	Objecting	Objects to housing development at Strode Farm, because: 1. of the lack of road infrastructure, the current roads are already busy and insufficient, there is no infrastructure delivery plan or traffic figures 2. it would harm the conservation area 3. the greengap will be lost 4. Parish Cllr Brealy has financial interest in Strode Farm.	
Policy SP3 e	777231	Mrs Kathleen Moore		796	Objecting	Objects to development proposals at Strode Farm.	Allocate housing along the A299 out to Sturry.
Policy SP3 e	777408	Miss Linda Hill		730	Objecting	Keep Herne as a rural village. No more houses or shop, but a nice quiet backwater. I like being a villager not a townie!	No development in Herne
Policy SP3 e	777233	E V Moore		798	Objecting	Objects to development proposals in the Herne vicinity [Herne Bay Golf Club and Strode Farm). Concerned about infrastructure provision i.e. roads, sewers, utilities etc.	
Policy SP3 e	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1247	Objecting	The Council does appreciate the positives associated with new housing as this will enliven the area and meet future housing needs, but there are many negatives. Development at these strategic sites will result in an increase in traffic volume for both the A28 and the Sturry/Broad Oak area north of Sturry Crossing. Further traffic congestion leads to an additional increase in air pollution, which affects residents (incl lung cancer) and wildlife (RAMSAR/SSSI).	All five strategic sites converge on the A28 and the Sturry level crossing. It is important that incentives for motorists to use the new roads be put into place.
Policy SP3 e	778582	Mr Laurence Muston		1325	Objecting	Too many houses, not needed, inadequate infrastructure.	The character of Herne and its distinct existence apart from Herne Bay must be maintained. Any building which would increase traffic through Herne and which would destroy its independence is absolutley against the desire iof the Herne residents and would be detrimental to the village.
Policy SP3 e	776825	Mr Dennis Rampley		1366	Objecting	The contactors who are presumably going to start the work may not have sufficient funds to complete the exercise and therefore they should be aware of the Insolvency Act 1986 of disqualification for 15 years as directors. I would like to see indemnity that was required that was requested by Herne Bay Urban District Council to satisfy the residents that the work would be completed.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	777483	Mrs E E Kenward		1437	Supporting	Concerning the proposal to build 1,000 properties on the former Golf Course, Strode Farm, Greenhill and Hillborough. I have concerns relating to transport, schools and affordable housing and doctors, dentists and hospitals being overstretched.	
Policy SP3 e	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1734	Objecting	Site 5 (SP3e) requires new transport infrastructure on third party land, the funding and delivery of which is uncertain given the current economic climate, land ownership issues and lack of available public funding. The significant reliance that the Local Plan strategy places on delivery of this site within the Plan period is unsound.	Include under Policy SP3 the allocation of an additional Strategic Site at Bodkin Farm, Chesterfield, Whitstable (as per the site details provided under our representation to Policy SP3a).
Policy SP3 e	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1713	Objecting	Any and all Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL, aka S106 Developer Contributions) raised in Herne Bay must be spent in Herne Bay. In the unlikely event that CIL revenue exceeds Herne Bay's needs - we do have a Pier to build, after all - the money should be retained for future Herne Bay requirements.	CIL raised in Herne Bay must be spent in Herne Bay.
Policy SP3 e	778206	Mr Brown		1861	Objecting	As a resident of Bullockstone Road, if this proposed plan goes ahead would greatly affect my property and my life. This area is already a danger area as there are many incidents at the junction as fast traffic meets slower waiting traffic. The drainage of rainwater in the area is also a major consideration as flooding in the area is quite common. Schools, Drs etc are over stretched.	
Policy SP3 e	778210	A F Dilnot		1855	Objecting	With the increased number of houses comes more traffic, if the above development were to take place so would the number of cars both moving on the roads and parked on the road which would cause further congestion. There will be a greater risk of flooding. The ancient village of Herne cannot support 1000 new houses.	
Policy SP3 e	778228	Mrs Ann Blatherwick		1874	Objecting	The proposed Strode farm development will lead to loss of Identity. Herne is a village and is at present separated from Herne Bay by the Thanet Way and the 'green gap' of Strode Farm and the former Herne Bay golf club. The massive amount of development proposed for this area is simply too great for the infrastructure of the area including schools and medical facilities and highway infrastructure. Water supply and the sewage system is also an issue of concern.	
Policy SP3 e	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1898	Objecting	Too much development planned for Herne Bay. Why should the money be spent for Sturry and Canterbury development?	
Policy SP3 e	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1893	Objecting	Too much development and potential flood risk.	
Policy SP3 e	778402	Mr Mark Hunter		2235	Objecting	I object to the proposal for intense development at Strode Farm, Herne. My objection is simply based on the excessive destruction of our countryside I would beg you to stop these high density developments and consider better use of the existing spaces in our towns and villages, not to mention the use of brownfield sites and the refurbishment or demolition of buildings currently in poor states of repair..	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	778648	Sharon & Stephen Sayers		2271	Objecting	With the proposed development on Strode Farm there would be serious issues relating to Water supply, Jobs, Infrastructure, Wildlife and Environment, Quality of Life and Open spaces.	
Policy SP3 e	778655	Ms Nikki Ward		2273	Objecting	I strongly object the large development being proposed at Strode Farm, Herne Will there be enough employment locally for new residents of these estates? There will be an impact on infrastructure - roads/traffic/schooling/utilities nad noise/air pollution/ traffic etc will be increased. There will be a loss of 'open space nad overall impacts on people's quality of life.	
Policy SP3 e	778664	Mrs Kathleen Harrington		2279	Objecting	I would like to submit my concerns and objections to the proposed development to Herne and Broomfield. The amount of traffic that it will generate through Herne will increase to unacceptable levels. Where will all these new residents find jobs ?. Schools, Doctor's surgeries, dentists and hospitals are already overstretched. Loss of countryside. Please, Please, reduce this development and protect the village of Herne.	
Policy SP3 e	778711	Mr Simon Dyson		2293	Objecting	I have concerns over proposal to build 1,000s of new houses in and around the Herne village. The Council has not given anything like enough consideration to just how much extra traffic will be added to the A291, any housing development at Strode Farm, Herne would greatly increase the traffic levels and so add to an already existing problem. Also concerns over school places nad employment for people in the new houses.	
Policy SP3 e	778750	Mrs E Sharpe		2310	Objecting	I wish to express my deep concern over the plans for the large development proposed for Strode Farm. I cannot see that the proposals will adequately ensure the necessary infrastructure of drainage, sewerage, and water supplied etc. Schools, surgeries etc would need to be vastly increased to cope with the numbers proposed.	
Policy SP3 e	778760	Mr P A Foad		2202	Objecting	I object to the proposed plans concerning all the houses etc planned for the Strode Park farm area. I am concerned about the additional roads and in particular being so close to my property whcih will de value it.	
Policy SP3 e	778763	G E & B P Clifton		2262	Objecting	I object strongly to the proposed development of thousands of houses etc next to Herne and Broomfield. The local roads could not cope with the increased traffic, the sewers can't cope, water shortage at times of drought, local schools - 30 plus in classes! Doctors full.	
Policy SP3 e	779299	Mr John Smith		2049	Objecting	The phrase 'proportionate contribution' without any hard figures means essentially nothing. The amount required needs to be agreed in advance and guaranteed by the developers.	The 'proportionate contribution' needs to be agreed in advance and guaranteed by the developers.
Policy SP3 e	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2398	Objecting	No mention of open space provision, nor of public transport.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	773048	Mrs J Moran		2636	Objecting	The proposals to develop more areas in Herne and Herne Bay along with the proposed sites in Sturry Parish, will put a considerable strain on all the local infrastructure, but a road bypassing Sturry and joining the A28 as suggested, will not solve the City Councils traffic problems. Will the utility services, schools, medical and other services be able to cope?	
Policy SP3 e	778759	Mr G D Quinton		2333	Objecting	I oppose the Strode Farm scheme.800 houses will generate at least 1,200 cars to add to the chaos and to funnel more into Eddington, 'Slip' roundabout (ER) is a recipe for collisions.The existing sewage/drainage systems cannot cope.It will lead to the loss of valuable farmland and impacts on schools and infrastucture..	
Policy SP3 e	778762	Mrs Wendy Dinley		2336	Objecting	The farmland that you are proposing to build over 12,000 homes on with roads that will exit onto Bullockstone Road, which is already a rat run to Canterbury and could become a major accident black-spot.There is a lack if infrastructure in Herne Bay including schools to accommodate the families that will move into these proposed new homes	
Policy SP3 e	778771	P Kelk		2327	Objecting	Increase noise and traffic pollution due to huge volume of traffic that will come from the village of Herne and Herne Bay developments that you say must come towards Canterbury and come through Broad Oak. You must find other routes on the Thanet Way to take that traffic not bring it towards Sturry and Broad Oak.	
Policy SP3 e	778779	Mrs J M Joshua		2334	Objecting	The proposal for 1,000 new build homes opposite the farm buildings in Lower Herne Road/Bullockstone Road will be an environmental catastrophe as well as a logistical nightmare. The UK needs grade 3 agricultural land and it is not used for that. Brierley can get five times that amount by putting up solar panels. Where are the jobs, school places for the children and who will pay for the transport of these children and their parents? These are insufficient parking places at present.	
Policy SP3 e	778783	A Briant		2339	Objecting	Housing provision proposed at Herne Village is disproportionate. There are no traffic figures; no information on the proposals for the relief road; there are no details of cost of proposals; the village will lose its identity; green gaps lost; flooding problems; impact on Conservation Area adjacent Strode Farm; how accurate are the growth predictions?; there are few details of house type proposed and infrastructure phasing; concerns related to school provision, doctors, dentists and hospitals.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	778852	Mr John Pye		2407	Objecting	I object to the proposed development planned for Herne and Broomfield. The objections I have are as follows. Herne will lose its identity as a village and won't have the "green gap" any longer. The volume of traffic will increase greatly. The proposals for Bullockstone Road and Sturry Crossing are unclear. Infrastructure doesn't appear to have been given any thought, with extra housing comes the requirement for improved sewerage, schools, doctors, transport and all the other amenities required.	
Policy SP3 e	778856	Miss B T Busby		2591	Objecting	I feel that the amount of housing proposed at the Strode Farm site is far too high. As we all know new housing requires the necessary infrastructure and I have grave concerns regarding water supplies and whether the sewers could cope.	
Policy SP3 e	778883	Mrs F Dingle		2581	Objecting	Object to proposed development at Strode Farm: the area floods on a regular basis (who will fund drainage / infrastructure?); would lose identity of semi-rural village; who will fund the link road, how would it work?; it would harm the Conservation Area; there will not be adequate farmland left to meet future needs; how will the already overstretched schools, doctors, dentists and hospitals cope?	
Policy SP3 e	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2625	Objecting	The proposed strategic allocations are all dependent upon significant strategic infrastructure. However, neither the Local Plan nor its evidence base demonstrates that these sites are economically viable and can deliver not only dwelling completions but the necessary essential strategic infrastructure.	Allocate land at New Thanington
Policy SP3 e	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2880	Objecting	The housing provision in Herne and Broomfield and surrounds is excessive. Will impact on Herne Village, roads, schools, shops, environment. Concerned about road improvements, compulsory purchase, the by-pass and funding, nil CIL, infrastructure provision, no visum, traffic. Need play area, open space, green gap. Object to Strode farm because impacts on heritage, school places for locals, loss of agricultural land, flooding, it is out of scale, loss of identity, population increase.	
Policy SP3 e	778477	Mrs K J Taylor		2716	Objecting	Concerned about Strode farm development, because: loss of farmland and greenbelt; lack of infrastructure, water and sewage; no new primary school or GP's shown; increase in traffic; relief road dependant on developers so what guarantees are there; Herne is a historic village but is not included on list of villages; lack of jobs; land floods; no mention of elderly sheltered housing; can area sustain such a large number of houses; how will Canterbury Rd be managed and ensure people use relief Rd	
Policy SP3 e	779129	J Robinson		2663	Objecting	Whilst appreciating the need for additional housing in the Canterbury and District area, I am alarmed at the proposals for the large number of properties to be built in the Herne and Herne Bay areas. The present infrastructure is inadequate for the current population. The road system could not possibly cope with the additional traffic.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	779130	Mrs D Phippard		2719	Objecting	Raised concerns about a sewage spill. Objects to the huge housing developments in Herne Bay, Herne Village, Bullockstone Rd, Greenhill, Strode Farm and the golf club, because: some are on flood plain; no plans for sewage, the system is under strain now; planners should create a new village further inland with enough space for services, include Sturry or Canterbury.	create a new village further inland with enough space for services, at Sturry or Canterbury.
Policy SP3 e	779131	I C Belsom		2715	Objecting	Concerned about the development on Strode Farm, because: building unwanted houses on countryside is not the answer to the Country's problems; they will become townies; no plans for hospitals, doctors, dentists or schools; without the facilites pressure will be put on NHS and teachers.	
Policy SP3 e	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2919	Objecting	In some cases the risk of non-delivery of individual strategic sites could undermine the achievement of other strategic plan objectives, where for example the provision of a piece of strategic infrastructure is dependent upon a site coming forward in a timely manner. This is an issue for Strode Farm (Site 5) .	If the land at Strode Farm adjoining Herne Village is not allocated then Kitewood suggest that a potential alternative route would be through the Herne Bay Golf Club site complemented by a widening of Bullockstone Road.
Policy SP3 e	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2926	Supporting	It is noted that the delivery of this particular proposal is entirely dependent upon the development of Strode Farm strategic allocation. Kitewood therefore supports the Strode Farm allocation.	However, if Strode Farm fails to be allocated, we would encourage the Council to investigate an alternative proposal through the Herne Bay Golf Course site should the Strode Farm allocation fail to come forward through the Local Plan. However, if this fails to be allocated, we would encourage the Council to investigate an alternative proposal through the Herne Bay Golf Course site should the Strode Farm allocation fail to come forward through the Local Plan.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3025	Objecting	We welcome the extensive areas of open space that appear to be present within the indicative masterplan. This will provide alternative opportunities to recreate, providing a significant amount of the space is natural or semi natural habitat. Concened about recreational pressure on Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay (potentially severe individual and in-combination impact - Canterbury, Dover and Thanet housing in close proximity), and Blean Complex SAC and East Blean Woods SSSI.	We would recommend that within the site specific policy the quantum of natural open space to be delivered as part of the development is specified to ensure adequate on-site mitigation is provided. It will be important within any masterplanning that the Plenty Stream which runs through the site is sufficiently buffered and the riparian habitat is managed.To ensure permeability through the site we recommend that further corridors are planned through the built environment present on both sites. This is particularly relevant in relation to site 5 where an extensive block of housing is planned. ARCH shows that neutral grassland and scrub woodland are present throughout the Southern boundary. Buffering and management of these habitats should be required within Policy SP3e. To ensure that the integrity of the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay site is not compromised there is a need to collect visitor and disturbance data in relation to existing pressure and formulate a Strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy to ensure visitor control is adequate within the SPA and sufficient natural open space is available to detract visitors from using the coast for dog walking. Blean Complex SAC and East Blean Woods SSSI will also require a Strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy.
Policy SP3 e	779157	Mrs D Boughton		2910	Objecting	Objection to SP3e Site 5 Strode Farm on the grounds of loss of identity for Herne, impact on services such as schools, doctors, dentists, sewage and water services. Site is lowlying and often waterlogged. Impact on traffic, road safety, does not believe Bullockstone road will be suitable for the increased traffic, impact on Herne village. Lack of employment, Impact on conservation area. Housing development should be focussed on the north rather than overcrowded south.	
Policy SP3 e	779334	Loraine & Robert Gardiner		2883	Objecting	Object to development proposals at Strode Farm. It would merge Herne with Herne Bay and lose its identity; there are already not enough school places to meet demand - this would only get worse; it would become more difficult to see a doctor; and traffic would increase significantly. Herne should be left as a village, the village does not have the amenities to sustain the level of development proposed.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	779564	Mr J Tinker		2904	Objecting	I am against the use of ...most of proposed site 4 (Strode Farm) as this is prime agricultural land and we need this for food production to ensure that we are not dependent on imports in the future (Kent is supposed to be the Garden of England). Other sites of lesser agricultural quality eg E of Seasalter lane, Herne Bay Road, around Broad Oak and Chartham. Concerned at the amount of local shopping proposed.	
Policy SP3 e	779590	Mr Trevor Davis		2892	Objecting	Objects to the large developments at the: golf course, Strode Farm and Hillborough. Keep Herne and Herne Bay separate as we do not want to be a suburb. The roads are busy and accidents happen often at the junction of Bullockstone and Canterbury Rds and near Herne Grove Farmhouse. M cars will make this worse.	
Policy SP3 e	780330	Mr Nigel Unknown		2895	Objecting	Objects to large developments next to Herne & Broomfield. Necessary infrastructure improvements will not be completed in time to avoid disruption. Beltinge Road is nearly impassable near the local shops. It will spoil the rural character of the coastal resorts which could bring economic benefit to the community and will be a blot on the landscape.	
Policy SP3 e	108772	Mrs Shirley Dilnot		3209	Objecting	Object to development proposals at Strode Farm. Concerned about the use of greenfield, agricultural land; and the impact that new housing would have on facilities in Herne - especially if the developers do not have the capital to undertake the essential infrastructure provision necessary. There shouldn't be anymore development around Herne.	
Policy SP3 e	777509	Mrs Monica Blyth		3151	Objecting	Object to the development of Strode Farm	
Policy SP3 e	779159	Mr & Mrs Ken & Pauline Finch		2930	Objecting	Objection to Strode Farm because of impact on Herne loss of identity; impact on conservation area, schools, doctors surgeries. Added pollution, impact on flooding issues relating to Bullockstone Road/Lower Herne Road; no examination of existing traffic issues associated with with A291 or details of relief road. Problems of water supply and sewage. Housing on part of floodplain. Proposed community centre does not take into account Parish Council plans. Housing likely to be used as second homes	
Policy SP3 e	779161	Mrs M E Linkin		2935	Objecting	Objects to Strode Farm because of insufficient water supply; impact on infrastructure eg roads, transport, schools, provision for doctors, dentists and policing; impact on the identity of Herne, loss of green spaces.	
Policy SP3 e	779276	Ms Susan Harvey		3201	Objecting	Object to development proposals in the Herne and Bloomfield area. Concerned that the large amounts of housing would overstretch the existing infrastructure; increase traffic and congestion; extend waiting times for doctors and dentists; increase competition for school places; exacerbate water supply and drainage issues; and result in the loss of green space. Many houses in the area are empty and unsold, as mortgages are difficult to get and prices are often unaffordable for local residents.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	779287	Ms Daphne Jenness		3208	Objecting	Object to the development proposals next to Herne and Broomfield. Concerned about the increased traffic through Herne (esp. if the bypass take a long time to deliver); employment opportunities; attracting businesses to fill the new industrial units; and infrastructure issues such as school places, water supply and flooding etc. Herne should retain its identity as a village .	
Policy SP3 e	779568	Mr & Mrs Walker		2971	Objecting	As residents of both Herne and Bullockstone, my husband and I are concerned about the impact the proposed development at Strode farm and the upgrading of Bullockstone Road to form a new relief road for Herne Village will have on our area. We are not against future development if it is needed, providing a satisfactory solution is found for a relief road for Herne.	We are not against future development if it is needed, providing a satisfactory solution is found for a relief road for Herne.
Policy SP3 e	779707	J McGookin		3094	Objecting	I am writing to register my protest against the proposed urban development of Herne and Strode Park.	unless and until more imaginative use is put to recycle/regenerate existing buildings (residential and business) further urban sprawl cannot be justified. Do we know how many buildings in the region are not being put to reasonable levels of residential or business use? Is there lack of occupation being properly justified?
Policy SP3 e	779163	Sarah Nops		3319	Objecting	Objection to Hillborough Is this amount of development really necessary? Sufficient work on forecasts; insufficient business development for the proposed allocation of homes; too much pressure has been put on Herne by the surrounding development; increase in traffic; insufficient information on road improvements eg Bullockstone; No plans for infrastructure; lack of info from Highways Dept; no info on ration of affordable versus luxury housing; difficult to find info on proposals on CCC website	
Policy SP3 e	779165	Mr A Blatherwick		3316	Objecting	I am writing to tell you my objections to the Draft Local Plan. Firstly, I want my village to stay as Herne, and not be joined up to Herne bay, therefore losing our identity. I like living in a village and I would hate to be classed as 'living in Herne Bay'. Also, there is already enough traffic through the middle of our village, how is putting thousands of extra houses going to help? Even though I am only 12 years old, this is going to affect my future!	
Policy SP3 e	779542	L R Blake		3362	Objecting	Objects to Golf Club on grounds of extra traffic through Herne; loss of village identity; loss of green gaps; essential services will not be able to cope; development of Strode Farm will harm adjacent conservation area. Accept some development but numbers are too high an dhsould be reduced. Strode Farm should be left as agricultural land.	
Policy SP3 e	779550	Jean & Adrian Perry		3364	Objecting	Object to Strode Farm because loss of peaceful location for retirement on the edge of a charming, independent village. Will change from rural lcoation to small town with no amenities such as schools or doctors for influx of people. Herne will cease to be separate entity. We had been assured by farmer that land would not be built on.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	779602	Mr J Abernethy		3341	Objecting	I am writing this in order to voice my concerns over the proposed building of new homes in our district, notably around the Herne Bay/Herne/Broomfield areas. Not only will the community spirit erode but the current infrastructure cannot sustain such large scale changes. Rather than building large expanses of new homes, more must be done to improve, modernise and rejuvenate the more urban areas of our communities and those which we live side by side with.	Rather than building large expanses of new homes, more must be done to improve, modernise and rejuvenate the more urban areas of our communities and those which we live side by side with.
Policy SP3 e	779603	Mrs S Abernethy		3338	Objecting	I am writing this in order to voice my concerns over the proposed building of new homes in our district, notably around the Herne Bay/Herne/Broomfield areas. Not only will the community spirit erode but the current infrastructure cannot sustain such large scale changes. Rather than building large expanses of new homes, more must be done to improve, modernise and rejuvenate the more urban areas of our communities and those which we live side by side with.	Rather than building large expanses of new homes, more must be done to improve, modernise and rejuvenate the more urban areas of our communities and those which we live side by side with.
Policy SP3 e	779920	Lynda Martin		3252	Objecting	I am writing to register my strong protest against the proposed development at Strode Farm, Herne.	
Policy SP3 e	779914	David & Ann Bowley		3500	Objecting	The local plan will mean the end of village life in Herne. Lower Herne Rd is subject to flooding, extra houses etc will mean surplus rainwater and less space for natural soakage. Herne Bay does not have the industry to accommodate a large workforce. A super road will increase congestion. Local schools are already full. Doctors and dentist services would be out of control. Reconsider plan.	
Policy SP3 e	779918	Mr Brian Root		3492	Objecting	The local plan states that green gaps should be retained between villages and towns. Herne existed long before Herne Bay so 1000's of houses will be contrary to this. Where is the infrastructure? Roads, public transport, doctors, carers, dentists, police and schools are already overstretched. New residents will exacerbate the high unemployment problem. Object to proposed development, leave Herne as it is.	
Policy SP3 e	780005	K Seed		3372	Objecting	Objects to Hillborough. Numbers too high and would change the character of Herne village become a conurbation putting extra pressure on resources, roads and transport systems, schools health services. No infrastructure delivery plan or traffic figures which is not very reassuring. No costs of new infrastructure- viable? what happens if developer cannot pay. Existing flooding problems will worsen. Impact on conservation area. Do new homes create new jobs? Cost of new homes beyond locals.	
Policy SP3 e	780283	Mr Robert Jones		3504	Objecting	The current proposal at Strode Farm will damage Herne and Broomfield's identity put unsustainable pressure on roads, water, sewer and flood risks. An alternative would be a smaller development of larger houses and gardens with the rest of the land given over to a country park. It would put less pressure on services, maintain Herne's separate identity, provided green open space to the village, have lower infrastructure costs.	A smaller development of larger houses with the rest of the land to be given back to the local people (to the City council) and made into a country park. More houses could be built at sites in Thannington to compensate.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	780456	Mr Rory White		3352	Objecting	The increased traffic from the proposed developments at Herne would be funnelled onto this road, which already has an accident black spot at Calcott Hill. If the Shalloak/Broad Oak though route were discontinued, as proposed, all this additional traffic would arrive at the same point in Sturry, joining the increased traffic coming from Hersden.	
Policy SP3 e	780803	Mr & Mrs T Coleman		3486	Objecting	We most strongly object to proposed building on Strode Farm.	
Policy SP3 e	780809	Mr J F Day		3515	Objecting	The development will generate extra traffic and there is no indication of when road improvements will be done. Bullockstone Rd improvements are unclear and costly with little money available. Concerns about flooding, water supply, sewage, school places, doctors. Hillborough traffic will come via Altira and Blacksole roundabouts causing congestion. Heart in Hand Rd will have to be improved. Some development needed but this is too much.	The numbers should be reduced significantly.
Policy SP3 e	755184	Mr Ian Sargent		3560	Objecting	Concerned Srode Farm development will cause problems: no housing requirements details; vague plans; traffic flows; Bullockstone bypass is unworkable; drainage issues; loss of food production land, loss of green gap; impact on village amenity. Upset re the potential loss of his family home a 150yr old bungalow which is to be demolished, what is to happen to him, he loves the village and it would destroy him to move. Look at developing Eddington. Don't destroy village for infrastructure.	Fewer houses and look at developing Eddington.
Policy SP3 e	755187	Mrs M E Pottinger		3553	Objecting	Objects to development in and around Herne because: changing the character of the villages via population increase of 1/3; new houses have not been taken up on Talmead; no green buffer zones; will not create new jobs;m increased traffic; traffic plan not sound, Bullockstone Rd will be dangerous as will other proposed exits from new developments; schools in wrong places and won't be built; loss of farming land; lack of open spaces provided for.	
Policy SP3 e	777366	G & M Goodfellow		3529	Objecting	Agree with parish council comments: housing provision for Herne is disproportionate; no infrastructure delivery plan, costings/funding/phasing; no traffic figures; No details about Bullockstone Rd improvements, will have negative impact on us; loss of Herne's identity; loss of green gaps conflicts with plan; flooding; impact on conservation area; insufficient jobs; unaffordability; lack of school places; overstretching of medical services.	
Policy SP3 e	780300	R & J Fullford		3556	Objecting	Protests in the strongest terms. The development will destroy the village environment. Concerned about: local schools are at capacity where are the additional children to be educated; traffic chaos; water supplies; flooding at Stode Farm, inadequate sewers and raw sewage flooding, local doctors surgeries at capacity. If development is necessary then it needs to be significantly reduced to be acceptable.	If development is necessary then it needs to be significantly reduced to be acceptable.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3546	Objecting	The proposals for Strode Farm are totally unacceptable, firstly because it will destroy land that should continue to be used to provide food. It will erode the green gap between urban Herne Bay and the village of Herne.	
Policy SP3 e	780500	Carol & Kevin & Fredrick Byrne & Moon		3725	Objecting	Object to development proposals for Strode Farm because; it will have a huge impact on the area as a whole; the wildlife and the amount of extra traffic going through Herne. There is concern also about the lack of infrastructure planning i.e. water supplies, flooding and drainage. Would like to see the number of homes reduced significantly which would mean the development would enhanced Herne and not totally ruin it by making it a part of Herne Bay and Greenhill.	Reduce the number of houses proposed at Strode Farm, Herne.
Policy SP3 e	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3816	Objecting	Proposals at Herne Bay Golf Club (and Stode Farm) will destroy the Green Gap between Herne Bay and the west side of Herne Village and effectively join up the two communities. There is no reason for including commercial facilities or retail. It would kill off for good any town centre plan. There has been a lack of sensible thinking about road structures and the junction with both the Thanet way and Bullockstone Road would be dangerous. A route through Mandaline land would receive objections.	If there is a need for commercial premissis include the two plots of land between Eddington Lane and the Thanet Way - they could do with some tidying up.
Policy SP3 e	780976	Mr Malcolm White		4274	Objecting	It is unreasonable in the extream to continue to expand the the immediate area around the junction of the A291 with the south side of Herne Bay in particular. The reason behind this is the village of Herne itself which had its street plan laid down before the advent of motorised transport. There has been recent road building elsewhere in Kent, but very little in Canterbury District. The New Thanet Way is a mixed blessing, but restricts access to two exits southwards, one through Herne.	I therefore submit that the housing developments are deferred until the plight of Herneis addressed.
Policy SP3 e	406328	Mr Daniel Smith		4529	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Herne Bay because the area has already been significantly damaged by excessive building. The town needs focused employment opportunities via improved transport links to London and the development of sites in the town centre that are under-used or un-used.	
Policy SP3 e	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4483	Objecting	Object to Strode Farm because: development is unrelated and out of scale with Herne village, Herne not part of the urban area of Herne Bay, 800 houses will have a major impact; loss of green gap between Herne and Herne Bay; Loss of highly visible agricultural landscape; negative impact on adjacent conservation area; infrastructure proposals esp ability of the roading network to cope with addtional traffic, the viability and impact of relief road and changes to Bullockstone Rd. Delete allocation	The proposed allocation at Strode Farm and Policy SP3e should be deleted from the Plan. Instead we ask that the site is identified in the Local Plan as a green gap under Policy OS5.
Policy SP3 e	781153	Mr & Mrs D Baker		4363	Objecting	We strongly object to the proposed planning to go ahead in Herne village. On the plans it shows a new bypass road running within meters of our back garden and further beyond the road we will have commercial buildings to look at. There is also the wildlife to consider at anyone time we could have as many as six herons roosting on the field, foxes, voles, birds of prey etc.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	781159	Mr D R Budd		4397	Objecting	A great deal of planning is required by experts in all aspects of flooding, highway construction, all mains services, danger, conservation, hospitals, elderly, schools, employment, local and main transport services. Disproportionate housing provision, no traffic figures, lose village identity, loss of green gap, impact on Conservation Area, insufficient jobs, overstretched services, infrastructure provision unclear. The proposal should be discussed by the Government and each individual department	
Policy SP3 e	781240	Mr & Mrs Mark Kim Kirby		4338	Objecting	I am concerned about these developments as i feel it will change the village of Herne, generate an increase amount of traffic and have a large impact on local services ie doctors and school places. Although i understand housing is needed the amount proposed are too high for Herne & Broomfield. Another concern is the road improvements that will be needed. I would appreciate that our comments can be noted.	
Policy SP3 e	781019	Mr & Mrs B Morgan		4614	Objecting	Object to amount of housing currently proposed for Herne Bay. Developments will cause huge problems pressure on nursery school places and doctor surgeries. Herne will lose its village status and join it with other communities. Create further traffic problems.	
Policy SP3 e	781038	Mr T J Fallon		4653	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Strode Farm because it would result in the village of Herne losing its identity, the existing infrastructure can barely serve the needs of the existing community, and it would lead to an increase in traffic and noise pollution in the Bullockstone Road area.	
Policy SP3 e	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4736	Objecting	No direct impact on designated sites. The impact of the development on the Thanet Coast SSSIs needs to be assessed and considered. The site is grade 3 Agricultural Land - this loss must be justified in terms of need and alternatives.	
Policy SP3 e	766602	Mr John Elson		4896	Objecting	Object to the development proposals at Strode Farm because there would be a loss of amenity space and productive farmland, a harmful effect on established wildlife; and the village of Herne would lose its identity. The site is prone to surface water flooding, and if developed the risk to other areas, upstream and downstream would increase. Finally, too little emphasis is being placed on infrastructure to support the proposed development i.e. schooling and medical facilities	
Policy SP3 e	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4891	Objecting	The strategic development site in Herne Bay are to share the costs of a relief road. Locking these sites together, to fund such a scheme, regardless of their individual situation seems complex and high risk.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	781923	Ms Barbara Jackson		4915	Objecting	Concerned about Strode Farm proposals and the road works. The number of houses is too high, and the likelihood of flooding, the inadequacy of water and sewage provision, the impact on schools and doctors' surgeries, is of great concern. I cannot see that the Bullockstone Road improvement, which will be necessary, is practical. Loss of village identity and insufficient services. It will cost more than expected. There is no good local reason for this scale of development and where will they work.	
Policy SP3 e	781930	Neil Yates & family		4924	Objecting	Object, to plan to build 1800+ new homes between Herne, Herne Bay and Greenhill. Our number one concern is the lack of road capacity to deal with such a large influx of new residents and development related traffic. We have not been given clear details of how and when developers will meet these costs. Concerned that Herne will completely lose it's village identity, as there will be nothing seperating the three communities. Proposed numbers are in excess of what is feasible and necessary.	
Policy SP3 e	380690	Hollamby Estates		4973	Supporting	HEL broadly supports the proposed strategic site allocation under Policy SP 3 (e), subject to changes in the type and scale of development, and clarification and changes to the Council's approach to the phasing and delivery of development on the site.	
Policy SP3 e	380690	Hollamby Estates		4979	Objecting	The last approach to the viability and delivery of the relief road is for the Council to propose more retail floor space on the Strode Farm site, and to resist retail development on Altira and the Golf Club sites. A significant retail development on the site would also help reduce traffic leaving Herne Bay to go to Asda in Canterbury, and claw back traffic flow from the Sturry Road Crossing. Retail development would bring employment and boost the local economy.	The last approach to the viability and delivery of the relief road is for the Council to propose more retail floor space on the Strode Farm site, and to resist retail development on Altira and the Golf Club sites.
Policy SP3 e	380690	Hollamby Estates		4980	Objecting	The amount of employment floor space proposed by the Consultation Document should be scaled down significantly. Clearly, the need for and viability of development of new employment floor space should be questioned, and the Council's position changed. However, if the Council considered that the term 'employment generating' might provide more flexibility to provide more flexibility to providing new commercial development on the site.	The amount of employment floor space proposed by the Consultation Document should be scaled down significantly. Clearly, the need for and viability of development of new employment floor space should be questioned, and the Council's position changed. However, if the Council considered that the term 'employment generating' might provide more flexibility to provide more flexibility to providing new commercial development on the site.
Policy SP3 e	782023	Mr Graham P Jackson		4962	Objecting	Object to development at Strode Farm. Number of dwellings is disproportionate with the size of the site; it is overdevelopment unsuited to its locality; no effortis made either to provide amenity to the village community or new residents; impacts on amenity, quality of life and identity have been ignored; the highways provision is conspicuous by its absence; congestion and pollution will unfairly affect the sick and disabled residents; and the development is out of character with the locality.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	127115	B.J. Gore		5280	Objecting	Objection to Strode Farm. The Council is being two-faced in its approach. On the one hand it promotes open space as providing health and social well-being, whilst on the other it proposes to take away Kingsmead Field in the City, Dengrove Wood Sturry, Strode Farm and S Canterbury. All the "amenity spaces" in the world cannot compete with nor replace these areas. The areas also assist considerably in air cleansing and improvement of air quality.	
Policy SP3 e	781721	Ms Lynne Broadbent		5180	Objecting	The draft Local Plan needs to be far more balanced in terms of the number and location of new houses i.e. access to services, more specific in terms of business and employment opportunities and much clearer in terms of addressing existing traffic and infrastructure issues.	
Policy SP3 e	781738	Anne & Francis Entwistle		5166	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for 3000 new houses in and around the Herne and Herne Bay area. Concerned that the village of Herne will lose its identity and community, the existing infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional demands; as well as cause environmental destruction on a huge scale.	
Policy SP3 e	781787	Mrs D Hills		5262	Objecting	Object to the development proposals at Strode Farm because the roads would not be able to cope with the increased traffic, the existing infrastructure i.e. gas, electric is already at capacity at would require investment, it would result in the loss of grade 3 agricultural land and is within a flood risk zone; and there is no mention of any additional health care facilities.	
Policy SP3 e	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5357	Objecting	Request 3 amendments to policy SP3e. Site survey identified insufficient sewerage capacity in the network to accommodate increased demand. Development should connect instead to the nearest point of capacity and any new infrastructure provided. Sewerage infrastructure crosses the site. Development layout should ensure this is not built on and a 6-13m easement. Diversions at the developers cost. Amend as outlined	Include in the 'Infrastructure' section of policy SP3e: The development must provide a connection to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by Southern Water. Include in the 'Other' section of policy SP3e: Development proposals must ensure future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.
Policy SP3 e	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5530	Objecting	I object strongly to the inclusion of the strategic site at Strode Farm (site 5)	Change required: Removal of site 5. The inclusion of some significant sites in larger villages and along railway corridors in close proximity to railway stations, land to the south at Hersden and development of a sustainable new residential area at Yorkletts on lower grade agricultural land (not on the SHLAA sites investigated there). Commitment is required to more investigative work re-Howe Barracks and Canterbury Prison for potential new housing.
Policy SP3 e	784601	R & D Hill		5416	Objecting	We wish to record our objections to the inclusion of Strode Farm in the local plan.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	784622	Mr Paul R Tapsell		5481	Objecting	Opposed to the building of hundreds of houses in the green area between the village of Herne and Herne Bay town. Herne has been a village for over 800 years, far longer than Herne Bay has existed. Filling the clear area between Herne and Herne bay would instantly destroy Herne's ancient identity as a separate village by turning it into a district of Herne Bay: a fate which has been allowed to happen to other Kent villages, such as St. Peter's in Thanet. Please do not destroy our village	Please do not destroy our village
Policy SP3 e	784623	Sheila Tapsell		5484	Objecting	Disapproves of the large amount of proposed development around Herne and Broomfield. The strong village identity will merge into Herne Bay. It will make traffic issues worse. Developers will have to pay for road improvements before the development is built. What if money runs out? More development would have to mean a new school, Herne Bay High is packed to capacity.	
Policy SP3 e	785169	Ms Susan O'Leary		5988	Objecting	I would like to express my opposition to the proposed development at the above sites. I feel that development of the above areas would have a detrimental effect on the locality and is not in keeping with the area in general. The intensity of the proposed developments is a great concern, particularly the impact they will have on Herne Village in terms of its identity; level of housing disproportionate to the village; traffic congestion and impact on the environment.	
Policy SP3 e	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6017	Objecting	Strode Farm: Positives: including benefits of Herne by-pass, employment floor space, speciefied amenities and facilities, funding for infrastructure changes. Uncertainties: including sufficient funding for infrastructure, delivery of jobs close to the houses, meeting the needs of local communities. Negatives: the strength of local feeling, increased traffic on the A291/A28 in Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 e	785239	C & J Marks		6249	Objecting	Object to Strode Park Farm for the following reasons: Over development for the area. No traffic figures supplied. Traffic through Herne village is already unable to cope at certain times of the day and comes to a grinding halt. No details of the Relief Road, how wil this be brought up to standard of A road? Green gap will be lost. Flooding issues Lower Herne and Bullockstone roads. Impact on hospitals. loss of good agricultural land when brownfield available. Infrastructure must be built first.	
Policy SP3 e	785216	Mr Chris Bacon		6947	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Strode Farm as it would destroy the identity of Herne village by becoming part of Greenhill and Herne Bay. Other concerns include the scale of the development being too great and the capacity of existing infrastructure i.e. water supply and drainage.	The number of new houses proposed in the area should be significantly reduced. The development of the golf course may be a good compromise.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 e	785222	Ms Pam Bacon		6946	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Strode Farm as it would destroy the identity of Herne as a result of losing its green gap and becoming part of Greenhill and Herne Bay. Other concerns include the scale of the development being too great, flooding and the capacity of existing infrastructure i.e. water supply and drainage.	The development of the golf course is an option as this would not impact too much for the residents of Herne. This would also give a good amount of housing in a controlled space.
Policy SP3 f	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		78	Objecting	No mention of open space; of public transport; of either walking or cycling provisions.	
Policy SP3 f	14082	Mr George Johnson		220	Objecting	Too many houses proposed in Herne Bay and not enough infrastructure. It will cause problems.	Much less housing of high quality which will be unsuitable for the rental sector.
Policy SP3 f	117585	Cllr Nick Eden-Green		196	Supporting	Focus development at Herne Bay to deliver Herne Bypass	Remove South Canterbury and other sites not listed above.
Policy SP3 f	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		340	Objecting	Strategic allocation should have an indicative layout map. Cycle and footpath infrastructure should be allocated as detailed in the attached annotated map.	Strategic allocation should have an indicative layout map. Cycle and footpath infrastructure should be allocated as detailed in the attached annotated map.
Policy SP3 f	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	151	Supporting	It is recommended that the following sites be considered which are in the draft Local Plan: Herne Bay Site -Land at Greenhill, Herne Bay, 600 dwellings	
Policy SP3 f	769850	Ms Jean White		179	Objecting	Concerned about is losing the identity between the areas Greenhill/Herne/Hillborough/Broomfield. How can you envisage these large developments before a reservoir is built! What consideration has been given to schools which are already oversubscribed. What support would new shops recieve? If people wanted to come to Herne Bay why hasn't the area by Homebase been developed? Where are the jobs, can new residents commute?	Thanet is one of the most deprived areas, so only London would offer job prospects. Please give more thought to ruining to area.
Policy SP3 f	775396	Mrs Rachel Blair		459	Objecting	Objects to additional houses because there are no schools mentioned and the current Herne School is full, there is a lack of new roads and Herne is already a bottleneck for traffic, School Lane is too narrow to take additional traffic, the widening of Bullockstone Road will be inadequate and the area will lose its identity becoming one huge housing estate.	
Policy SP3 f	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1248	Objecting	The Council does appreciate the positives associated with new housing as this will enliven the area and meet future housing needs, but there are many negatives. Development at these strategic sites will result in an increase in traffic volume for both the A28 and the Sturry/Broad Oak area north of Sturry Crossing. Further traffic congestion leads to an additional increase in air pollution, which affects residents (incl lung cancer) and wildlife (RAMSAR/SSSI).	All five strategic sites converge on the A28 and the Sturry level crossing. It is important that incentives for motorists to use the new roads be put into place.
Policy SP3 f	777483	Mrs E E Kenward		1438	Objecting	Concerning the proposal to build 1,000 properties on the former Golf Course, Strode Farm, Greenhill and Hillborough. I have concerns over transport facilities, schools and affordable housing aslo doctors, dentists and hospitlas being overstretched.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 f	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1735	Objecting	Site 6 (SP3f) requires new transport infrastructure on third party land, the funding and delivery of which is uncertain given the current economic climate, land ownership issues and lack of available public funding. The significant reliance that the Local Plan strategy places on delivery of this site within the Plan period is unsound.	Include under Policy SP3 the allocation of an additional Strategic Site at Bodkin Farm, Chesterfield, Whitstable (as per the site details provided under our representation to Policy SP3a).
Policy SP3 f	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1716	Objecting	Any and all Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL, aka S106 Developer Contributions) raised in Herne Bay must be spent in Herne Bay. In the unlikely event that CIL revenue exceeds Herne Bay's needs - we do have a Pier to build, after all - the money should retained for future Herne Bay requirements.	CIL raised in Herne Bay must be spent in Herne Bay.
Policy SP3 f	778228	Mrs Ann Blatherwick		1886	Objecting	I consider 600 homes in Greenhill is also too great.	
Policy SP3 f	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1897	Objecting	Too much development planned for Herne Bay. Why should Sturry and Thanet benefit from the money from this development? People here would be more likely to commute towards London than Canterbury.	Drop the spending of development monies in Sturry
Policy SP3 f	778402	Mr Mark Hunter		2175	Objecting	My objection is prompted by the proposal for local intense development at Greenhill. My objection is based on the excessive destruction of our countryside. I would beg you to stop these high density developments and consider better use of the existing spaces in our towns and villages, not to mention the use of brownfield sites and the refurbishment or demolition of buildings currently in poor states of repair.	
Policy SP3 f	778655	Ms Nikki Ward		2274	Objecting	I strongly object the large development being proposed at Greenhill. Will there be enough employment locally for new residents of these estates? There will be an impact on infrastructure - roads/traffic/schooling/utilities nad noise/air pollution/ traffic etc will be increased. There will be a loss of 'open space nad overall impacts on people's quality of life.	
Policy SP3 f	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2400	Objecting	No mention of open space; of public transport; of either walking or cycling provisions.	
Policy SP3 f	773048	Mrs J Moran		2637	Objecting	The proposals to develop more areas in Herne and Herne Bay along with the proposed sites in Sturry Parish, will put a considerable strain on all the local infrastructure, but a road bypassing Sturry and joining the A28 as suggested, will not solve the City Councils traffic problems. Will the utility services, schools, medical and other services be able to cope?	
Policy SP3 f	778762	Mrs Wendy Dinley		2338	Objecting	This has now given us pockets of land in the middle of farmland that you are proposing to build over 12,000 homes on with roads that will exit onto Bullockstone Road, which is already a rat run to Canterbury and could become a major accident black-spot. There is a lack if infrastructure in Herne Bay to accommodate the families that will move into these proposed new homes.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 f	778771	P Kelk		2328	Objecting	Increase noise and traffic pollution due to huge volume of traffic that will come from the village of Herne and Herne Bay developments that you say must come towards Canterbury and come through Broad Oak. You must find other routes on the Thanet Way to take that traffic not bring it towards Sturry and Broad Oak.	
Policy SP3 f	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2726	Objecting	The housing provision in Herne and Broomfield and surrounds is excessive. All of the sites will impact on Herne Village, roads, schools, shops, environment. Concerned about road improvements, compulsory purchase, the by-pass being fit for purpose and funding availability. Few jobs will be provided where people live so car use will be high. Hillborough is too large results in loss of agricultural land. Reduce numbers to 500.	The Greenhill site should be reduced from 600 to a maximum of 400 dwellings.
Policy SP3 f	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2626	Objecting	The proposed strategic allocations are all dependent upon significant strategic infrastructure. However, neither the Local Plan nor its evidence base demonstrates that these sites are economically viable and can deliver not only dwelling completions but the necessary essential strategic infrastructure.	Allocate land at New Thanington
Policy SP3 f	779129	J Robinson		2664	Objecting	Whilst appreciating the need for additional housing in the Canterbury and District area, I am alarmed at the proposals for the large number of properties to be built in the Herne and Herne Bay areas. The present infrastructure is inadequate for the current population. The road system could not possibly cope with the additional traffic.	
Policy SP3 f	779130	Mrs D Phippard		2720	Objecting	Raised concerns about a sewage spill. Objects to the huge housing developments in Herne Bay, Herne Village, Bullockstone Rd, Greenhill, Strode Farm and the golf club, because: some are on flood plain; no plans for sewage, the system is under strain now; planners should create a new village further inland with enough space for services, include Sturry or Canterbury.	create a new village further inland with enough space for services, at Sturry or Canterbury.
Policy SP3 f	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3026	Objecting	We could find no masterplan for this site and it is therefore difficult to assess whether the development will contain adequate natural open space to deflect new residents away from the Natura 2000 and Ramsar network and LWS. Concened about recreational pressure on Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay (potentially severe individual and in-combination impact - Canterbury, Dover and Thanet housing in close proximity), and Blean Complex and West Blean and Thornden Woods SSSI and Red House Farm LWS.	We would recommend that within the site specific policy the quantum of natural open space to be delivered as part of the development is specified to ensure adequate on-site mitigation is provided. To ensure that the integrity of the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay site is not compromised there is a need to collect visitor and disturbance data in relation to existing pressure and formulate a Strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy to ensure visitor control is adequate within the SPA and sufficient natural open space is available to detract visitors from using the coast for dog walking. Blean Complex SAC, West Blean and Thornden Woods SSSI will also require a Strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy. It is important that residents are deflected from using the Red House Farm LWS by creating similar natural habitat within the development site.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 f	779334	Loraine & Robert Gardiner		2884	Objecting	Object to development proposals at Greenhill. It would merge Herne with Herne Bay and lose its identity; there are already not enough school places to meet demand - this would only get worse; it would become more difficult to see a doctor; and traffic would increase significantly. Herne should be left as a village, the village does not have the amenities to sustain the level of development proposed.	
Policy SP3 f	779564	Mr J Tinker		2907	Supporting	Supports development at Hersden as it would enhance the existing community and has no obvious agricultural purpose.	
Policy SP3 f	777509	Mrs Monica Blyth		3154	Objecting	The development at Greenhill should be reduced by 50%.	The development at Greenhill should be reduced by 50%.
Policy SP3 f	780803	Mr & Mrs T Coleman		3487	Objecting	We wish to register our objection to the proposals to build vast amounts of housing etc in the area of Herne and Herne Bay.	
Policy SP3 f	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3561	Objecting	I wish to object to the proposed development in Greenhill, Herne Bay. The scale of development proposed in Herne & Herne Bay will totally surround the parish of Herne and Broomfield almost doubling its size.	
Policy SP3 f	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3772	Objecting	Two sites in the area which I am told were agreed in the last plan, but have not yet been developed Greenhill (and Bullockstone Road). Surely these sites should be the priority sites and no others should be considered until these are developed. If housing is so important and all that are built can be sold then the question has to be asked - 'Why has no developer taken on these two sites?' The simple answer is that they can not make a profit.	
Policy SP3 f	406328	Mr Daniel Smith		4530	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Herne Bay because the area has already been significantly damaged by excessive building. The town needs focused employment opportunities via improved transport links to London and the development of sites in the town centre that are under-used or un-used.	
Policy SP3 f	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4484	Supporting	Land at Greenhill, Herne Bay. Accept the allocation of this site for development as proposed, subject to support from the local community.	
Policy SP3 f	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4737	Objecting	No direct impact on designated sites. The impact of the development on the Thanet Coast SSSIs needs to be assessed and considered. The site is grade 3 Agricultural Land - this loss must be justified in terms of need and alternatives.	
Policy SP3 f	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4892	Objecting	The strategic development site in Herne Bay are to share the costs of a relief road. Locking these sites together, to fund such a scheme, regardless of their individual situation seems complex and high risk.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 f	781930	Neil Yates & family		4925	Objecting	Object, to plan to build 1800+ new homes between Herne, Herne Bay and Greenhill. Our number one concern is the lack of road capacity to deal with such a large influx of new residents and development related traffic. We have not been given clear details of how and when developers will meet these costs. Concerned that Herne will completely lose it's village identity, as there will be nothing seperating the three communities. Proposed numbers are in excess of what is feasible and necessary.	
Policy SP3 f	380690	Hollamby Estates		4974	Supporting	HEL broadly supports the proposed strategic site allocation under Policy SP3 (f), subject to some changes and clarification in what the Council is seeking through the linked Policy QL7.	
Policy SP3 f	781721	Ms Lynne Broadbent		5181	Objecting	The draft Local Plan needs to be far more balanced in terms of the number and location of new houses i.e. access to services, more specific in terms of business and employment opportunities and much clearer in terms of addressing existing traffic and infrastructure issues.	
Policy SP3 f	781738	Anne & Francis Entwistle		5167	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for 3000 new houses in and around the Herne and Herne Bay area. Concerned that the village of Herne will lose its identity and community, the existing infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional demands; as well as cause environmental destruction on a huge scale.	
Policy SP3 f	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5359	Objecting	Request 2 amendments to policy SP3a. Site survey identified insufficient sewerage capacity in the network to accommodate increased demand. Development should connect instead to the nearest point of capacity and any new infrastructure provided. Sewerage infrastructure crosses the site. Development layout should ensure this is not built on and a 6-13m easement. Diversions at the developers cost. Amend as outlined	Add to the 'Infrastructure' section of policy SP3f : The development must provide a connection to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by Southern Water. Add to the 'Other' section of policy SP3f: Development proposals must ensure future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.
Policy SP3 f	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5897	Objecting	Indicates a requirement for community facilities. Please include: fully accessible community facilities that caters for all age groups and vulnerable people. €“ This will cater for FSC clients. All community facilities to be determined in conjunction with parish, district councils and KCC service providers.	Indicates a requirement for community facilities. Please include: fully accessible community facilities that caters for all age groups and vulnerable people. €“ This will cater for FSC clients. All community facilities to be determined in conjunction with parish, district councils and KCC service providers
Policy SP3 f	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6018	Objecting	Land at Greenhill: Positives: Potential funding contribution for the Sturry infrastructure. Uncertainties: These plans actually meet the needs of the local community and they will be sustainable in the future. Negatives: Amenities and facilities not specified, possible increase in traffic on the A291/A28 into Canterbury.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	769487	Ms Christine Buchan		145	Supporting	Re :Land to the North of Thanet Way, Whitstable. I think the allocation of this site for development will be an advantage for all. Whitstable as a town is growing, and has a lot to offer. It accommodates people of all ages and more affordable housing is needed. This is an ideal site, not only for accessibility but it will have the added benefit of Duncan Doen which will provide all the pleasures of the countryside within walking distance.	
Policy SP3 g	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		423	Supporting	We fully support the allocation of policy SP3g Land off Thanet Way, Whitstable for around 400 dwellings together with the extension of Duncan Down Country Park, additional open space and allotments. The developer and landowner have and will continue to engage with Friends of Duncan Down (FODD) and the local community/stakeholders and have undertaken numerous studies in support of this site's housing allocation.	
Policy SP3 g	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		342	Objecting	The foot & cycle connectivity must extend into and across the site. It must be used as an opportunity to improve foot & cycle connectivity for adjacent residential areas.	The foot & cycle connectivity must extend into and across the site. It is important that road connectivity is not formed across the site so as to create a shortcut for motor vehicle traffic.
Policy SP3 g	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	154	Supporting	It is recommended that the following site be considered which is in the draft Local Plan: Whitstable Site- North of Thanet Way, Whitstable - 400 dwellings	
Policy SP3 g	772403	Ms Tracey Inge		217	Supporting	Supports the development north of the Thanet Way at Whitstable. It will provided needed houses and open space.	
Policy SP3 g	775994	Mr Neil Strand		615	Supporting	Development sites under policy SP3 of the Canterbury City Council draft local plan. Site to provide 400 dwellings with open space for the development on the north side of the A2990 at Whitstable for housing and open space. I would suggest it is the best area available for the town's future growth. No other land in Whitstable can offer a good site being that it adjoins existing development and has a natural barrier in the A2990 to contain it.	
Policy SP3 g	777230	Mrs Teresa Lucchesi		780	Supporting	Supports proposals at Thanet Way as the site is considered to be un-farmable after a number of incidents over the past 40 years; it is in close proximity to a range of local services; and there is a need for affordable housing in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	777427	Ms L S Easton		755	Supporting	I support the draft allocation on the Thanet Way site, Whitstable. It is in a sustainable location which can take its access from the Thanet Way, thereby limiting any impact on surrounding residential streets. The ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development and will be kept as enhanced open space. Development has been limited to arable fields which are the least value in ecological terms . It will also provide much need recreational facilities.	
Policy SP3 g	355426	Cllr Ashley Clark	Secretary Friends of Duncan Downs	1019	Objecting	Page 22 of the Consultation document mentions "Extension to Duncan Down Country Park€". Duncan Down is not a Country Park. It is an area of 5 continuous village greens totalling some 52 acres. The area is registered as a local wildlife site.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	355426	Cllr Ashley Clark	Secretary Friends of Duncan Downs	1020	Objecting	The strategic development site map is misleading in that Gorrell Wood and Benacre Wood appear to be part of the development. They are not as they already form part of the Duncan Down Village green having been awarded village green status in 2007 and 2011 respectively.	
Policy SP3 g	355426	Cllr Ashley Clark	Secretary Friends of Duncan Downs	1024	Supporting	On balance it is felt that the benefits to the local community in terms of public open space, allotment provision and enhancement of a locally important wildlife area provide something that mitigates the pain to a level that the majority can accept. Open space provision, allotments, landscaping and green burial provision is supported.	Accordingly we feel we can give our qualified support to the proposal but would ask that a number of matters are considered and these we outline below. We accept that some of these points may be more relevant to any Development Brief at some future stage but we feel that these matters are best raised at the earliest opportunity. The housing area: In our negotiations with Devine Homes we arrived at a figure of some 300 houses. We would prefer a low density quality development than the 400 quoted. WE OBJECT TO THE NUMBER OF HOUSES QUOTED The primary access from a roundabout on the Old Thanet Way is both safer and sensible. It will help reduce speeds along this section of road. There should be absolutely no vehicular access from St Davids or St Marks Close There is a need for landscaping on the western side of Golden Hill to soften things for current residents Some access by vehicle via St Lukes Close might be advantageous to mitigate extra traffic in Millstood Road and to serve residents of the new estate as well as existing residents from the Grimshill area by reducing journey lengths. WE OBJECT TO THERE BEING NO OPTION ON THE PLAN FOR VEHICULAR INGRESS AND EGRESS FROM THE GRIMSHILL ESTATE Foot/bicycle routes across the development are useful particularly those that will afford access to Tesco and the Community College from those living in the Grimshill Estate area.(It should be noted that persons residing in this area did create routes across the current agricultural land much to the annoyance of the farmer)
Policy SP3 g	355426	Cllr Ashley Clark	Secretary Friends of Duncan Downs	1025	Objecting	In our negotiations with Devine Homes we arrived at a figure of some 300 houses. We would prefer a low density quality development than the 400 quoted. WE OBJECT TO THE NUMBER OF HOUSES QUOTED	
Policy SP3 g	355426	Cllr Ashley Clark	Secretary Friends of Duncan Downs	1026	Objecting	€Some access by vehicle via St Lukes Close might be advantageous to mitigate extra traffic in Millstood Road and to serve residents of the new estate as well as existing residents from the Grimshill area by reducing journey lengths. WE OBJECT TO THERE BEING NO OPTION ON THE PLAN FOR VEHICULAR INGRESS AND EGRESS FROM THE GRIMSHILL ESTATE	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	355426	Cllr Ashley Clark	Secretary Friends of Duncan Downs	1028	Objecting	Unfortunately the plan produced (and we are aware that this is shown for illustrative purposes only) has the open space provision, the allotments and green burial in the wrong areas. What is shown represents a very early plan for the area and does not reflect the consultation we have had. We have since refined the plan with a sketch over an aerial photograph. [Additional observations are made in representation about reason for preferred locations for allotments and green burial allocations].	We object strongly to the land allocation as currently displayed on the indicative layout and ask that it be made in accordance with the sketch that we have produced.
Policy SP3 g	777234	Mrs Sandra Englefield		823	Supporting	Supports the development of houses at Whitstable as they are needed and the extension of Duncan Down. The situation of the development is perfect as it adjoins the town.	
Policy SP3 g	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	992	Objecting	Unfortunately the plan produced (and we are aware that this is shown for illustrative purposes only) has the open space provision, the allotments and green burial in the wrong areas. What is shown represents a very early plan for the area and does not reflect the consultation we have had. We have since refined the plan with a sketch over an aerial photograph. [Additional observations are made in representation about reason for preferred locations for allotments and green burial allocations].	We object strongly to the land allocation as currently displayed on the indicative layout and ask that it be made in accordance with the sketch that we have produced.
Policy SP3 g	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	985	Supporting	On balance it is felt that the benefits to the local community in terms of public open space, allotment provision and enhancement of a locally important wildlife area provide something that mitigates the pain to a level that the majority can accept. Open space provision, allotments, landscaping and green burial provision is supported.	Accordingly we feel we can give our qualified support to the proposal but would ask that a number of matters are considered and these we outline below. We accept that some of these points may be more relevant to any Development Brief at some future stage but we feel that these matters are best raised at the earliest opportunity. The housing area: In our negotiations with Devine Homes we arrived at a figure of some 300 houses. We would prefer a low density quality development than the 400 quoted. WE OBJECT TO THE NUMBER OF HOUSES QUOTED The primary access from a roundabout on the Old Thanet Way is both safer and sensible. It will help reduce speeds along this section of road. There should be absolutely no vehicular access from St Davids or St Marks Close There is a need for landscaping on the western side of Golden Hill to soften things for current residents Some access by vehicle via St Lukes Close might be advantageous to mitigate extra traffic in Millstood Road and to serve residents of the new estate as well as existing residents from the Grimshill area by reducing journey lengths. WE OBJECT TO THERE BEING NO OPTION ON THE PLAN FOR VEHICULAR INGRESS AND EGRESS FROM THE GRIMSHILL ESTATE Foot/bicycle routes across the development are useful particularly those that will afford access to Tesco and the Community College from those living in the Grimshill Estate area.(It should be noted that persons residing in this area did create routes across the current agricultural land much to the annoyance of the farmer)

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	989	Objecting	In our negotiations with Devine Homes we arrived at a figure of some 300 houses. We would prefer a low density quality development than the 400 quoted. WE OBJECT TO THE NUMBER OF HOUSES QUOTED	
Policy SP3 g	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	990	Objecting	€Some access by vehicle via St Lukes Close might be advantageous to mitigate extra traffic in Millstood Road and to serve residents of the new estate as well as existing residents from the Grimshill area by reducing journey lengths. WE OBJECT TO THERE BEING NO OPTION ON THE PLAN FOR VEHICULAR INGRESS AND EGRESS FROM THE GRIMSHILL ESTATE	
Policy SP3 g	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	973	Objecting	Page 22 of the Consultation document mentions "Extension to Duncan Down Country Park€". Duncan Down is not a Country Park. It is an area of 5 continuous village greens totalling some 52 acres. The area is registered as a local wildlife site.	
Policy SP3 g	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	974	Objecting	The strategic development site map is misleading in that Gorrell Wood and Benacre Wood appear to be part of the development. They are not as they already form part of the Duncan Down Village green having been awarded village green status in 2007 and 2011 respectively.	
Policy SP3 g	778555	Mr Ken Little	agent SMPL	1296	Objecting	The Sustainability Appraisals are in particular at SHLAA 135 flawed. No CCC officer visited our site. No verification or visit was undertaken by Entec/Amec on our site. The owners at SHLAA 135 were not updated, or advised of any restraints [if any] on our site. CCC officers never acknowledged our site for-100% Social housing, New Grammar school, a Holiday park, or a holiday/residential park. CCC has the site area incorrectly assessed [size]. CCC officers have not contacted us since 2009.	Re-commence the S A process on all the SHLAA sites BUT this time with officers visit to the sites with the owners on site [with the Pro-forma form] so that a Full appraisal with all the facts can be undertaken, any restraints to be noted on site and a consultation undertaken to see if they can be resolved. An agreement that the S A has been fully acknowledged and agreed [by the parties] before CCC officers reject or accept any given site. That process is what we understand should have occurred but on our site it did not, hence a flawed process.
Policy SP3 g	778555	Mr Ken Little	agent SMPL	1299	Objecting	The Government Inspector stated in 2005 Public Inquiry Report this site is valuable farm land. Government Practise guidelines state Agriculture land should not be used unless their are no alternative site available there are available sites one opposite this site. The Inspector said-"this site is visible from a large part of the Thanet Way the A2990, so the effects of encroaching suburbanisation would be magnified if it were developed".	The Duncan Down site should be excluded from the Local Draft Plan it is too valuable a site for Nature, and the community. There are many better site options as we have demonstarted if the S A's were corectly undertaken. GPG state Agriculture land should not be used. AONAB should not be used this site is a AONAB, it has four Village Greens abutting the site. The inducement from Devine Homes is not a viable consideration, the site [land] can be bought back for the community by the €1 Million pound alternative offer from SHLAA 135. The problem is CCC officers and Members have rejected our site that would include the offer, it is totally un-democratic not to have given Whitstable residents this alternative to the Divine Homes offer.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	778555	Mr Ken Little	agent SMPL	1300	Objecting	At the Inquiry into the 1998 Local Plan this site was rejected by the Government Inspector. The value of the site to the community has been enhanced since it has received Two more Village green status sites [since what the Inspector said in 1998] at or next to this proposed site. AT SHLAA 042 next to Duncan Down CCC officers S A's states-This is a "very sensitive site" regarding biodiversity. Protected species highly likely; scoping survey necessary. NO such concerns at Duncan Down!	Reject the site based upon what Two Government Inspectors have previously stated. Reject the site on Biodiversity issues, and being a Sensitive nature site. Reject the site on GPG none use of Agriculture land. Reject the site as CCC have done with SHLAA 042 based upon the S A's that must be the same as the two sites are meters apart. It is inconsisteant One site endorsed by CCC, one rejected by CCC... on their CCC officers S A's.
Policy SP3 g	778555	Mr Ken Little	agent SMPL	1301	Objecting	The land that Devine Homes want to give us cannot be built on [Devine Homes would if it could]. One parcel of land sits next to Benacre Woods, Village Green 256 the other area sits in between VG 256 and VG 240 beyond that lays VG 232 and VG 124. The "value" of the land [to be given away] is very small compared to the 100 Million Pound "windfall" Devine Homes will get. Building on or near this site will destroy Nature, the Biodiversity, and the Character of the area it is too high a cost.	Canterbury Council should use the alternative site opposite at SHLAA 135, or other sites locally that will save nature's food basket, and the communities food basket [3b Agriculture land]. The site Duncan Down is too valuable to lose to the bulldozer, and concrete. We want "affordable homes" not executive homes on any land that is left in Whitstable to build on as defined by Canterbury Council officers as "little left" but that is not why Duncan Down should be used, there are alternatives... one meteres away.
Policy SP3 g	778555	Mr Ken Little	agent SMPL	1293	Objecting	An alternative site is directly opposite SHLAA 001 that is available it is SHLAA 135. The site owners have offered a £1 Million pound inducement to save Duncan Down from the developers and to protect Duncan Down into perpetuity. Duncan Down is a Nature site with huge benefits to the community. The owners at SHLAA 135 are offering a better option than Devine Homes offer, theirs is a better alternative, and a better site. We would buy and give Whitstable the whole site and save it from building.	CCC should use the many alternatie sites it has to date rejected SHLAA 135, SHLAA 178. SHLAA 192 that are all better options than the valuable Duncan Down site
Policy SP3 g	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1778	Objecting	We have had mixed comments from our membership regarding this development. We have serious concerns that the initial consultation was for 250 to 300 houses, and yet it has increased to 400 & an area consulted on has been removed completely. A disproportionate amount of building has occurred in this area in recent years and concerns for infrastructure are highlighted by our members together with the development being located next to existing properties rather than spread on the site.	If this development is to go ahead, reduce the number of properties to 250-300 maximum as was initially proposed and consulted on at the beginning of this project. Include the sloping area included in the consultation to extend development area. Mitigate against the development along the existing residential boundaries by spreading development on the site and adding buffering and/or open space to reduce the impact to existing residents, possibly including bungalows (existing residents side), to once again reduce impact on existing residents. Create more than one exit/entry and include a roundabout as a condition of the building.
Policy SP3 g	778382	Ms Suzanna Steward		1862	Supporting	Supports the plans for north of the Thanet Way in principle. Enlarging Duncan Down Village Green is excellent as are the green burial ground and allotments. But the allotments would be best next development for easy access and the burial ground between Benacre and Gorrell Wood. Also a less dense development of 300 houses would allow an improved area for residents, carparking and landscaping.	Reduce the number of houses to 300 and move the burial ground to between Benacre and Gorrell Wood

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	778640	Ms Daphne Ellis		1647	Supporting	The area of North of the Thanet Way in principle I support this proposal, but would like to see the number of houses reduced to about 300 as was published. Duncan Down Village Green being enlarged is an excellent use of some of the land.	
Policy SP3 g	778079	Mr & Mrs Roger & Felicity Cornish		2208	Objecting	We would prefer to see three hundred homes rather than four hundred - giving the new households a better quality of life. It is very important that the land outlined to extend Duncan Down is protected by village green status. This will protect it for the future to be used by the people of the town as it grows. Allotments, a green burial site plus play facilities are also all desirable amenities, giving both people and nature they need. Beneficial to Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	778079	Mr & Mrs Roger & Felicity Cornish		2210	Objecting	We have noticed there are some inaccuracies in the illustrative lay-out of the "strategic development site, Thanet Way, Whitstable"but understand that these have been notified to you.	
Policy SP3 g	778079	Mr & Mrs Roger & Felicity Cornish		2211	Objecting	It is very important that the land outlined to extend Duncan Down is protected by village green status.	
Policy SP3 g	778932	Ms Mary Lerigo		2522	Supporting	Support development proposals land north of the Thanet Way. Would like to see high quality housing; with energy and water saving solutions; adequate car parking; and innovative designs to screen waste and recycling bins. Supports the proposal to enlarge the Duncan Down Village Green and would welcome a green burial site and allotments	The green burial site would do well between Benacre Wood and Gorrell Wood; and the allotments would be best placed next to the development.
Policy SP3 g	779133	Ms Rebecca Strand		2567	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779135	Helen A Miles		2566	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779136	J Weekes		2565	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	779139	B R Strand		2564	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779154	Ms Allison Bennett		2563	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779172	Mr Ross Buchan		2562	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779182	Mr W Buchan		2561	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779187	E Milsted		2560	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779188	Mr V Wood		2559	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	779708	B Hurlock		2549	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779712	E Hurlock		2548	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779734	R A Clayson		2554	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779735	Ms Rachel Clayson		2553	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779736	Mr Colin Clayson		2552	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779737	Sian Hulse		2551	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	779740	Miss J Clayson		2550	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779892	M Hurlock		2558	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779894	Mrs L M Lodge		2557	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779903	Mrs E J Clayson		2556	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	
Policy SP3 g	779906	Mr Scott Clayson		2555	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is in a logical sustainable position with limited impacts on residential streets; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3028	Objecting	We welcome the extensive areas of open space that is present around the LWS. This may provide alternative opportunities to recreate, however they LWS must be protected from increases in pressure where possible. Concened about recreational pressure on Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay (potentially severe individual and in-combination impact - Canterbury, Dover and Thanet housing in close proximity), and Bleran Complex SAC, West Blean and Thornden Woods SSSI and Duincan Downs LWS.	We would recommend that within the site specific policy the quantum of natural open space to be delivered as part of the development is specified to ensure adequate on-site mitigation is provided. We would recommend that the boundary of the LWS is buffered by 15m and discussions with KWT take place to negotiate clauses in the policy to protect the LWS. To ensure that the integrity of the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay site is not compromised there is a need to collect visitor and disturbance data in relation to existing pressure and formulate a Strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy to ensure visitor control is adequate within the SPA and sufficient natural open space is available to detract visitors from using the coast for dog walking. Blean Complex SAC and West Blean and Thornden Woods SSSI will also require a Strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy.
Policy SP3 g	779142	Mr N Strand		2782	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is a logical extension on low quality farmland; ecologically sensitive areas are not proposed for development; improve links to Tesco; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents and future generations; provide needed affordable and private housing allowing local people to stay in Whitstable; the developers have engaged with the community; site provide community benefits.	
Policy SP3 g	779175	Mr B Strand		2787	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; it is a logical extension on low quality farmland; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing for younger people; the developers have consulted with the community.	
Policy SP3 g	779177	Mrs J Strand		2788	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it is a logical extension next to bulit up area on farmland of low ecological value; improve links to Tesco; it will double the size of Duncan Down and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; the developers have consulted with the community.	
Policy SP3 g	779184	Ms C Buchan		2789	Supporting	Support allocation of land at Thanet Way (SP3g) because: it will double the size of Duncan Down as key assest and provide recreation facilities benefiting all residents; The firends of Duncan Downs mean it will be kept for future generations; it is a logical extension on low quality farmland; improve links to Tesco; provide needed affordable and private housing for younger people; the site is deliverable.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	13837	Mr William Leetham		3278	Objecting	Any development on Duncan Downs must be preceded by the building of a joint cycle/pedestrian route to The Long Reach roundabout where cycling park and ride facilities should be provided. A toucan crossing across the Old Thanet Way will be required. This will help to encourage alternative transport use.	Any development on Duncan Downs must be preceded by the building of a joint cycle/pedestrian route to The Long Reach roundabout where cycling park and ride facilities should be provided. A toucan crossing across the Old Thanet Way will be required. This will help to encourage alternative transport use.
Policy SP3 g	779277	Mr Richard Amos		3284	Supporting	Support development proposals for Land North of the Thanet Way. Whitstable does not have a central park; therefore the offer to release 38 acres of land to extend the adjacent Duncan Downs is viewed an opportunity to supplement existing green space and ehance outdoor amenities, environmental diversity and educational opportunities for local families and schools. This will be close to the proposed development and recent new dwellings at Golden Hill & Millstrood Farm.	
Policy SP3 g	780271	Councillor Alison O'Dea	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3291	Supporting	I have read the two submissions made by my Co Councillor Ashley Clark in relation to: 1. The draft local plan.and 2. Specific comments relating to the proposed development North of the Thanet Way. I concur totally with what has been forwarded to you and in the circumstances it would be a pointless exercise to duplicate the material here.	
Policy SP3 g	780486	Commerical Land		3366	Objecting	My client does not disagree with the strategic allocation set out under Draft Policy SP3g. However, we would encourage the Council to consider again the inclusion of my client's interest at the neighbouring site as part of this allocation. (See attached)	We would encourage the Council to consider again the inclusion of my client's interest at the neighbouring site as part of this allocation. (See attached)
Policy SP3 g	780804	Ms Elizabeth Fela		3450	Supporting	I support the draft allocation for Land at Thanet Way, Whitstable. The housing area is proposed in a sustainable location which can take its access from the Thanet Way, thereby limiting any impact on surrounding residential streets. The parts of the site which are ecologically sensitive are not proposed for development and will be kept as enhanced open space. The development would provide much needed affordable housing alongside private housing.	
Policy SP3 g	780805	Mr Joseph Strand		3451	Supporting	I support the draft allocation for Land at Thanet Way, Whitstable. The housing area is proposed in a sustainable location which can take its access from the Thanet Way, thereby limiting any impact on surrounding residential streets. The parts of the site which are ecologically sensitive are not proposed for development and will be kept as enhanced open space. The development would provide much needed affordable housing alongside private housing.	
Policy SP3 g	406328	Mr Daniel Smith		4531	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Whitstable because of existing transport constraints. It would be beneficial to look at improved transport links to London in tandem with Herne Bay as well as the possibily of a suttle rail link to Canterbury.	
Policy SP3 g	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4485	Supporting	Thanet Way site, Whitstable. Accept the allocation of this site for development as proposed, subject to support from the local community.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4738	Objecting	No direct impact on designated sites. The impact of the development on the Swale SSSIs needs to be assessed and considered. Part of the site is grade 3 Agricultural Land - this loss must be justified in terms of need and alternatives. The proposals for open space across the western part of the site should ensure, through design and management, the protection and enhancement of the Benacre Local Site and particularly the ancient woodland.	
Policy SP3 g	423636	Dr David Ponsonby		5290	Supporting	I oppose in principle the loss of agricultural land but recognise that there is a government requiremetn and this site does have some characteristics that favour development. Support the extension to Duncan Down as it has become an important wildlife site eg for Nathusius' Pipistrelle bats and is rich in other flora and fauna. Support creation of wildflower meadow and allotments although would be better located adajcent to housing & A2990. Query no. of units as developer consultation was 300	
Policy SP3 g	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5361	Objecting	Request 2 amendments to policy SP3g. Site survey identified insufficient sewerage capacity in the network to accommodate increased demand. Development should connect instead to the nearest point of capacity and any new infrastructure provided. Sewerage infrastructure crosses the site. Development layout should ensure this is not built on and a 6-13m easement. Diversions at the developers cost. Amend as outlined	Add to the 'Infrastructure' section of policy SP3g : The development must provide a connection to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by Southern Water. Add to the 'Other' section of policy SP3g: Development proposals must ensure future access to the existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.
Policy SP3 g	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5900	Objecting	KCC request that Policy SP3 g states what community facilities are needed on the site.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 g	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6141	Objecting	The Devine Homes site has relative planning advantage and has been offered substantial community advantages. However it is clear that the proposal suffers from two major disadvantages, not in the draft SP3g, but issues that can be resolved.	1. A northern entry/access point is constructed and paid for by the developer. The infrastructure of the area is not fit to cope with the new traffic flows; especially given that the proposal is now for 400 rather than the 300 homes in the developer's public consultation. The Millstrood Road/Grimshill Road/ Belmont Road route is the shortest access route to the town for the new estate but is at maximum capacity with the present parking arrangements; having had no improvement from the extant Local Plan despite the latter requiring/permitting massive expansion of housing as well as retail capacity to the immediate south. The route's further jamming will cause serious harm to the viability of traffic management in the town. Therefore there must be an entry/exist point to the north of the new estate via St Luke's Close (at its western end), in addition to that proposed via a roundabout on the Old Thanet Way. For much of the estate , traffic levels may be the same or even fall as diverted commuter journeys from theGrimshill estate offset extra journeys from the new estate to the town. We expect general support given that residents of the estate will have rapid access to the road system to the south of the town; with the benefit proportional to their distance to the new entry/exist point given the geography of the situation and offsetting the net increase in traffic to be expected closest to the new entry/exit point. Therefore , this critical new entry /exit should be conditional on there being no majority opposition to such a northern access from those on the most direct route through the Grimshill estate who are closest to it and also on the installation of
Policy SP3 h	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		13	Objecting	Colin Carmichael is reported as describing Canterbury's traffic problems as insoluble, a comment with which I respectfully agree. However adding to the population at Hersden with the associated employment opportunities is going simply to make a dire problem even worse. Nothing that I have read in the draft persuades me that anyone has a solution.	
Policy SP3 h	117585	Cllr Nick Eden-Green		197	Supporting	Focus Development at Hersden to provide by pass of Sturry level crossing	Remove South Canterbury and other sites not listed above.
Policy SP3 h	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		343	Objecting	The foot & cycle paths shown must link up the existing adjacent infrastructure and edges of the site so as to produce a contiguous walking and cycling network. The contiguous network is necessary for encouraging people to choose to make walking & cycling journeys in preference to the private motor vehicle.	The foot & cycle paths shown must link up the existing adjacent infrastructure and edges of the site so as to produce a contiguous walking and cycling network. Better pedestrian and cycle connectivity should be made to the Spires Academy, Hersden Community Primary School, and Lakesview International Business Park.
Policy SP3 h	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	156	Supporting	It is recommended that the following site be considered which is in the draft Local Plan:Rural Site- Land North of Hersden- 800 dwellings	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	773048	Mrs J Moran		270	Objecting	The proposed sites in Hersden and Sturry, shown in the 2013 District Local Plan, are not suitable for housing development because of land instability issues resultant from past sand and gravel extraction. There are also concerns that developers will only want to build on the most stable sections of the proposed sites and that if the entire proposed development in Sturry Parish does not proceed, there will be no relief road built.	
Policy SP3 h	768224	Dr Torren Peakman		685	Supporting	I understand there is a brown field site at Hersden suitable for development. I hope that CCC is pursuing this option with vigour in conjunction with negotiations with Network Rail and South Eastern Rail to re-open Hersden railway station with a scheduled stop for the High Speed to St. Pancras.	
Policy SP3 h	777173	Mr Tim Timpson		748	Supporting	We have an ex-coal-mining village wanting development to increase the infrastructure which has been sadly lacking. Hersden could be sustainable by doing one simple thing. Create a Javelin stop on the nearby High Speed line. It would be costly to re-provide the old Chislet Halt station and ancillary parking and access roads. Sturry station could become a High Speed Parkway would make all this sustainable and take away the need for the development in South Canterbury (a bad location).	
Policy SP3 h	777193	Prof Robert & Nicola Shaughnessy		713	Objecting	Object to the planning proposals for a housing and business development (REF: Site 8 -SHLAA148). This would have a radical impact on the environment, the landscape, community and individuals. The proposals would harm a heritage asset in contradiction to Historic Environment-Related Policies and the National Policy Planning Framework. The impact of these developments on the village of Sturry and its community is considerable. It is situated in an area populated by rare and protected species.	
Policy SP3 h	777485	Miss Janet Wilson-Sharp		1076	Objecting	I am very concerned about the proposals for over 1,000 new homes in this area. This will have a very serious effect on the local community. There are several practical issues which have not been given due consideration: existing sewerage facilities are inadequate; water shortage exacerbated by building on greenfield sites; congestion will increase; due to economy there is a risk of many empty homes; what jobs will there be after construction?; not enough school capacity.	These are very serious issues which must be resolved before any building work is started.
Policy SP3 h	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1250	Objecting	The Council understands that National Grid's preferred corridor is the north corridor and is the corridor with existing pylons. These pylons will have an important impact on site 8 (Hersden). They may make open housing less attractive. There is a link between proximity to pylons and an increase in childhood leukaemia. The site may need to be revisited and include the planning consultants for the site in order to examine whether both can be accommodated.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1241	Objecting	Although positives, there many negatives associated with new housing. Development north of Hersden would bring heavy additional traffic volume to the A28 regardless of whether closure of Sturry Crossing is approved. Local shopping and doctor's surgery are essential to prevent residents travelling further afield. Further traffic congestion leads to an additional increase in air pollution, which affects residents (incl lung cancer) and wildlife (RAMSAR/SSSI).	Local shopping and doctor's surgery are essential to prevent residents travelling further afield. It should be noted that people are creatures of habit and are used to using the A28 and A291 routes. It is important that incentives for motorists to use the new roads be put into place. Since Westbere's parish plan recommends a reduction in maximum speed sections of the A28 in order to improve safety and to reduce CO2 emissions. The plan also recommends planting Lombardy poplars from Bushy Hill Road to the Business Parks in order to increase the absorption of CO2, recognising the fact that trees, in their capacity as our lungs, could reduce/combat future air pollution problems. These recommendations will be absolutely essential if the Hersden site is approved.
Policy SP3 h	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1736	Objecting	Site 8 (SP3h) does not meet the sequential approach to the allocation of land for development and the settlement hierarchy set out at paragraphs 1.67 - 1.70 of the Local Plan. The significant reliance that the Local Plan strategy places on delivery of this site within the Plan period is unsound.	Include under Policy SP3 the allocation of an additional Strategic Site at Bodkin Farm, Chesterfield, Whitstable (as per the site details provided under our representation to Policy SP3a).
Policy SP3 h	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1901	Supporting	Hillreed Homes (part of the Persimmon Homes Group) control all of the land to the north of Hersden and therefore has the ability to masterplan and deliver a comprehensively planned housing led expansion of the settlement. This represents a unique for the village to regenerate and to further bolster its existing sustainable credentials still further. It is important that a strategic level of growth is identified at Hersden in order that this comprehensive expansion can be delivered.	
Policy SP3 h	779262	Mr John Bailey		1955	Supporting	Perfect location as long as flooding issues overcome and transport infrastructure is in place.	
Policy SP3 h	778402	Mr Mark Hunter		2238	Objecting	I object to the proposed intense local development at Land North of Hersden. I would beg you to stop these high density developments and consider better use of the existing spaces in our towns and villages, not to mention the use of brownfield sites and the refurbishment or demolition of buildings currently in poor states of repair.	
Policy SP3 h	778498	A J & S E Blaydes		2248	Objecting	We object to the site North of Hersden as the draft plan and those associated documents do not reflect the true impact on the environment and the current community should the development proceed. We also have concerns over the impacts on traffic, sewage system, schools and protected species. There is shop provision ot large scale employers in the area. This proposal will also lead to a divided community.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	778501	A J Blaydes		2193	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden village I/we object strongly to the inclusion of site North of Hersden in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing and surrounding countryside, which has been respected by the people from this original coal mining village since the pits first opened in 1890.	
Policy SP3 h	778747	Mrs Vivienne Lorimer		2307	Objecting	I am therefore writing to oppose this developer-led building of 1,000 houses in Broad Oak, Hersden and Sturry on green land which threatens agriculture and future food production, and jeopardizes ancient woodland. Also concerns over protected species. Traffic will be a major problem nad pressures on schools, hospital, water, drainage nad sewage facilities.	
Policy SP3 h	778770	S Thorne		2230	Objecting	Furthermore, for the properties to be built at Hersden, a railway station should be built with an adequate car park. The High Speed train could be arranged to call there in the morning and evening to pick up and set down commuters.	Furthermore, for the properties to be built at Hersden, a railway station should be built with an adequate car park. The High Speed train could be arranged to call there in the morning and evening to pick up and set down commuters.
Policy SP3 h	778770	S Thorne		2231	Objecting	No consideration has been given to the state of the district's water supply. More homes mean more consumption. The water company has owned land at Broad Oak for approximately 30 years with plans to build a reservoir, but no reservoir has been forthcoming, due to local objections. It is surprising that such a vital piece of infrastructure has been delayed due to a few local individuals objecting on spurious grounds.	
Policy SP3 h	773048	Mrs J Moran		2638	Objecting	The proposals to develop more areas in Herne and Herne Bay along with the proposed sites in Sturry Parish, will put a considerable strain on all the local infrastructure, but a road bypassing Sturry and joining the A28 as suggested, will not solve the City Councils traffic problems. Will the utility services, schools, medical and other services be able to cope?	
Policy SP3 h	777999	Mrs Lee Mannering		2359	Objecting	Concerned about building 800 houses at Hersden: it has blighted their property, purchasers pulled out due to proposal, were told that nothing could be built when they purchased; no site visit; it is an AONB with a lot of wildlife; additionall traffic will make the A28 more congested; air pollution; proposal to sell caravans was refused; Bredlands Ln is a small rural lane with a school, increased traffic would be dangerous; no account taken of listed buildings; concerns about consultation.	
Policy SP3 h	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2627	Objecting	The proposed strategic allocations are all dependent upon significant strategic infrastructure. However, neither the Local Plan nor its evidence base demonstrates that these sites are economically viable and can deliver not only dwelling completions but the necessary essential strategic infrastructure.	Allocate land at New Thanington

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	779921	Hem Limbu		2667	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779923	Mrs M L Sumnall		2669	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779925	Mr & Mrs A Gates		2674	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779926	John & Roslyn Diamond		2676	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779928	Mr J C Beck		2677	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779929	D & D Chandler		2678	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779930	Mr Lalbahdur Pun		2679	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779932	J F Hubbard		2680	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779933	Ms Marie Tazey		2681	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	779934	D A & L M Evans		2682	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779935	Ms Violet Tazey		2683	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779936	Miss J Wildish		2684	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779937	Mr Robert Tazey		2685	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779938	Ms Slyvia G M J Lobo		2686	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779941	Mr Kenneth James Wibberley		2687	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779943	Mr P R Johnson		2688	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779944	Ms Christine Cooke		2690	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779946	The Williams Family		2691	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	779949	Mrs Pamela Fagg		2692	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779951	J I Cullis		2693	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779953	Ms Audrey Bridger		2695	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779954	Mr & Mrs S Williams		2697	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779956	Mr & Mrs A F & S A Short		2698	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779957	Ms Katherine Mccarthy		2699	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779963	Yveun Vereecke		2700	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779967	Rebecca & Graham Linkins & Cross		2701	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779968	The Llewellyn Family		2702	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	779969	Mr & Mrs V Wells		2703	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779972	Mr & Mrs Hughes		2704	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779974	Mr G Weir		2705	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779976	R McCormick		2706	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779977	Mr C E Sams		2707	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779978	Mrs M Baker		2708	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779979	Mr Harry Wibberley		2709	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779982	Foxley & Maskell		2710	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	779995	A Fifield		2711	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	780000	Eddie & Janette Hammer		2712	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	780008	Mrs M Baker		2713	Objecting	As a resident of Hersden Village I object strongly to the inclusion of the above named site in the Local Plan. I/we oppose the proposed development on the basis that it will double the size of the existing village (800 houses) and will destroy the existing community and the surrounding countryside.	
Policy SP3 h	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3035	Objecting	The site is in a very sensitive area and could impact on a number of designated sites. The site appears to have very little open space and residents will use sites within the locality for recreation. Concerned about recreational pressure on Stodmarsh, Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay (potentially severe individual and in-combination impact - Canterbury, Dover and Thanet housing in close proximity), and Blean Complex SAC, East Blean Woods SSSI and Chislet Marshes, Sarre Penn and Preston Marshes LWS.	To ensure that the integrity of the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay site is not compromised there is a need to collect visitor and disturbance data in relation to existing pressure and formulate a Strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy to ensure visitor control is adequate within the SPA and sufficient natural open space is available to detract visitors from using the coast for dog walking. Blean Complex SAC and West Blean and Thornden Woods SSSI will also require a Strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy. Due to the in-combination impacts with this site and other developments a strategic Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategy should be prepared with measures within Stodmarsh to control visitor impact being incorporated into Policy LB5 and the site specific policy. Possible mitigation could include a combination of increased natural open space within the development and off-site contributions to visitor control strategies on Stodmarsh. At Chislet Marshes, Sarre Penn and Preston Marshes Lt will be important that full hydrological surveys are specified as a requirement within any site specific policy and that the design of the development conserves the hydrology and water flows onto the LWS. The site is within a BOA and the LWS needs protected from impact.
Policy SP3 h	777540	Dr Julia Dale		2839	Objecting	Suggests that land north of Hersden should be a 'self build' area, along the lines of Almere in the Netherlands and Ashley Vale in Bristol. Following such examples would set a high standard in housing solutions as opposed to the alternative out-dated profit-led developer packages.	Self Build v. "Developer-Led" Proposal If the Council were really serious about low income housing rather than a percentage of "low-cost" (= poor quality) in each area which perpetuates developer-led estates, then it should consider SELF BUILD areas €" e.g. the whole of the Hersden (400 homes) and Broad Oaks (Sturry) (1,000) could be allocated into plots for self build. This could be an award winning and very dynamic solution €" e.g. a) Ashley Vale, Bristol €" mixed development including office & community use b) Almere, Holland €" 3,000 homes on 250 acre site in 'themed' areas.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	779147	Mr John Caddick		2846	Objecting	Object to site at North Hersden, on grounds on effect on business, loss of views, Lakesview not full, impact on wider village	
Policy SP3 h	779676	Mr & Mrs R Featherstone		2973	Objecting	We are writing to object to the planning proposal for Site 8 North Hersden. This would have a devastating affect on the land, local buildings and the community. Our objections are on the following grounds - inadequate local facilities; additional traffic congestion; increase population by 50%; social unrest; impact on listed building.	
Policy SP3 h	779170	Mrs Jean F Fenner		3286	Objecting	Objection to Hersden as village can not support this amount of development will become an overspill of Canterbury. Hersden would lose its identity. Loss of flora and fauna. Added congestion and air pollution on A28 particularly if Richborough connection and Hoplands farm are also developed. Staines Hill cannot cope with amount of traffic. Hersden is only an attractive proposition because affordable housing in Canterbury is used by students. Should promote energy efficiency, reduce need to travel.	
Policy SP3 h	780003	Mrs B M Hughes		3367	Objecting	Objection to North of Hersden on the basis that it will double the size of the village, destroy existing community and countryside which has already been compromised by 3 devts. allocation does not respect Localism Act. Primary school cannot absorb increase. Doctors' surgery is already inadequate. Existing inadequate sewerage and water supply infrastructure will be overloaded. Access road cuts through children's play park.	
Policy SP3 h	780010	S Marsh		3374	Objecting	Objects to North of Hersden. Impact on Bredlands Lane properties, light pollution, change character of area. Impact on protected species eg Marsh Harriers, traffic impact on Bredlands Lane, impact of new road on existing property. Loss of agricultural land should use brownfield land e.g. old colliery and Hoplands south of A28. Impact on listed building.	
Policy SP3 h	780456	Mr Rory White		3351	Objecting	The vast development at Hersden would increase the traffic on the Island Road in Sturry, a road that is bordered by housing estates. No widening is proposed or possible. The proposed new recycling plant at Lakes View would make the traffic even worse.	
Policy SP3 h	780738	Ms Mandy Russell	Assistant Vice Principal for Inclusion & Ethos Spires Academy	3428	Objecting	Spires Academy would like to object to housing on Land North of Hersden due: · The proposal for development is in a quality area of agricultural land and unspoilt countryside, having an impact on the environment and the loss of opportunity to educate our students in wildlife and nature · We believe that traffic accessing the A28 will need to use Bredlands lane which is where our school is based and therefore causing a potential increase in the risk of accidents to our students	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3234	Objecting	The RSPB is concerned about the following strategic allocation: North Hersden, Canterbury housing development for 800 residential units. This site lies less than 1km from Stodmarsh SSSI/SPA/Ramsar, Blean Complex SAC, East Blean SSSI. As acknowledged in the screening of HRA, increased urbanisation associated with residential development is likely to lead to recreational activity on or adjacent to European sites and disturbance impacts.	This should be fully assessed as part of an AA in relation to these sites.
Policy SP3 h	780525	Ms Katharine Rist	Campaigner - Ancient Woodland The Woodland Trust	3814	Objecting	Object to development proposals for Land North of Hersden because it will have an adverse impact on two areas of ancient woodland within the allocation boundary inc. Little Joiners Wood. The site allocation should not be taken forward unless the protection of the ancient woodland is taken into consideration and that there is no loss of ancient woodland. A buffer area of 50m provided to ensure that there are no detrimental impacts due to any proposed development.	Site allocation Land North of Hersden should not be taken forward unless the protection of the ancient woodland is taken into consideration and that there is no loss of ancient woodland. The ancient woodland should also have a buffering area of 50m provided to ensure that there are no detrimental impacts due to any proposed development.
Policy SP3 h	780272	Councillor Tony Austin	Councillor Canterbury City Council	4158	Objecting	Object to North of Hersden: Bredlands Lane is too narrow and unsuitable; extra traffic will lead to potential pedestrian and vehicle conflicts with the Spires Academy; Blackthorn Road is also unsuitable; there are also listed buildings at teh end of Bredlands Lane and these require protection from new development as well as farm pond that provides a habitat for protected species.	
Policy SP3 h	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4246	Objecting	All of the reasons cited in objection to land at Sturry Road/Broadoak also apply to the land to the north of Hersden. All of these allocations are dependent upon the provision of a new Sturry crossing/bypass. There is no evidence in the public domain of a serious analysis of the viability. Neither is there any form of agreement between the numerous land owners involved. The remedy is to allocate land for housing development at Cockerling Farm, together with the Thanington Urban Extension.	The remedy is to allocate land for housing development at Cockerling Farm, together with the Thanington Urban Extension.
Policy SP3 h	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4486	Objecting	While Hersden could be expanded to provide community facilities, development should take place on the southern side of Hersden. They object to allocation for development on the northern side of Hersden. The southern side is previously developed land, a buffer/barrier could be provided to the SSSI, it will involve the loss of less agricultural land and maintain more of a green gap between Westbere and Hersden. Hersden be redesignated as a rural service centre. Allocate SHLAA 41 and 187, instead.	Delete allocation of north Hersden and allocated 800 units on SHLAA41 and SHLAA187 instead
Policy SP3 h	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patribourne Parish Council	4678	Objecting	Object to the development proposal for Land North of Hersden because it will substantially increase traffic and it is felt that insufficient thought has gone into improving the main routes in and out of the District	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	4551	Objecting	We OBJECT to the allocation of the land North of Hersden for housing as being inappropriate for the following reasons: greenfield land; loss of high quality farmland; landscape impact; difficult access to A28; won't create a sense of place; uncertainty created by National Grid proposals; proximity to listed buildings.	
Policy SP3 h	779927	Mr R W Hughes		4591	Objecting	Object: it will double the size of Hersden; destroy existing community and countryside; protected species on site. If colliery club is demolished for new road link then will lose the last remaining link to heritage of the village. Road safety at The Sycamores; A28 is congested; Bredlands Lane & Hoath Road cannot take further traffic. Location of new Club house is too far away. Access to children's park is dangerous. Sewerage system is heavily overloaded. Do not need new business park.	
Policy SP3 h	780002	Mr Howard Myers including household		4598	Objecting	Objection to North of Hersden: No actual traffic counts for junction of THE Sycamores/A28 or A28 roundabouts; No mention of traffic calming or road layouts; destruction of the mining legacy; new road next to children's play ground/BMX ground dangerous and insufficient parking; loss of natural habitat and wildlife; impact on primary school; additional traffic on Bredlands lane and Hoath Road. CCC should use scientific method to evaluate proposals; no respect for existing community from Council.	
Policy SP3 h	780004	Ms Heather Stennett	Secretary The Society of Sturry Village	4580	Objecting	Building Chislet Gardens has not been successful in terms of integration of the old and new communities at Hersden. There exists a strong feeling of 'them' and 'us' and this will always be a danger when a large number of new homes are built adjacent to an existing, established community. Residents of all three villages are very concerned about this outcome and the problems that it causes. Level of development will dramatically change character of village. More congestion on A291 & A28.	
Policy SP3 h	780528	Patrick & Moira Austin		4541	Objecting	Object to the development proposals at Land North of Hersden because there is no justification for taking large greenfield sites when a majority of new properties in the recent development on Fordwich Road remain unsold; there is also no information as to the type of housing proposed; and the additional industrial units would not guarantee new businesses or jobs as similar units in the area are already lying empty.	
Policy SP3 h	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4739	Objecting	No direct impact on designated sites. The impact of the development on the Stodmarsh SSSIs needs to be assessed and considered. The site is grade 2/3 Agricultural Lan- this loss must be justified in terms of need and alternatives.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	13753	Mr Jeremy Bellamy		4985	Objecting	Sturry Parish Council rejects proposals for Hersden because of concerns regarding the ability of the existing road, water and sewage infrastructure to support new homes; the village not being identified as somewhere able to take large scale development, the loss of agricultural farmland which is integral to its character as well as being the habitat for threatened species, and as much of Lakesview sits empty it would be potentially excess to requirements to build a new business park opposite.	
Policy SP3 h	781033	Ms Hazel Brackley		4822	Objecting	The development proposals for Land North of Hersden will double the current size of the existing village. The level of facilities provided will depend on the number of properties built but the problems that will present themselves r.e integration of new residents will be a multi-agency situation. Support for the proposal of a doctor's surgery at Hersden but there is no welcome from the users of the Welfare Club of it being re-sited.	
Policy SP3 h	781921	National Grid		4914	Objecting	National Grid is proposing new electricity transmission infrastructure between Richborough and Canterbury and will confirm the route connection and route corridor later in 2013. The Land North of Hersden site interacts with the proposed route corridor options and sub-options. The NPPF (para 162) requires that LAs take account of the need for strategic infrastructure and plan proactively to accommodate this through the recognition of electricity infrastructure within allocations and policies.	National Grid requests that reference is made to the Richborough Connection Project in relation to this allocation and note that provision for electricity infrastructure through masterplanning may be required if the sites prove to be affected by the chosen route corridor option.
Policy SP3 h	780212	Church Commissioners for England		5206	Objecting	Supports allocation at Hersden which will provide needed homes, business space and infrastructure. However, the indicative layout plan doesn't allow sufficient flexibility in the location of uses on the site, remove some of the detail to be agreed in the future development brief. Would like to discuss inclusion of their land. Supportive of improved footpath and cycle links.	Remove some of the detail in the layout plan to be agreed in the future development brief. Would like to discuss inclusion of their land
Policy SP3 h	780277	Yvonne & Mark Culverhouse & Ford		5050	Objecting	Dvlpmnt north of Hersden will destroy landscape, countryside character; agric land; historic environment & setting of listed building; lack of respect for quality of life; would not support job growth; not sustainable development; community/ social issues; insufficient school places and services; significant traffic & safety implications; will devastate habitats, wildlife & protected species; will damage tranquility. Concerned about emergency access and social club. Objection supported by NPPF.	Former colliery land and Hoplands Farm at Hersden would be the finder of the two sites.
Policy SP3 h	781343	Jon & Nicki Holmes		5156	Objecting	Object to the development proposals at Land North of Hersden because of the site's Agricultural Land Classification, wildlife concerns, loss of countryside, light pollution, access issues and the need to meet both English Heritage and Canterbury City Council's own obligations "to protect Locally Listed and Grade 2 listed buildings and their settings".	Land North of Hersden should be deleted from the Draft Local Plan.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	782424	Mr & Mrs Manser		5047	Objecting	SP3 h relating to the proposed Strategic Development Site north of Hersden (Site 8) should be deleted and the 800 dwellings redistributed elsewhere in and around the larger settlements of Canterbury City Centre, Whitstable, and Herne Bay. The site is not considered appropriate or a sustainable location, and there are also biodiversity, heritage and highway issues.	Site 8 as a Strategic Development Site should be deleted and the 800 dwellings redistributed elsewhere in and around the larger settlements of Canterbury City Centre, Whitstable, and Herne Bay.
Policy SP3 h	780840	Mrs J Collins		5460	Objecting	Opposes the development of 1,800 houses at Sturry, Broad Oak and Hersden, because: requirements are met through provision of student housing; the housing has been allocated only to get the Sturry by pass built at no cost to the Council and to hell with the effect on the area; increased traffic; further schools; more GP's; only jobs during construction; mass development will lead to an area where no one wants to live; greenfield; Canterbury district is at capacity.	CCC stands up for itself and the people it represents, and says, enough is enough, and admit Canterbury district is now at capacity.
Policy SP3 h	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5389	Objecting	Hersden: CAST believes that the most obvious answer to promote sustainable development, that limits the amount of additional traffic from any development here, would be the development of a rail station, perhaps utilising what remains of the infrastructure of the old 'Chislet Halt'. We urge that the Council rigorously explore this possibility.	
Policy SP3 h	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5362	Objecting	Request 2 amendments to policy SP3h. Site survey identified insufficient sewerage capacity in the network to accommodate increased demand. Development should connect instead to the nearest point of capacity and any new infrastructure provided. Sewerage infrastructure crosses the site. Development layout should ensure this is not built on and a 6-13m easement. Diversions at the developers cost. Amend as outlined	
Policy SP3 h	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5419	Objecting	I am particularly concerned with the inclusion of Site 8 Land north of Hersden as a Strategic Development Site in Policy SP3 h: - not in line with NPPF - not in line with SA objectives - development is disproportionate in scale - inadequate infrastructure provision - impact on landscape and biodiversity - unnecessary and inappropriate new business space - policy misleading about new community building - lack of community engagement - proposals for this site have been resisted previously	
Policy SP3 h	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5422	Objecting	Comments on SP3h Illustrative layout Appendix 1 of the Draft Local Plan - object to illustrative layout on grounds of road layouts and access; and proximity to listed and locally-listed buildings; lack of landscaping near the listed and locally-listed buildings.	
Policy SP3 h	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5767	Objecting	Savills has been instructed jointly by The MHP Partnership and George Wilson Developments Ltd (acting for the owners of the land) to submit representations to the Canterbury District Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation in support of a formal site allocation at South Hersden. These representations formally request that land at South Hersden is allocated as a strategic allocation instead of Land at North Hersden, and revised Policy SP3(h) is proposed.	As such these representations formally request that land at South Hersden is allocated as a strategic allocation instead of Land at North Hersden, and revised Policy SP3(h) is proposed.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5786	Objecting	An objection is raised to Policy SP3h, the proposed allocation of land North of Hersden for residential led mixed use development: incongruous addition to this village, impacts on landscape, unclear whether deliverable in view of electricity and pylon proposals,	As such Canterbury City Council are requested to remove this proposed allocation (Policy SP3h) and instead to formally allocate land at South Hersden for residential led mixed use development.
Policy SP3 h	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5804	Objecting	Development of land North of Hersden (Policy SP3h) would not accord with the policy requirements set out with Policy LB4 due to the landscape impact these proposals are likely to have and the incongruous nature of the proposed addition to Hersden. Land south of Hersden by contrast would fully accord with this policy, as it will result in very real landscape enhancements whilst also building on the local distinctiveness of the village creating a central core and heart.	
Policy SP3 h	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5794	Objecting	An objection is raised to Policy SP3h, the proposed allocation of land North of Hersden for residential led mixed use development. This scale of expansion on virgin Greenfield land impacting further on the high land and hence the skyline would represent an incongruous addition to this village and pose very real impacts in terms of visibility from the wider landscape. As such Canterbury City Council are requested to remove this proposed allocation (Policy SP3h).	Canterbury City Council are requested to remove this proposed allocation (Policy SP3h).The proposed site allocation (Land at South Hersden) is requested to be included in the Local Plan.
Policy SP3 h	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5764	Objecting	Savills has been instructed jointly by The MHP Partnership and George Wilson Developments Ltd (acting for the owners of the land) to submit representations to the Canterbury District Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation in support of a formal site allocation at South Hersden. These representations formally request that land at South Hersden is allocated as a strategic allocation instead of Land at North Hersden, and revised Policy SP3(h) is proposed.	As such these representations formally request that land at South Hersden is allocated as a strategic allocation instead of Land at North Hersden, and revised Policy SP3(h) is proposed.
Policy SP3 h	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5818	Objecting	An objection is raised to Policy SP3h, the proposed allocation of land North of Hersden for residential led mixed use development. This scale of expansion on virgin Greenfield land impacting further on the high land and hence the skyline would represent an incongruous addition to this village and pose very real impacts in terms of visibility from the wider landscape. As such Canterbury City Council are requested to remove this proposed allocation (Policy SP3h).	Canterbury City Council are requested to remove this proposed allocation (Policy SP3h).The proposed site allocation (Land at South Hersden) is requested to be included in the Local Plan.
Policy SP3 h	784487	Mr E Manser		5769	Objecting	There are serious concerns with Site 8 on the following strands of sustainable development. Economic: land is not the right type in the right place and time to support growth. Environmental: threat to the natural, and historic environment (incl character and setting of listed buildings in Bredlands Lane). Traffic congestion and safety is a concern, particularly on Bredlands Lane. Negative impact on landscape, biodiversity and protected species, incl bats and badgers. Access shown is inadequate.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5898	Objecting	Indicates a requirement for community facilities. Please include: fully accessible community facilities that caters for all age groups and vulnerable people. €“ This will cater for FSC clients. All community facilities to be determined in conjunction with parish, district councils and KCC service providers	Indicates a requirement for community facilities. Please include: fully accessible community facilities that caters for all age groups and vulnerable people. €“ This will cater for FSC clients. All community facilities to be determined in conjunction with parish, district councils and KCC service providers
Policy SP3 h	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5828	Objecting	Development of land North of Hersden (Policy SP3h) would not accord with the policy requirements set out with Policy LB4 due to the landscape impact these proposals are likely to have and the incongruous nature of the proposed addition to Hersden. Land south of Hersden by contrast would fully accord with this policy, as it will result in very real landscape enhancements whilst also building on the local distinctiveness of the village creating a central core and heart.	
Policy SP3 h	784707	Dr Philip Rogers		5784	Objecting	Objects to expanding the village to the north, because: use of high value greenfield land, that should be conserved for food supply; it is unsustainable to use our top-grade agricultural land; contains a major pylon route which is seen as a health hazard; more traffic through the existing built environment.	
Policy SP3 h	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6020	Objecting	Positives: incl. facilities, small business space, could lead to greater administrative independence, funding for infrastructure. Uncertainties: including jobs, impact of affordable housing, whether funding will be forthcoming, whether this is what the community wants. Negatives: traffic and congestion increases, problems of integration for existing community, has housing need been assessed?, impact on listed buildings, amenities and facilities provision not guaranteed	
Policy SP3 h	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1903	Supporting	Hillreed Homes (part of the Persimmon Homes Group) control all of the land to the north of Hersden and therefore has the ability to masterplan and deliver a comprehensively planned housing led expansion of the settlement. This represents a unique for the village to regenerate and to further bolster its existing sustainable credentials still further. It is important that a strategic level of growth is identified at Hersden in order that this comprehensive expansion can be delivered.	
Policy SP3 h	784495	P Manser		6962	Objecting	I am particularly concerned with the inclusion of Site 8 Land north of Hersden as a Strategic Development Site in Policy SP3 h: - Not in line with NPPF - Not in line with SA objectives - Development is disproportionate in scale - Inadequate infrastructure provision - Impact on landscape and biodiversity - Unnecessary and inappropriate new business space - Policy misleading about new community building - Lack of community engagement - Proposals for this site have been resisted previously	
Policy SP3 h	784495	P Manser		6963	Objecting	Comments on SP3h Illustrative layout Appendix 1 of the Draft Local Plan - object to illustrative layout on grounds of road layouts and access; and proximity to listed and locally-listed buildings; lack of landscaping near the listed and locally-listed buildings.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 h	784497	Rosanna Manser		6959	Objecting	Comments on SP3h Illustrative layout Appendix 1 of the Draft Local Plan - object to illustrative layout on grounds of road layouts and access; and proximity to listed and locally-listed buildings; lack of landscaping near the listed and locally-listed buildings.	
Policy SP3 h	784497	Rosanna Manser		6954	Objecting	The development proposal conflicts with the NPPF's 'core planning principles' which advocates the use of previously developed land and conserving heritage assets. The scale of additional housing is disproportionate in a rural setting and will place put pressure on existing infrastructure i.e A28. Contributions should be sought for sustainable transport measures, and utilities and social infrastructure. There will be a loss of agricultural land, impacting negatively on landscape and biodiversity.	
Policy SP3 h	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6915	Objecting	Suspicion about the 'extras' mentioned by the Council and developers. Suggestions for the benefit of the commnuity - The protection of Sturry village High Street as a commercially viable centre. A kindergarten, a day care centre for the elderly and a sports hall (tennis, basketball etc.), a good size multi-purpose hall with easy access for all by bus. Parking in Sturry village, road and pavement repairs, more road crossings and better cycle paths. Retention of Sturry Farm Shop, butcher welcomed.	
Policy SP3 i	766238	Mr Mike Sole		25	Objecting	At present there is no indication of the timescales for development. Areas should be zoned with dates in which planning permission will be given. This will give some comfort to residents and ensure that infrastructure is in place to deal with any new housing or commercial development.	Give indication of timescales for development
Policy SP3 i	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		424	Supporting	In support of Policy SP3i a development brief will be prepared for Site 7: Land off Thanets Way, Whitstable (Poilcy SP3g) setting out the development requirements for the site with the continued engagement of the local community and stakeholder groups.	
Policy SP3 i	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		344	Supporting	I support the Garden City design principles and that a mechanism will be put in place to ensure timely co-ordinated delivery of infrastructure.	
Policy SP3 i	778466	Mrs Barbara Hudgell		1384	Objecting	So less building and more eco-friendly.	So less building and more eco-friendly.
Policy SP3 i	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1727	Objecting	When considering "the anticipated phasing of development and physical and social infrastructure" PLEASE bear in mind that developers are adept at evading their obligations. In Herne Bay, Blacksole Bridge remains unbuilt, and the Reculver Road/Barnes Way traffic diversion has only just happened after a SEVEN YEAR delay. Whoever drew up the original agreements should be fired. The agreements must ensure that the developers meet their obligations BEFORE they get their cash and walk away.	A professional contracts draughtsman should be employed to ensure that the developers can't run evade their responsibilities and rings round the Council as they have in the past.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 i	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2758	Objecting	Pleased to see that planning requirements will reflect 'garden city' principles, would prefer them to be 'applied', rather than reflect, as this is open ended.	
Policy SP3 i	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3037	Objecting	We welcome the requirement to prepare development briefs for the above sites.	Due to the impacts on a number of international, national and local designations and undesignated ancient woodland, it is our view that the impacts on the Blean Complex, Stodmarsh and Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay require a strategic approach to be taken, with resilient district wide and cross boundary Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategies, based on sound up to date visitor and where relevant bird disturbance surveys. The SAMMS should include on and off site measures to ensure the integrity of the designated sites is not compromised by the proposed development.
Policy SP3 i	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3177	Objecting	Support a coherent thought out policy for any proposed development. However the land will be cherry picked by the main developer and rest parceled off to other developers making it hard for the Council to control. Council's past record in ensuring delivery true to principles is patchy. It will not deliver a garden city rather it will be urban sprawl.	
Policy SP3 i	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3691	Objecting	Agree each site will need a master plan, but consider that garden city principles is too open to interpretation and unlikely to be achieved due to the infrastructure burdens. It is misleading, the principles need to be properly defined.	
Policy SP3 i	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4748	Objecting	refers to "garden city" principles, but they do not appear to be set out in the document.	
Policy SP3 i	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4837	Objecting	The omission of Development Briefs dilutes the robust consultation process expected and raises the question of how the viability of the key sites proposed can be judged as required under the NPPF (Paragraph 47). The lack of Development Briefs at this stage risks creating a situation where any future document is unduly influenced by the developer rather than delivering the needs and aspirations of the District.	
Policy SP3 i	13812	Mr N J Blake		5190	Objecting	It would appear that the "Garden" concept is a somewhat incincere and muddled input into the Council's thinking and contrary to what Howard set out. There are density implications in a " Garden City" format. The density for housing alone set out by him was about 50 units per hectare (20 per acre) which may be a little low for a world where land has to be more carefully used. His densities did not allow for car parking and of course had over twice as many persons per household as there are today.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 i	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5025	Objecting	Policy SP3i fails to be flexible, requiring proposals on the sites allocated for development under Policy SP3 to be in 'total accordance with the policy and development brief.' The DLP has a lifespan of 20 years, over which time development requirements can change, due to changes to National policy, local objectives and requirements. The delivery of acceptable developments could therefore be delayed in coming forward if they don't meet the requirements of the policy. Amend as outlined	In first para last sentence; delete 'total' and add 'unless material considerations indicate otherwise'.
Policy SP3 i	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5740	Objecting	We welcome the plans for new employment (and commercial) land to be located near to housing to support jobs for local people. The Council need to, consider how and when the commercial elements are delivered to ensure these are brought forward in a timely manner (i.e. before and while new homes are being built and not after). As recommended in its Employment Land Review, the Council should use a range of tools to ensure this occurs.	Council should use a range of tools to ensure commercial elements are delivered in a timely manner (i.e. before and while new homes are being built and not after)
Policy SP3 i	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5836	Objecting	KCC require developer to fund necessary infrastructure eg s106 /other means. KCC must be involved with ithis particular transport and community infrastructure. KCC request that the required provision for schools is specified for each site in Policy SP3, be regarded as essential infrastructure. Consideration should be given to the critical mass needed to provide new infrastructure eg schools. CCC Infra Delivery plan should demonstrate key infrastructure needed via S106/CIL/other funding mechanism	
Policy SP3 i	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6031	Objecting	Why is the previous outlines for Site 8 Hersden (and site 2 Sturry/Broad Oak) so much vaguer than for the other sites? As it stands, site 8 could be vulnerable without this amendment. The Sturry Parish communities deserve the same guarantee and protection for beneficial improvements as other sites, where there is already specific provision under this Policy. Any future developer must also be held to account for the improvements.	There is a serious and glaring omission of any specific mention of the provision of, and how much, dedicated land area would be allowed for, amenities, facilities, employment space, land use for recreational purposes, new woodland, other community benefits, and energy saving/eco friendly measures. This must be corrected, so all sites are treated the same. All existing communities must be able to read in this document exactly the same degree of detail for what is being proposed for them.
Policy SP3 i	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6024	Objecting	Why is the previous outlines for Site 2 Sturry/Broad Oak (and site 8 Hersden) so much vaguer than for the other sites? As it stands, sites 2 could be vulnerable without this amendment. The Sturry Parish communities deserve the same guarantee and protection for beneficial improvements as other sites, where there is already specific provision under this Policy. Any future developer must also be held to account for the improvements.	There is a serious and glaring omission of any specific mention of the provision of, and how much, dedicated land area would be allowed for, amenities, facilities, employment space, land use for recreational purposes, new woodland, other community benefits, and energy saving/eco friendly measures. This must be corrected, so all sites are treated the same. All existing communities must be able to read in this document exactly the same degree of detail for what is being proposed for them.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP3 i	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	6507	Objecting	While they support south Canterbury and the production of development briefs they have promoted changes: there will have to be a high degree of flexibility to maintain completions and multiple sales outlets to allow market; their site could come forward as a stand alone site; plan should make specific reference to need for range of simultaneous development locations; and interim traffic improvements.	
1.58	766797	Miss L Dowle		117	Supporting	Alternative and better placed existing brown field sites have not been included into the draft, i.e. Hersden Colliery	
1.58	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	162	Supporting	There are other sites which are, in some cases, mentioned in the Local Plan which should be considered. The most notable of these is land south of Hersden which constitutes the largest brown field site in the district and was dropped from the Local Plan at the last minute because of an objection from Natural England on the grounds of cat predation It is believed that this objection can be overcome which would allow this site to go forward with a potential for 600 dwellings.	Land south of Hersden which constitutes the largest brown field site in the district and was dropped from the Local Plan at the last minute because of an objection from Natural England on the grounds of cat predation It is believed that this objection can be overcome which would allow this site to go forward with a potential for 600 dwellings.
1.58	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	227	Objecting	Of considerable concern. Given the sensitive nature of the Stour Valley to the south of the A28, it is monstrous to suggest that this could come under scrutiny for development, especially with the dubious justification that development "could contribute to the cost of the Sturry Crossing Relief Road".	
1.58	665473	Dr Richard Norman		521	Supporting	The development opportunities south of the A28 at Hersden should certainly be considered further, and there is good reason to think that the concerns about the impact on wildlife could be met.	
1.58	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		926	Supporting	The former Chislet Colliery site at Hersden should be included as a definite site for the following reasons: The site is brownfield. The village of Hersden has a a number of community facilities.A substantial amount of housing (eg 300-500 dwellings) should be allocated for this site together with employment land and community facilities.	A substantial amount of housing (eg 300-500 dwellings) should be allocated at the Chislet Colliery site, Hersden site together with employment land and community facilities.
1.58	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1448	Objecting	CDLP draft, paragraph 1.58, page 23 states that in addition to the strategic sites above, CCC also believes that land to the south of the A28 at Hersden could be considered further - and form submission in the final draft to the Inspector. This presumably could include the following Sites for Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs): 41, 187, 72 and 50. WPC express grave concern at the lack of any detail in the CDLP draft regarding any or all of these SHLAAs.	
1.58	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1450	Objecting	Any development south of the A28 is likely to arouse opposition on the grounds of unexplored archaeology, water supply issues, proximity to the SSSI/ Ramsar sites and interdependence between the valley slopes and the SSSI/ Ramsar sites. Higher numbers for development will impact on the surrounding infrastructure, school spaces and health requirements. Flood risk to new homes.	Inclusion of SHLAAs 41 in a final draft Plan would warrant further representation not least of which include traffic implications, environmental impact, and run off. WPC would ask to be made aware of any changes to include this in a final draft plan.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.58	415773	Ms Eleanor Brown		1546	Supporting	Rather than South Canterbury would it not be more reasonable to develop Hersden, a brown field site where there are already facilities, ie schools etc, or one of the villages?	
1.58	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1737	Objecting	Reference to the potential for development of land to the south of the A28 at Hersden should be deleted on the basis that this land has not been fully assessed having regard to SEA Regulations and does not meet the sequential approach to the allocation of land for development and the settlement hierarchy set out at paragraphs 1.67 - 1.70 of the Local Plan.	Omit paragraphs 1.58 to 1.61 inclusive of the Draft Local Plan. Include under Policy SP3 the allocation of an additional Strategic Site at Bodkin Farm, Chesterfield, Whitstable (as per the site details provided under our representation to Policy SP3a).
1.58	778182	Gordon and Susan Manley		1596	Supporting	Possible use of brownfield sites essential housing development should be carried out in the area of Hersden and inland from Herne Bay. Trains could possibly be provided with a stopping place at a re-established Hersden Station.	
1.58	778304	O W Presland		2608	Objecting	Include other sites that may reflect a better distribution of employment opportunities throughout the local plan area.	
1.58	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3018	Objecting	Due to the pressure already likely to be experienced as a result of a number of developments, it is our view that this site is too near to the SPA and Ramsar site and should be excluded from the plan. Chequers Wood and Old Park SSSI is also a significant site and disturbance could cause declines in the bird population.	Within the Thames Basin Heaths mitigation strategy a buffer of 400m was established around the SPAs to ensure no development too close to the site. We recommend that Canterbury City Council establish a similar buffer around all internationally designated areas as part of any mitigation strategy. Consideration will need to be given to the individual and in-combination impacts on the Chequers Wood and Old Park SSSI with appropriate safeguards being included within the site specific policy.
1.58	414960	Cllr Alex Perkins	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3174	Supporting	Support for the consideration of the former Chislet Colliery site.	
1.58	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3178	Objecting	The sites identified at Hersden, south of A28, and at Howe Barracks need more examination for inclusion. The Council's intransigent position in not exploring the potential of these sites is baffling considering public opinion and stakeholder support. Hersden's proximity to the existing high speed rail link and potential to develop a new station lend its self to a much larger development. LANRA considers it perverse not to include the site when many see the merits of doing so.	
1.58	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3235	Objecting	Land to the south of the A28 at Hersden housing development €“ for an undetermined number of residential units. This site lies in a highly sensitive location in very close proximity to Stodmarsh SPA/SAC/SSSI. The RSPB is seriously concerned about the close proximity of this site to Stodmarsh and potential impacts should be fully assessed as part of the AA. It has not been included in the screening stage of the HRA.	
1.58	407886	Mr J and P Booth		3528	Objecting	When there is concern at strategic level about the amount of food we have to import it is wrong to turn quality agricultural land over to housing. This is especially so when it appears that insufficient consideration has been given to utilising the former Chislet Colliery site.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.58	780010	S Marsh		3581	Supporting	The agricultural land (North of Hersden) should not be lost. Especially as there is a brownfield site - the old colliery and Hoplands Farm south of the A28.	
1.58	780499	Valerie & John Puleston		3582	Supporting	Support development proposals for the Chislet Colliery	Reconsider the whole plan taking into consideration this large area now available.
1.58	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3718	Supporting	Our alternative proposal is for increased development in Hersden on land to the north of the railway line. It includes the re-opening of the rail station.	
1.58	408497	Mr C Mills		3731	Supporting	The council maintains that it has looked towards Brownfield sites before moving on to green field sites. A brownfield sites that could be used is the old Colliery at Hersden.	Include the site south of the A28, Hersden in the final draft local plan.
1.58	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3692	Objecting	These paragraphs deal with potential scope for development on the southern side of Hersden. Please see our comments on development at Hersden included in Part 1 of our response. If our view is accepted that this land is developed in preference to that proposed in Policy SP3h on the northern side of the village, these paragraphs will need to be deleted.	Delete paragraph
1.58	406328	Mr Daniel Smith		4533	Supporting	Support development proposals on brownfield sites such as the former colliery at Hersden.	
1.58	781014	Mr & Mrs C & J Stocken		4603	Supporting	Emphasis should be on siting smaller developments on several brownfield sites such as the Chislet colliery site, Howe Barracks and including Hersden in the plan, which could be served by a rail link, in preference to South Canterbury.	
1.58	121393	Cllr P Vickers		4686	Supporting	Barton farmland is soil of the highest quality (Grade 1). As such it should be protected. There are many other sites in the district with soil of a much lesser value, including some brownfield sites which are not included in the proposals e.g. south of Hersden, Canterbury prison site and the Howe Barracks).	
1.58	124122	Mrs. V Gore		4719	Supporting	Outskirts of town dwellings promote the use of cars. Therefore build in parts of the district which have amenities already in place and on brown field sites. Also, very important, where the inhabitants are willing to expand. HERSDEN ticks all the boxes on this one, from what I have read in the paper.	
1.58	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4749	Objecting	The proximity of the site to habitats designated for their national and international may present issues which are difficult to address. There is an ongoing conversation with consultants regarding the urbanising effect of housing adjacent to a SSSI/SPA/RAMSAR/SAC and the consequent impact on ground nesting birds through cat predation.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.58	13753	Mr Jeremy Bellamy		4993	Objecting	Object to any development proposal at the former Chislet Colliery because it is technically not classified 'brownfield' land €“ contrary to opinion, the adjacent Westbere Marshes Nature Reserve is a habitat for endangered and/or protected species; and rather than being an extension of Hersden, any development would simply create a new entirely separate village separated by the A28 with the existing residents unable to easily access any new facility provided as part of the scheme.	
1.58	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4945	Objecting	Object to the non-inclusion of land at Hersden for development in the draft Local Plan, on grounds that it is a brownfield site, there is no objection from Kent Wildlife Trust or the Highway authority.	We consider that the time has now come seriously to investigate the Hersden option in a way the Council have not done before and to identify Hersden, including the former colliery site, as a location for a planned village regeneration scheme of between 1000 and 1200 dwellings.
1.58	780277	Yvonne & Mark Culverhouse & Ford		5062	Supporting	Former colliery land and Hoplands Farm at Hersden south of A28. Whilst understanding many of our objections could be argued against the site above we feel this is the kinder of the two sites. This would be re use of brownfield and our government states brownfield first. It would not violate the historic environment. It would give a solution to our main point of objection. The concerns of pylons and health implications would not need to be addressed.	
1.58	414112	C E Arter		5271	Supporting	Support for the former Chislet Colliery site to be investigated further in terms of its potential to contribute towards the housing supply target.	
1.58	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5364	Objecting	Land to the South of the A28 at Hersden (para 1.58-1.61, page 25) We have been unable to assess this site with respect to water and wastewater capacity. This is because there is no indication of number of dwellings on the site thus we are unable to estimate the anticipated flows to and from the site.	
1.58	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5533	Objecting	Re-Hersden, surely this research should have been carried out prior to the production of the DLP as this is the main remaining brownfield site and could make such a contribution to the development strategy and distribution. The A28 could be moved southwards on an embankment to the south adjacent to the railway €“ if designed & landscaped carefully this would not only act as a further buffer (mitigating impact on Stodmarsh), but would allow a more coherent development of the north and south sites	
1.58	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5666	Supporting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:€¸ Willingness to do more investigation re-Hersden	
1.58	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5532	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'On Housing'. This includes the long overdue acceptance of much of Hersden as a development site.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.58	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5907	Objecting	There are a number of European sites in locality, and known sensitivities eg for coastal SPAs, KCC would like sight of the HRA before can agree that simple changes to policy wording can ensure that a likely significant effect is avoided. This is with respect to scale of development proposed and in particular para 1.58 that states the intention to consider an additional allocation site S of Hersden which lies immediately adjacent to Stodmarsh SPA. Could also impact on unidentified heritage assets	
1.58	784707	Dr Philip Rogers		5780	Supporting	Utilise the large brownfield site at south Hersden. The proposal is comprehensive, has a desirable range of facilities and would enhance community. As there is development south of A28 (business parks) the old colliery would make the village more compact and rationalise transport.	
1.58	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6033	Objecting	Land south of the A28. The protection of a site of international importance should be a matter of pride for Canterbury. Another 600 houses in Hersden on top of the 800 already proposed in Policy SP3 would be disaster with major concerns on impact for a rural village, with recognised problems. The social changes would be dramatic and should not be underestimated. Traffic and air quality impact. The developers would also need to contribute to infrastructure improvements.	
1.58	13835	Mr Michael Steed		6995	Supporting	I support positive consideration of the South of Hersden site (paras 1.58 - 1.59). But I find it extraordinary that this discussion ignores the adjacent disused station (Chislet Colliery Halt) - there is another one at Upstreet/Grove Ferry. The use of this railway line, with several new or re-opened halts is an obvious way of facilitating non-car dependent development. Why ignore it?	
1.59	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		345	Objecting	The South Hersden site should only be developed if sustainable transport options from the site are heavily supported so as to minimise the use of private motor vehicles via the A28 and mitigate against the adverse impact of the site due to its close proximity of the site to Stodmarsh National Nature Reserve.	Foot & cycle path links as detailed in the attached annotated map; Reopen the Chislet Colliery Halt on the railway.
1.59	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	228	Objecting	Of considerable concern. Given the sensitive nature of the Stour Valley to the south of the A28, it is monstrous to suggest that this could come under scrutiny for development, especially with the dubious justification that development "could contribute to the cost of the Sturry Crossing Relief Road".	
1.59	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		925	Objecting	Significant housing development is planned around Herne Bay and yet some of the money received via the CIL is to go to build a new crossing at Sturry. Herne Bay has one of the most deprived wards in the district. It has a failing retail centre. it has an underprovision of school places. It has no strategy for employment and none for tourism. Spending Herne Bay's development money away from the town will just serve to impoverish this town further as the balance is tipped still further into there	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.59	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1907	Supporting	The principle of the Hillreed controlled land to the north of Hersden contributing to road infrastructure improvements at Sturry is supported.	
1.59	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3693	Objecting	These paragraphs deal with potential scope for development on the southern side of Hersden. Please see our comments on development at Hersden included in Part 1 of our response. If our view is accepted that this land is developed in preference to that proposed in Policy SP3h on the northern side of the village, these paragraphs will need to be deleted.	Delete paragraph
1.60	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	229	Objecting	Of considerable concern. Given the sensitive nature of the Stour Valley to the south of the A28, it is monstrous to suggest that this could come under scrutiny for development, especially with the dubious justification that development "could contribute to the cost of the Sturry Crossing Relief Road€".	
1.60	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		475	Objecting	The proposed relief road sends the traffic back into Sturry. What is required is a full bypass to Sturry, and one where the Canmterbury end allows greater use to be made of Broad Oak Road as a relief route to Sturry Road.	A redesign of the Sturry relief road so the it bypasses Sturry not just the crossing - and one that takes also note of the proposal for the 400kV Richborough connection, which requires to use much the same alignment.
1.60	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		927	Supporting	The former Chislet Colliery site at Hersden should be included as a definite site The site is brownfield. The village of Hersden has a lagre number of community facilities.A substantial amount of housing (eg 300-500 dwellings) should be allocated for this site together with employment land and community facilities.	A substantial amount of housing (eg 300-500 dwellings) should be allocated for this site together with employment land and community facilities.
1.60	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3694	Objecting	These paragraphs deal with potential scope for development on the southern side of Hersden. Please see our comments on development at Hersden included in Part 1 of our response. If our view is accepted that this land is developed in preference to that proposed in Policy SP3h on the northern side of the village, these paragraphs will need to be deleted.	Delete paragraph
1.61	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3695	Objecting	These paragraphs deal with potential scope for development on the southern side of Hersden. Please see our comments on development at Hersden included in Part 1 of our response. If our view is accepted that this land is developed in preference to that proposed in Policy SP3h on the northern side of the village, these paragraphs will need to be deleted.	Delete paragraph
1.62	383359	Ms Judy Seymour - Ure		21	Supporting	The redevelopment of Howe Barracks should now be investigated, and this is a brown field site. I know the site only became vacant after the Canterbury Plan was published, but - given that this is an irreversible decision - surely this should be looked at again even if it means delaying the implementation of the Plan.	Investigate the redevelopment of Howe Barracks
1.62	766469	Ms Helen Paine		34	Supporting	All this seems totally unnecessary when Howe Barracks are about to be vacated. This constitutes a huge site, already well adapted to meeting housing needs.	
1.62	766609	Mr Paul Chapman		36	Supporting	The now vacant army barracks on Wngham Road could also be used to provide a large number of housing units.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.62	766840	Ms Sheelagh Deller		49	Supporting	Why is not possible to include the Howe Barracks in this plan. It's not too late to rethink. Building a road out of round Canterbury from there would make a lot of sense and ease congestion throughout the city. If for some reason the council reject the idea of including the Howe barracks in the the plan, then I trust the current housing and facilities already in place there will be kept and used for social housing.	
1.62	766797	Miss L Dowle		115	Supporting	Alternative and better placed existing brown field sites have not been included into the draft,ie the M.O.D site at Howe Barracks	
1.62	767055	Ms Julie Mecoli		94	Supporting	The proposed plan to build 4000 new homes at the end of Old and New Dover Road is of great concern and should not happen. Where is the convincing evidence new houses are actually needed in this location? At what point does the council actually take a stand and put forward a sustainable future for Canterbury,not one of constant expansion? If some houses are needed, there are new 'windfall' sites available at Howe Barracks which should be exploited.	
1.62	408452	Mr & Mrs Raymond and Marion Bell		198	Supporting	The plan completely ignores brownfield sites at Howe Barracks on the Littlebourne Rd. The Council has a duty to develop brownfield sites before using Grade 1 farmland.	
1.62	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	163	Supporting	The second major site to be included should be the Howe Barracks which came forward towards the end of discussions on the Local Plan.	Include the Howe Barracks site in the Local Plan.
1.62	769838	Mr Edward Goff		203	Supporting	Include the redevelopment of the Howe Barracks site	Include the redevelopment of the Howe Barracks site
1.62	408444	Mr & Mrs Bill & Carol Hinchliffe		490	Supporting	Develop brownfield sites such as Howe Barracks.	Include Howe Barracks in plan.
1.62	772987	Mrs Doreen Louren		312	Supporting	Potential development opportunities for the Barracks site	
1.62	773027	Ms Sofiah Garrard		318	Supporting	Windfall sites such as Howe Barracks, which has many existing facilities should be being considered for development instead of the 'preferred options' to preserve the City's historic setting.	
1.62	665473	Dr Richard Norman		522	Supporting	Support further investigation of opportunities provided by the Howe Barracks site, which should be proactively pursued.	
1.62	775418	Ms Elizabeth Darling		471	Supporting	Development of brownfield land should be maximised such as the barracks site. Put a strong case to the MoD for the release of more land for houses.	
1.62	775804	Mr A Spokes		675	Supporting	The land at Howe barracks should be identified as potential development land. There is sufficient land to fulfil the City Council's projected housing requirements included in the Local Plan without any other development. It would join up with the ribbon development along the Sturry Road and could have a road system the would divert the traffic from the bottlenecks along both Sturry and Military roads	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.62	775890	Mr John Alterskye		623	Supporting	Supports potential development opportunities for the Barracks site to reduce the amount of farmland earmarked for development.	
1.62	776234	Miss J Bell		596	Supporting	The newly vacated Howe Barracks could be used for housing development.	
1.62	366511	Mr Tony Couperthwaite		808	Supporting	Object to development at South Canterbury. There are other alternatives including Canterbury Army Barracks.	
1.62	776757	Mr Adrian Fox	Policy and Projects Manager Dover District Council	737	Objecting	Given the cost of the other infrastructure listed in Policy SP3, the environmental and nature conservation issues that would need to be fully addressed as part of any feasibility work combined with multiple land ownership issues the deliverability of this bypass is, in our opinion, highly questionable. It would also need to be demonstrated through transport modelling that the construction of an eastern bypass is fully justified in terms of national transport policy.	
1.62	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		931	Supporting	Open Space/Habitat Considerations, paragraph 1.62 No reference is made to the possibility of using part of the Howe Barracks site as a football stadium for Canterbury Football Club. This would be an excellent location for a football ground.	
1.62	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	1049	Objecting	There is limited information on Howe Barracks will present opportunities.	
1.62	777478	Mr John J Davis		1136	Supporting	Development should be confined primarily to Brown Field sites in this area such as Howe barracks.	
1.62	777479	Ms Jennifer S Davis		1152	Supporting	Development should be confined primarily to Brown Field sites in this area such as Howe barracks.	
1.62	778048	Mr Stuart Read		1081	Supporting	Howe Barracks should be taken into full consideration in the draft Local Plan	
1.62	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1256	Objecting	The need to expand detail around the closure of Howe Barracks. Since Howe Barracks will be closing further exploration on the wider contributions this site could make to the future planning of the city is necessary. The detail and potential of these items will need to be strengthened for the final submission.	
1.62	421407	Ms Carol Mather		1494	Supporting	There is a local available brownfield site - Howe Barracks. Why has consideration not been given to this site?	
1.62	777494	Mr Fred Wilson		1513	Supporting	Consideration could be given to building on Howe Barracks site, including the benefit of cleaning-up of contaminated land.	
1.62	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1738	Objecting	Reference to the potential for development of Howe Barracks should be deleted.	Omit paragraphs 1.62 to 1.66 inclusive of the Draft Local Plan. Include under Policy SP3 the allocation of an additional Strategic Site at Bodkin Farm, Chesterfield, Whitstable (as per the site details provided under our representation to Policy SP3a).
1.62	778183	Jo and David Pick		1539	Supporting	Now that the Ministry of Defence has announced the closure of the Howe Barracks, surely it would be sensible to look at the local plan afresh, giving proper consideration to all areas available for re-development.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.62	778529	Ms Rachel Franks		1630	Supporting	The recent availability of land at Howe Barracks in Canterbury should be investigated as alternative site for new homes for Canterbury together with brownfield sites.	
1.62	778754	Mrs Patricia Smith		1583	Supporting	I believe the brownfield land of the MoD site could provide some of the housing allocation required for Canterbury.	
1.62	778230	Mr & Mrs S R & D J Miles		1915	Supporting	Housing development should be focussed on brownfield sites such as Howe Barracks	
1.62	778237	R & M Smith		1987	Supporting	There is a considerable amount of land available for sensible development following the closure of Howe Barracks.	
1.62	778403	Mrs Christobel Seath		2106	Objecting	There is very little analysis in the COLP of the alterative brown field sites, which are currently available in the city. The Council should consider the Barracks site and the Peugeot Garage site.	The Council should consider the Barracks site and the Peugeot Garage site.
1.62	778486	Prof & Mrs Osman & Lorna Durrani		2135	Supporting	Council should concentrate on brownfield sites and the redevelopment of Howe Barracks.	
1.62	778494	Mrs A Ray		2177	Supporting	If the Howe Barracks proposal goes ahead surely this will be enough houses for Canterbury with the properties that are already empty.	
1.62	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2291	Supporting	New housing within the range of the total that the NLP study recommends could be achieved by a number of additional small schemes. Additional building as well as acquiring existing housing at Howe Barracks, together with additional housing at Canterbury West Station would mean that housing at south Canterbury could be dropped.	Allocate land for additional building as well as acquiring existing housing at Howe Barracks.
1.62	778884	Mr Ian Johnson		2587	Supporting	Why, oh why, is there not a plan for limited growth by use of brownfield sites? Howe Barracks, is an obvious candidate.	
1.62	779100	Mrs Ruth Matthews		2656	Supporting	What are your detailed plans for Howe barracks? It seems to me that this is a prime area to be redeveloped when new housing is necessary.	
1.62	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3019	Objecting	This site is adjacent to Chequers Wood and Old Park SSSI. Due to the impact that could occur as a result of other developments within Canterbury consideration will need to be given to the individual and in-combination impacts on this site as a result of any development. This site is also within 2km of Stodmarsh.	Due to the individual and in-combination impacts of other developments on Stodmarsh, consideration will need to be given as to whether impact can be mitigated if this site is delivered.Consideration will need to be given to the individual and in-combination impacts on the SSSI with appropriate safeguards being included within the site specific policy.
1.62	778384	Nicholas and Deborah Wells		3002	Supporting	Build some of the proposed additional housing on Howe Barracks.	
1.62	779274	Mr Graham Duplock	Parish Councillor Parish Councillor Beskesbourne	2841	Objecting	We feel that Canterbury City Council should look carefully at land realised by Howe Barracks and Prison and that the plan should be revisited in light of the forthcoming closures and land release.	We feel that Canterbury City Council should look carefully at land realised by Howe Barracks and Prison and that the plan should be revisited in light of the forthcoming closures and land release.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.62	779564	Mr J Tinker		2908	Supporting	There is also the Howe Barracks site in Canterbury, which, because of its current use, would be suitable for residential development. Following the experience of the Chattenden Barracks site on the Hoo peninsula, early development is probably a priority at this site to avoid it becoming unusable. Use of such sites would preserve the agricultural land described in the first paragraph.	
1.62	414960	Cllr Alex Perkins	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3175	Supporting	Support for the consideration of the barracks site	
1.62	779715	Andrew & Anne Goodwin		3149	Supporting	Support the development of the now redundant Howe Barracks site.	
1.62	383359	Ms Judy Seymour - Ure		3314	Supporting	Canterbury is simply not the right place to develop 4000 new homes. I do hope that the Council will re-think this decision, and perhaps have a new look at the Military Barracks site.	
1.62	772200	Solihin Garrard		3251	Supporting	Apart from any extension, the former barracks sites as well as other brownfield sites ought to be drawn into this plan to respect the environment and the Canterbury population.	
1.62	779170	Mrs Jean F Fenner		3288	Supporting	The Howe Barracks site would be more suitable and would keep people closer to the heart of the City and all it has to offer.	
1.62	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3180	Objecting	The sites identified at Hersden, south of A28, and at Howe Barracks need more examination for inclusion. The Council's intransigent position in not exploring the potential of these sites is baffling considering public opinion and stakeholder support.	
1.62	407886	Mr J and P Booth		3530	Objecting	When there is concern at strategic level about the amount of food we have to import it is wrong to turn quality agricultural land over to housing. This is especially so when it appears that insufficient consideration has been given to utilising the Howe Barracks site.	
1.62	780499	Valerie & John Puleston		3584	Supporting	Support development proposals for the Howe Barracks site	Reconsider the whole plan taking into consideration this large area now available.
1.62	408497	Mr C Mills		3735	Supporting	The council maintains that it has looked towards Brownfield sites before moving on to green field sites. A brownfield site that could be used is Howe Barracks that will become available in time.	Include Howe Barracks site in the final document.
1.62	780272	Councillor Tony Austin	Councillor Canterbury City Council	4160	Supporting	400 homes should be allocated in the plan for the Barracks Site and Cockerling Farm should be used also.	
1.62	780273	A D Linfoot		4118	Supporting	any small balance of that number could easily be re-located in available brown-field sites such as the Howe Barracks or lower-grade agricultural land.	
1.62	780847	Miss & Mr H & M Audsley & Dethier		4306	Supporting	Have all alternative strategies been explored? For example, use of brown field sites such as Howe Barracks, Canterbury Motor company site, or construction of new multi-storey car parking facilities to release sites for development within the city.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.62	780965	Mrs D Jeffers		4324	Supporting	The Council should concentrate proposed new growth on brownfield sites, such as Howe Barracks.	The Council should concentrate proposed new growth on brownfield sites, such as Howe Barracks.
1.62	780980	Ms Cecilia Duggan		4235	Objecting	I think that the effect of releasing land previously occupied by the barracks must be taken into consideration before pursuing any of the major developments proposed in the local plan. I believe there are also concerns regarding the adequacy of water supplies for such developments.	
1.62	780982	Mr John Hedington		4263	Supporting	Brown field sites and empty spaces elsewhere within the District should be fully exploited, particularly the army sites.	
1.62	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4413	Objecting	The enclosed plan shows the disposal area. DIO has updated this information by the submission of the plan of the disposal area with these reps.	
1.62	781154	Mr A R Blake		4382	Supporting	Could vacant brown field sites in Canterbury be used for houses e.g. Howe Barracks.	
1.62	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council	4576	Supporting	We feel that Canterbury City Council should look carefully at land released by Howe Barracks and the former Prison, and that the plan should be revisited in the light of the availability of extra land within the current city limits.	
1.62	779927	Mr R W Hughes		4596	Supporting	We know new houses have to be built, but not before the infrastructure has been put in place, also why are buildings that are empty not being utilised for new property's for example the old spires school and the army barracks in sturry road to name but a few.	
1.62	781014	Mr & Mrs C & J Stocken		4604	Supporting	Emphasis should be on siting smaller developments on several brownfield sites such as the Chislet colliery site, Howe Barracks and including Hersden in the plan, which could be served by a rail link, in preference to South Canterbury.	
1.62	781020	Ms Cathy Sales		4616	Supporting	New residential areas can be developed in a balanced way by using the Howe Barracks site as well as south Canterbury and connecting them with a road link across the current arable land next to the A2. When south Canterbury is developed playgrounds and open space for the young to play ball games must be incorporated into the plan as this need is not met for the current residents of south Canterbury.	
1.62	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council	4690	Supporting	Support for the Howe Barracks site to be investigated further in terms of its potential to contribute towards the housing supply target.	
1.62	121393	Cllr P Vickers		4689	Supporting	Barton farmland is soil of the highest quality (Grade 1). As such it should be protected. There are many other sites in the district with soil of a much lesser value, including some brownfield sites which are not included in the proposals e.g. south of Hersden, Canterbury prison site and the Howe Barracks)	
1.62	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4756	Objecting	Natural England's main concerns regarding the Barracks site are likely to be around the impact of possible changes on the Chequers Wood and Old Park SSSI, and the potential for protecting and enhancing habitats and landscape on the main barracks site.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.62	781719	A M Terry		4754	Supporting	Any houses to be built when the other conditions are satisfied should go on the barracks which the government/MOD should vacate 100%. They obviously do not need that space.	
1.62	781040	Ms Dawn Stroud		4812	Supporting	Support for the Howe Barracks site to be investigated further in terms of its potential to contribute towards the housing supply target.	
1.62	781786	D H Evans		5018	Supporting	The existing pitches at Howe Barracks would be a far more suitable and accessible location for Canterbury City Football Club.	Canterbury City Football Club should be sited on existing pitches at Howe Barracks.
1.62	782441	Mrs Sally Hopkins		5075	Supporting	The Council should concentrate on the Howe Barracks site.	
1.62	782442	Mr Richard Hopkins		5079	Supporting	The Council should concentrate on the Howe Barracks site.	
1.62	414112	C E Arter		5274	Supporting	Support for the former barracks site to be investigated further in terms of its potential to contribute towards the housing supply target.	
1.62	781721	Ms Lynne Broadbent		5182	Supporting	Support for the Howe Barracks site to be investigated further in terms of its potential to contribute towards the housing supply target.	
1.62	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5407	Supporting	We think that additional housing units from the following could be factored into the overall number required. a) Howe Barracks: 600 units.	
1.62	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5375	Objecting	We have been unable to assess this site with respect to water and wastewater capacity. This is because there is no indication of number of dwellings on the site thus we are unable to estimate the anticipated flows to and from the site.	
1.62	784579	Ms Ruth Buckland		5413	Supporting	There should be more investigation of brownfield sites including the barracks.	
1.62	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5536	Objecting	The Howe Barracks site warranted more careful study prior to the release of this DLP.	Commitment is required to more investigative work re-Howe Barracks
1.62	784617	Ms Beryl Wilson		5478	Supporting	I acknowledge the plan for new houses but the cost of this one is too much. The city is already crowded and our agricultural land is precious. Please rethink . Howe barracks is available and the prison area these must be factored in. Canterbury is a great city and desperately needs creative and original progress not the easy quick throwing up of houses only for profit and not quality of life. Come on Canterbury Council lead the way. Imagination and sensitivity.	
1.62	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5667	Supporting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:€ç Willingness to do more investigation re- Howe Barracks	
1.62	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5745	Supporting	The potential to use the former Military Barracks as both an additional/alternative site for housing to a limited extent and to provide a relief road from the A28 southwards is also an excellent opportunity to improve connectivity and regenerate that area of the city.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.62	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5912	Objecting	Development of these proposed sites has the potential to impact upon heritage assets such as direct impact resulting from construction activities and indirect impacts on the setting and character of neighbouring assets and places. The exceptional richness of historic environment + scale of the sites proposed would indicate a good potential for these allocation sites to impact upon presently unknown assets. Advice from CCC archaeological advisor should be sought with specific site analysis.	
1.62	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5848	Supporting	The likelihood of land round Howe Barracks becoming available means that this could provide for some 500 more helpfully located houses.	
1.62	784811	Dr Emily Blake		5839	Supporting	The proposal does not make any provision for using Brownfield sites such as The Military Barracks	
1.62	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6863	Supporting	Release of the Howe Barracks Site. (SHLAA 183, 184) The register does not give clear or complete maps of the whole site, and the DLP makes much of the encumbrances on the site. CCC exclude them from the appraisals. However, the combined area of the two sites listed is approx 11 ha. We cannot agree with the NLP Report proposal (at 8.17) of 35 dw/ha. We propose an average density of 75 dwelling/hectare. Thus it seems the Howe Barracks site might accommodate up to 750 dwellings.	
1.63	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4420	Objecting	The existing Service Family Accommodation at the Barracks will remain in MOD use, except for three dwellings which may be sold separately and which are part of the Annington Homes leased estate.	
1.64	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4421	Objecting	The Old Park Training Area will be retained by the MOD for training. The Management Plan has recently been updated in liaison with Natural England and other stakeholders. Open space provision within the area to be disposed of will be discussed in the context of the preparation of the planning application.	
1.65	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4422	Objecting	The Old Park Training Area will be retained by the MOD for training. The Management Plan has recently been updated in liaison with Natural England and other stakeholders. Open space provision within the area to be disposed of will be discussed in the context of the preparation of the planning application.	
1.66	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		346	Objecting	The A2 - A28 link road should not be provided. The A257 to Chaucer Road should not be usable by private motor vehicles. It should only benefit pedestrians, cyclists, and buses. Dedicated pedestrian and cycle infrastructure must be put in place at any development of the barracks site.	The A2 - A28 link road should not be provided. The A257 to Chaucer Road should not be usable by private motor vehicles. It should only benefit pedestrians, cyclists, and buses. Dedicated pedestrian and cycle infrastructure must be put in place at any development of the barracks site. See attached annotated map.
1.66	665473	Dr Richard Norman		523	Supporting	Support serious pursuit of possibility of an eastern bypass.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.66	778466	Mrs Barbara Hudgell		1386	Supporting	I support the use of the Tourtel Road- Littlebourne Road link through the barracks and also to add that it would help if Brymore Road was not closed early in the morning to avoid having to continue along Sturry Road. I would not support a dual carriage way by- pass through the Old Park but there might be a way of improving the road used by the Golf Club and adding to it.	
1.66	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3807	Objecting	Object to the signposting and safeguarding of the eastern bypass route from A2 to A28. 'Unlocking the gridlock' states that the proportion of traffic going that way is relatively low, the LP 2006 states that the eastern by-pass would have a significantly damaging effect on the local environment. KCC states most traffic into Canterbury is destination traffic. It is entirely aspirational, no justification is provided and it passes through a SSSI, which is unacceptable.	Delete the eastern bypass
1.66	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4759	Objecting	The proposal for an eastern by-pass should only come from a strategic assessment of the issues and the options. On the basis of the corridor shown on the proposals map, the road would have significant impact on the Chequers Wood and Old Park SSSI, both in terms of the loss and the fragmentation of habitat.	
1.66	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5537	Objecting	How important is the eastern bypass? If critical to relieving traffic and air quality problems in the Canterbury urban area and improving the District's attractiveness to employers, should it not have a greater prominence and a more tangible presence in the Plan? The Council should've made a very clear commitment to push the urgent need for this with central government.	
1.66	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5746	Supporting	The potential to use the former Military Barracks as both an additional/alternative site for housing to a limited extent and to provide a relief road from the A28 southwards is also an excellent opportunity to improve connectivity and regenerate that area of the city.	
1.66	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6060	Objecting	Tourtel Road to Littlebourne Road and potential longer eastern by-pass should be in place before the road changes at Sturry. How would sufficient funding be raised? Is this deliverable? What would the timescales be? Building even more housing to fund this would not mafe sense - even more houses = even more traffic.	ALL major infrastructure should be in place before any large scale housing, especially to the north and east of the city.
1.67	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		425	Supporting	In general we support the Councils Settlement Hierarchy Study (2011) which advocates a sequential approach to location of land for development primarily towards the 3 main urban settlements of the District i.e Canterbury, Herne Bay and Whitstable. We consider a housing target of around 400 dwellings on Site 7: land off Thanet Way, Whitstable as appropriate. This should be set as an approximate figure so as not to constrain the master plan analysis of this site.	
1.67	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		492	Supporting	Both these releif roads are necessary to relieve the present congestion on the New Dover Road and thereby allow the proposed development South of the city.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.67	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		280	Objecting	The Settlement Hierarchy Study was flawed by over-simplification and should not be given undue influence when considering development in villages	State clearly that the Settlement Hirarchy Study is a very rough tool for judging the size and sustainability of villages and that other factors will be taken into account when considering development.
1.67	408497	Mr C Mills		3771	Objecting	Strategic approach to the location of development - It is clear to I that this policy has been developed to underpin the decision by the council to develop in South Canterbury. We believe that this decision should be revisited to provide an evidence based approach that is transparent to all.	
1.67	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3808	Supporting	Generally supports the rural settlement hierarchy as proposed, subject to changes: remove rural centre category and redesignated Sturry as local centre; recognise the settlement of Herne; Tyler Hill should be a Hamlet. Rural settlements should have their built confines defined giving a definate boundary between countryside and built rather than relying on abitrary inconsistent planning decisions.	
1.67	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4401	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. Support the sequential approach in principle but not the way it is applied, because; 1 the reliance on large greenfield allocations, no justification, loss of Grade 1 land, undeliverable; 2 reliance on new road infrastructure, has driven site selection; 3 failure to address housing needs in all the Market Areas. no regard paid of how need is to be met in areas.	
1.67	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6064	Objecting	The 2011 Rural Hierarchy Study is flawedand misleading. The individual rural villages of Sturry Parish are not clearly considered separately. The complexity which results from the close vicinity of Sturry Parish communities with Fordwich and Westbere has not been properly appreciated or understood. The appraisals are confusing and inaccurate with duplication. Administrative boundaries are artificial when it comes to how local residents view their environs and lead their lives.	
1.68	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		281	Supporting	Agree that development should be concentrated in the urban areas where facilities exist.	
1.68	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1723	Supporting	The KDAONB supports the sequential approach to redevelopment for 2 reasons. To ensure the regeneration of town and urban centres is not challenged by cheaper development of greenfield sites which are less sustainable, and ensure the use of brownfield/ previously developed land is used before greenfield sites.	
1.68	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1780	Objecting	If new housing is continually located in urban areas of the district this inevitably leads to cramming, the loss of green elements, less trees, smaller gardens which is detrimental to the urban environment and the quality of life of residents therein and it is also damaging to the economic, cultural and wellbeing of the area.	Do not just increase the size of the coastal towns which are now becoming disproportionately large especially when you consider the size of the city.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.68	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2757	Objecting	We hope that CCC take the comments of residents and parish council on board, that the large amount of development is not wanted	
1.68	408497	Mr C Mills		3773	Objecting	Strategic approach to the location of development - It is clear to I that this policy has been developed to underpin the decision by the council to develop in South Canterbury. We believe that this decision should be revisited to provide an evidence based approach that is transparent to all.	
1.68	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3809	Supporting	Generally supports the rural settlement hierarchy as proposed, subject to changes: remove rural centre category and redesignated Sturry as local centre; recognise the settlement of Herne; Tyler Hill should be a Hamlet. Rural settlements should have their built confines defined giving a definite boundary between countryside and built rather than relying on arbitrary inconsistent planning decisions.	
1.68	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4402	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. Support the sequential approach in principle but not the way it is applied, because; 1 the reliance on large greenfield allocations, no justification, loss of Grade 1 land, undeliverable; 2 reliance on new road infrastructure, has driven site selection; 3 failure to address housing needs in all the Market Areas. no regard paid of how need is to be met in areas.	
1.68	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5538	Objecting	The underpinning studies highlighted to the need to reinforce the rural hubs/ service centres in a sensitive and appropriate manner, but where are the site allocations for Blean, Bridge, Chartham and Littlebourne? There is absolutely no explanation as to why they have been dropped. Even members of the LP Steering Group assumed allocations in these places would have been included having been part of the decision-making process that made such allocations.	
1.68	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5652	Supporting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:- Flexibility incorporated in 1.66 re-rural settlements and focus on local needs	
1.68	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5849	Objecting	Despite the DLP's commitment to preserving village services, many are now virtually dead dormitories, lacking all facilities save perhaps a Church. An intelligent policy would be to encourage more development there in the hope that such extra housing might help to bring them back to life. More people would possibly provide a base for facilities and enhanced community activities.	
1.68	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1724	Supporting	The KDAONB supports the sequential approach to redevelopment for 2 reasons. To ensure the regeneration of town and urban centres is not challenged by cheaper development of greenfield sites which are less sustainable, and ensure the use of brownfield/ previously developed land is used before greenfield sites.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.69	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		493	Objecting	There exist a nuber of potential locations where development alongside or within villages would be preferable to spreading urban sprawl around Canterbury. Prime among these are Selling and Bekesbourne	
1.69	777168	V Mit		688	Objecting	The extra houses need to be built on brown field sites, not green field. More consideration needs to be taken of public transport use, so development should be centred close to Canterbury City Centre, where this is easiest to achieve.	
1.69	777424	Mrs & Mrs Edmed		851	Supporting	Development should go on available brownfield land ahead of greenfield sites.	
1.69	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1717	Objecting	"The distribution of new development also broadly reflects ... the outcomes from the Ipsos MORI public opinion research" - no it doesn't. The Ipsos/MORI report says on Page 4: "There is a swing away from in principle support if it involves building on greenfield; 70% of all residents say they would oppose building in these circumstances". Yet ALL the proposed major developments are on greenfield sites. The Local Plan has ignored the wishes of residents.	Regardless of how much the developers squeal and weep tears of self-pity, every effort must be made to use in-fill and brownfield sites BEFORE developing ANY greenfield sites.
1.69	778738		ARJO Wiggins	1880	Supporting	We give support for the use of previously developed land for development and highlight the fact that the submission land at Chartham Papers meets this requirement	
1.69	408497	Mr C Mills		3775	Objecting	This policy has been developed to underpin the decision by the council to develop in South Canterbury. We believe that this decision should be revisited to provide an evidence based approach that is transparent to all.	
1.69	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3810	Supporting	Generally supports the rural settlement hierarchy as proposed, subject to changes: remove rural centre category and redesignated Sturry as local centre; recognise the settlement of Herne; Tyler Hill should be a Hamlet. Rural settlements should have their built confines defined giving a definate boundary between countryside and built rather than relying on abitrary inconsistent planning decisions.	
1.69	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4403	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. Support the sequential approach in principle but not the way it is applied, because; 1 the reliance on large greenfield allocations, no justification, loss of Grade 1 land, undeliverable; 2 reliance on new road infrastructure, has driven site selection; 3 failure to address housing needs in all the Market Areas. no regard paid of how need is to be met in areas.	
1.69	127115	B.J. Gore		5286	Objecting	Object to lack of reference to brownfield first approach as set out in NPPF. Plan should use all brownfield sites first before considering greenfield development. Infrastructure costs of proposed sites increase the build cost and design and materials will suffer.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.69	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5540	Objecting	The statements are untrue! Where is the evidence of a comprehensive search for: a) brownfield or underused urban or rural sites and b) low-grade, unused or degraded agricultural/ horticultural land? Surely there are alternatives to the proposed use of higher quality greenfield sites? The distribution of proposed development and housing allocations in this DLP do not fully reflect the Mori findings or the hierarchy study, especially as regards rural hubs and local centres.	
1.69	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5797	Supporting	The acknowledgement of the importance of siting development on previously developed land as a priority is supported. This fully accords with the requirements of the NPPF detailed at Paragraph 111.	
1.69	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5820	Supporting	The acknowledgement of the importance of siting development on previously developed land as a priority is supported. This fully accords with the requirements of the NPPF detailed at Paragraph 111.	
1.70	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	230	Objecting	Development in small villages and the Rural Settlement Hierarchy Study: Wickhambreaux is classified as a village by just one point. The study was based on an arbitrary and over-simplistic identification of facilities in settlements. There was no attempt to assess the availability of development land, the sustainability of sites in terms of infrastructure variables, types of housing, the layout and character of the roads, availability of parking and alternative transport possibilities. These indi	
1.70	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		494	Objecting	The words "previously developed" need clarification. It should be limited to industrial or commercial development and should never include recreational spaces.	Clarification is needed of the phrase "previously developed".
1.70	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		282	Objecting	The Settlement Hierarchy Study was flawed by over-simplified criteria.	State clearly that the Settlement Hierarchy Study is a very rough tool for judging the size and sustainability of villages and that other factors will be taken into account when considering development.
1.70	777517	Mr Keith Groombridge	Barham Court Farms	1403	Objecting	The table below paragraph 1.70 should be given greater weight by being included in a policy.	The table setting out the Rural Settlement Hierarchy should have policy status in order to enhance the effectiveness of the Local Plan.
1.70	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1133	Supporting	WPC welcomes the inclusion of Waltham as an "identified hamlet" in section 1.70.	
1.70	778582	Mr Laurence Muston		1324	Objecting	Herne should be included in the list of villages	Herne should be included in the list of villages
1.70	777995	Mr Steve Dallison		1498	Objecting	Please can you explain to me the rationale behind the 'upgrading' (sic) of Barham as a local centre rather than a village. I am aware of a number of businesses that exist outside the village but within the parish boundary.	
1.70	778187	Mrs Cynthia Lewsey		1600	Objecting	Re : Re-classification of Barham Village to a local centre. My concerns regarding the above are the potential increased volume of traffic using Church Lane/Gravel Castle Road.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.70	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1725	Objecting	Several settlements in the hierarchy are in the AONB or its setting. High quality design and compliance with strict criteria to ensure landscape impact is mitigated should be imposed. The LP should include criteria in accordance with the requirements of NPPF para 113. Refer to our comments on LB1 and LB2. Without such criteria the KDAONB object to the inclusion of settlements which are within the setting, on the boundary, or within the AONB in the rural settlement hierarchy.	Criteria which reflect the need for high quality design and requirements to conserve and enhance the AONB and mitigate impacts for development within Local centres, villages or hamlets in the AONB, on the boundary, or within the setting should be included in LB1.
1.70	778754	Mrs Patricia Smith		1584	Objecting	Barham does not have the local services required to be classed as a Local Centre, with only one community-run shop/PO, one bus an hour and very poor Broadband connections. Other limited services on the A2/A260 are more than 800m from nearly all the housing. The nearby village of Bridge does have a good range of services and is also designated as a Local Centre. There is therefore no need to also put Barham in this category.	Re-designate Barham as a village.
1.70	13739	Mrs Christobel Seath	Clerk Bridge Parish Council	1896	Objecting	Bridge Parish Council is alarmed to see that Canterbury City Council has apparently changed the designation of Bridge from a village to a 'Local Centre'.	
1.70	778481	Mr A C Lewsey		1883	Objecting	Objects to the reclassification of Barham as a centre instead of village, because: of the increase in traffic due to more properties. They live on a dangerous cross road (Chruch Ln/Gravel Castle Rd) which has seen and increase in traffic and many accidents. More property will be required but it will need to take into account the AONB and be built sympathetically in small numbers.	
1.70	778733		The John Graham Centre	1856	Objecting	The principle of the local centres accommodating a higher growth level than elsewhere is to be supported. However the ambiguity of the text and the confusing policy SP4 gives no firm guidance as to the level of growth that is considered appropriate and is therefore contrary to the aims of the NPPF	The plan needs to be more explicit on the level of growth acceptable at local centres.
1.70	778738		ARJO Wiggins	1882	Objecting	We have concerns that the meaning of this paragraph and in particular the scale of growth at local centres is not clear. This needs to be explained here or in policy SP4 or both	This paragraph should be more explicit on the scale of growth likely to be supported at local centres.
1.70	778740		Stour Valley Estates Ltd	1676	Objecting	The principle of the text in suggesting a higher level of development at rural service centres and local centres than small scale development is supported but the text is unhelpful in failing to identify what is meant by higher level. The matter is compounded by the confusion of SP4 and the overall failure to identify sites at the local centres for additional housing	The plan needs to identify what is meant by higher level and how developments at local centres will be measured
1.70	779149	Wortham		1678	Objecting	Need to retain sustainable villages as villages and not turn them into local centres and suburbs of the City.	Retaining the designation of 'village' and dropping attempts to turn them into local centres.
1.70	778777	Mr Nick Waldron	The Waldron Family	2107	Objecting	This approach is not advocated in the NPPF, which instead refers to the need for development at the villages to be sustainable, support the rural economy and be responsive to local circumstances. We also object to the proposal that development need be restricted to 'in the identified villages'. The NPPF does not prescribe development only within villages. Please see attached statement.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.70	778783	A Briant		2341	Objecting	Herne should be listed as a village in the local draft plan. Herne was here as a village/place of dwelling, whilst Herne Bay was not established until 1833. In fact, Herne was the original settlement where the local residents were quite happy to live in the village of Herne and also enjoy village life and its amenities and still do, for that matter.	
1.70	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2729	Objecting	Dismayed Herne has not been classified as a larger village, and is instead included within Herne Bay urban area. It is shown as a village in the amenities survey, hierarchy study and conservation area review. CCC ignore that Herne and broomfield are villages and semi rural. Concerned about loss of uniqueness and traffic. Change urban boundary to exclude Herne and Broomfield.	The parish council wish to see the urban boundary for Herne Bay changed so it does not include the Herne & Broomfield areas.
1.70	778883	Mrs F Dingle		2582	Objecting	I think Herne should be listed as a villiage in the Draft Plan . It was here as a settlement hundreds & hundreds of years ago. Herne Bay was only established in the early 1800's. By joining Herne Bay and Greenhill to Herne we will be loosing the identity of our much loved semi-rural village.	
1.70	777366	G & M Goodfellow		3522	Objecting	Herne should be listed as a village in the Draft Local Plan. It was here long before Herne Bay. Herne was the original settlement and the local residents are happy to live in the village and enjoy village life and amenities.	
1.70	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3580	Objecting	I think it is disgraceful that the City Council refuses to recognise Herne as a Village and ignores it in the Rural Settlement Hierarchy.	
1.70	408497	Mr C Mills		3776	Objecting	This policy has been developed to underpin the decision by the council to develop in South Canterbury. We believe that this decision should be revisited to provide an evidence based approach that is transparent to all.	
1.70	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3811	Objecting	Generally supports the rural settlement hierarchy as proposed, subject to changes: remove rural centre category and redesignated Sturry as local centre; elevate Hersden to a rural service centre; recognise the settlement of Herne; Tyler Hill should be a Hamlet. Rural settlements should have their built confines defined giving a definate boundary between countryside and built rather than relying on abitrary inconsistent planning decisions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i, The category of rural service centre should be removed from the hierarchy, and Sturry (the only settlement defined as falling in this category) should be re-designated in the hierarchy as a local centre. This, we believe, would better reflect its function as a centre given its close proximity to Canterbury. Redesignate Hersden as Rural Centre i, The village of Herne should be recognised in the hierarchy as a separate settlement to Herne Bay. It should be included as a local centre. i, As it only has a pub, it is difficult to see why Tyler Hill is defined as a village - it should be included in the hierarchy as a hamlet.
1.70	779026	Ms Amanda Sparkes	Clerk Barham Parish Council	4187	Objecting	Barham PC objects in the strongest terms to the reclassification of Barham to that of a "local centre"as it does not reflect the true situation of the village and this is further exacerbated by the apparently deeply flawed analysis that has helped lead to this proposal. Such a reclassification would open up the village to significant levels of development and prove impossable to protect the community. The desk study has errors- it does not reflect the position on the ground. Poor consultation.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.70	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4404	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. Support the sequential approach in principle but not the way it is applied, because; 1 the reliance on large greenfield allocations, no justification, loss of Grade 1 land, undeliverable; 2 reliance on new road infrastructure, has driven site selection; 3 failure to address housing needs in all the Market Areas. no regard paid of how need is to be met in areas.	
1.70	781159	Mr D R Budd		4400	Objecting	Herne should be listed as a village in. the Draft Local Plan. It was here long before Herne Bay which wasn't established until 1833. Herne was the original settlement and the local residents are happy to live in the village and enjoy village life and amenities.	
1.70	781043	Ms Daphne Iles		4645	Objecting	Object to Barham being re-categorised from a village to local centre.	
1.70	781045	Mr Barry Iles		4910	Objecting	Object to Barham being re-categorised from a village to local centre.	
1.70	380258	Mr Mavaddat		5129	Objecting	The proposed categorisation in the Table at Paragraph 1.70 of the Draft Plan places Westbere in the category of 'Hamlets' - small settlements with modest populations which provide very limited services. We oppose this designation and seek instead the inclusion of Westbere within the category of 'Villages'.	The proposed categorisation in the Table at Paragraph 1.70 of the Draft Plan places Westbere in the category of 'Hamlets' - small settlements with modest populations which provide very limited services. We oppose this designation and seek instead the inclusion of Westbere within the category of 'Villages'.
1.70	557251	Mr Simon Cavalier		4971	Objecting	It is difficult to see the justification of uprating Barham village to a 'local centre' and it is even more difficult to understand the implication of this change, given that there is no indication of how much or how extensive or how rapidly any future development might be, especially given its conservation and AoOB status. Theaoretical approach taken in the assessment has resulted in an extreme and bloated view of the services and resouces- including the bus service, level of employment.	
1.70	780212	Church Commissioners for England		5207	Objecting	Object to Ickham's classification as a hamlet and consider it should be a village because: the study does not take account of its location 5 miles from Canterbury City and jobs/shops/services; bus provision has changed with 7 stops/day; it is walking distance to Wickhambreaux school 800m away; these considerations would raise Ickham's score to 7 above Wickhambreaux which is listed as a village. 56% of residents confirm they would accept development of single dwellings.	Ickham should be defined as a village in the settlement hierarchy and the table in para 1.70.
1.70	782433	Eastling Farms Ltd		5051	Objecting	We object to the inclusion of Upper Harbledown as a hamlet, in the rural settlement hierarchy; we consider that it would be more appropriate for it to be regarded as a village.	We consider that Upper Harbledown should be regarded as a village.
1.70	782439	Mr Alan Holden	Chairman Broad Oak Preservation Society	5072	Objecting	One of the criteria apparently used in selecting our community for developmentis the identification of Sturry as a well-serviced village. However it should be remembered that the shops and community facilities in Sturry are either in the historic village centre to the south of the railway crossing, or in the neighbourhood shopping area of Hoades Wood Road at the extreme eastern end of Sturry village.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.70	779673	R H & A Godfrey-Faussett		5418	Objecting	The hierarchy study is flawed and wrongly classifies Barham as a local centre, because: it mistakenly describes the village as having 2 shops plus the postoffice/community store; it attributes a vineyard, cafe and garden centre to Barham when they are 2km away; It designates Broom Park Estate and Golf Club, Barham Business Park and the Crematorium as being Employment sites, the Golf Club and Business Park are over 2km away and closer to Denton. There are other errors. Reclassify as settlement.	Correct errors and the score for Barham should be reduced, bringing it within the category of a settlement.
1.70	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5798	Supporting	The inclusion of Hersden as a defined "Local Centre"and the associated acknowledgement of the range of facilities and employment opportunities it offers and therefore its self sustaining attributed is fully supported. This change in classification from the previous options report consultation is entirely welcomed, and accurately reflects the important community role this settlement plays.	
1.70	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5821	Supporting	The inclusion of Hersden as a defined "Local Centre"and the associated acknowledgement of the range of facilities and employment opportunities it offers and therefore its self sustaining attributed is fully supported. This change in classification from the previous options report consultation is entirely welcomed, and accurately reflects the important community role this settlement plays.	
1.70	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6062	Objecting	Rural settlements, be they a 'rural service centre', 'local centre', Village or 'Hamlet' are RURAL not URBAN and this distinction must be preserved. A token green gap is insufficient.	Para 1.70 should include the definition of 'Rural' and what is meant by a 'Rural Service centre', a 'local centre', a 'village' and a 'hamlet' here. The requirements for each should also be clarified here, or there should be a cross reference to paras 4.10 and 4.11
1.70	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	6538	Supporting	Littlebourne is correctly categorised in the Rural Settlement Hierarchy as a larger village/local centre where a level of development that is higher than 'small-scale' might be supported (Para 1.70). Agree with this, consider up to 87 dwellings could be accommodated on their site in keeping with character/scale of village. This and similar opportunities in other local centres could play a significant role in meeting the District/local housing need. Would strengthen plan.	
1.70	13835	Mr Michael Steed		7001	Objecting	This is too cautious about the contribution that small-scale rural development can make. A lot of people want to live in villages. See my points B and C above for the appropriate strategy. There are several villages on radial routes with good public transport which could benefit from limited growth. Why select the biggest of these, Sturry-Hersden, and put all the extra-urban area growth there?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.71	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	231	Objecting	1.71/Policy SP4: Clarification needed: 5 €" 10 houses within a "larger"village might be considered acceptable "minor"development. No mention of development in a smaller village. We might feel justified in inferring that up to 5 houses could be acceptable as a minor development, but inference is not good enough. This point needs clarifying.	
1.71	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		283	Objecting	There needs to be a clear definition of minor development in a small village.	Definition of minor development in a small village as fewer than 5
1.71	778777	Mr Nick Waldron	The Waldron Family	2113	Objecting	This approach is not advocated in the NPPF, which instead refers to the need for development at the villages to be sustainable, support the rural economy and be responsive to local circumstances. Please see attached statement.	See attached statement.
1.71	408497	Mr C Mills		3777	Objecting	This policy has been developed to underpin the decision by the council to develop in South Canterbury. We believe that this decision should be revisited to provide an evidence based approach that is transparent to all.	
1.71	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3812	Supporting	Generally supports the rural settlement hierarchy as proposed, subject to changes: remove rural centre category and redesignated Sturry as local centre; recognise the settlement of Herne;Tyler Hill should be a Hamlet. Rural settlements should have their built confines defined giving a definate boundary between countryside and built rather than relying on abitrary inconsistent planning decisions.	
1.71	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4405	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. Support the sequential approach in principle but not the way it is applied, because; 1 the reliance on large greenfield allocations, no justification, loss of Grade 1 land, undeliverable; 2 reliance on new road infrastructure, has driven site selection; 3 failure to address housing needs in all the Market Areas. no regard paid of how need is to be met in areas.	
1.71	380258	Mr Mavaddat		5130	Objecting	The Draft Local Plan does not identify or promote more modest development at any of the other rural settlements through allocations, despite guidance in the NPPF. The text in Paragraphs 1.71 and 2.45 is overly restrictive, limiting reasonable development at Rural Settlements that would be in accordance with the NPPF.	The text in Paragraphs 1.71 and 2.45 is overly restrictive, limiting reasonable development at Rural Settlements that would be in accordance with the NPPF.
1.71	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5653	Supporting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:- Concern re-pattern of any development in rural settlements inc. reservations re-infilling	
1.72	773048	Mrs J Moran		271	Objecting	In the past when planning applications have been refused [in the Sturry Parish], one reason given is 'the proposed development is outside the 'village envelope'. All the proposed sites shown in the 2013 Local Development Plan in regard to Sturry Parish, are outside the respective 'village envelopes'. Does this mean this particular reason will not be used in future to refuse an individual gaining planning permission?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.72	774890	Mrs Wendy Gregory		277	Objecting	There should be clarity on the boundary of a village and residents given the opportunity to challenge current assumptions.	Make public the boundary of a village.
1.72	408497	Mr C Mills		3778	Objecting	This policy has been developed to underpin the decision by the council to develop in South Canterbury. We believe that this decision should be revisited to provide an evidence based approach that is transparent to all.	
1.72	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3813	Objecting	Generally supports the rural settlement hierarchy as proposed, subject to changes: remove rural centre category and redesignated Sturry as local centre; recognise the settlement of Herne; Tyler Hill should be a Hamlet. Rural settlements should have their built confines defined giving a definite boundary between countryside and built rather than relying on arbitrary inconsistent planning decisions.	CPRE Protect Kent is strongly of the view that boundaries should be defined for the villages, local centres and rural service centres, as well as for the main urban areas.
1.72	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4406	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. Support the sequential approach in principle but not the way it is applied, because; 1 the reliance on large greenfield allocations, no justification, loss of Grade 1 land, undeliverable; 2 reliance on new road infrastructure, has driven site selection; 3 failure to address housing needs in all the Market Areas. no regard paid of how need is to be met in areas.	
1.72	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5541	Objecting	The defence of 'openness' and the failure to indicate boundaries do however rather undermine the protection of green belts. The unsuitable vacant plots within settlements can be highlighted and assigned protection €" that has been the standard and more rigorous approach to Local Plans. Otherwise such plots will still remain vulnerable to speculative planning applications.	
Policy SP4	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	232	Objecting	1.71/Policy SP4: Clarification needed: 5 - 10 houses within a "larger" village might be considered acceptable "minor" development. No mention of development in a smaller village. We might feel justified in inferring that up to 5 houses could be acceptable as a minor development, but inference is not good enough. This point needs clarifying.	
Policy SP4	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		284	Objecting	A definition of Minor Development in small villages is needed The importance of any development having regard to the 'character, appearance and historic environment' should be included in the wording of policy SP4	Improved clarity in the wording of Policy SP4
Policy SP4	777517	Mr Keith Groombridge	Barham Court Farms	1404	Objecting	Policy SP4 is inconsistent with Policy HD1, Appendix 2 and paragraph 2.24.	Insert 'strategic' in paragraph 2 line 1 to read 'In addition to the strategic development allocations...'. Reword paragraph 2 (2) of Policy SP4 to read 'small-scale allocations and new housing provision ...'. Include reference to Policy HD1 and Appendix 2 or footnote.
Policy SP4	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		933	Objecting	POLICY SP4: location of New Development - No mention is made of development on brownfield sites in the villages. There are a number of small brownfield sites which could be developed for housing.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP4	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		928	Objecting	Herne is a village. The plan will join it to Herne Bay by adding four housing estates on the greenfield land between the two. Herne will lose its identity. Another estate is planned at Bullockstone Road but it is not described anywhere n the plan. This seems a sub-optimal location for more development given that the Council is hoping to make Bullockstone Rd a relief road.	Do not fill the greenfield land between Herne and Herne Bay with housing.
Policy SP4	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1134	Objecting	WPC is pleased to note that items 4 and 5 of Policy SP4 concerning the location of new development in the district give assurance that "development at the identified hamlets will be limited to only that which specifically meets an identified local need€"; and "in the open countryside, development will normally be limited to that required for agriculture and forestry purposes (see Policy EMP13)€".	
Policy SP4	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1484	Objecting	Westbere Parish Council (WPC) does, however, appreciate the importance and the need for more housing within the Parish and, for this very reason, a group of motivated residents worked for three years on a Parish Plan. It takes into account additional housing and, at the same time, addresses the needs and issues of local residents within this context. Identified therein was to be the masterplan for future development within Westbere Parish and would be considered over and above other development.	Currently, we fear that the time, energy and money committed to producing a Parish Plan and lodging a copy with the appropriate authorities for adoption has been disregarded and would appreciate further clarification on this issue.
Policy SP4	13742	Mr G Eaton	Clerk Chislet Parish Council	1694	Supporting	The Council would like to reiterate its earlier comments (Dec 2012) regarding the maintenance of the Green Gap between Chislet and Hersden (the field west of Upstreet) to prevent continuous development. This land has been in continual agricultural use since time immemorial and the Council feels very strongly that this Green Gap should be maintained and not developed.	
Policy SP4	751574	Mr Nigel Fisher		1658	Supporting	I support the policy that priority will be given to the rural character of the distirct and housing development in villages in villages will be limited to minor development or infill. It is very important that the landscape and rural character of villages are maintained, especially in the AONB and conservation areras.	
Policy SP4	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1620	Objecting	This states the Canterbury sites as urban development. The proposals for a "garden city" clearly contradict this as it will be greenfield that is destroyed in the process. The site proposed is not "urban" only in the broadest sense possible.	Remove the plan for 4000+ houses in South Canterbury and keep to existing buildings levels, this removes the "need" for this building.
Policy SP4	13739	Mrs Christobel Seath	Clerk Bridge Parish Council	1902	Objecting	The CDLP does not take account of AONB objectives as set out in the Management Plan which state that the primary purpose of AONB designation is to 'conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the landscape'. The AONB Management Plan also makes it clear that the development of local services will be supported where they do not conflict with AONB policies (Ibid p 85) The CDLP should therefore be integrated far more closely with AONB policies where it affects Bridge.	The CDLP should therefore be integrated far more closely with AONB policies where it affects Bridge.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP4	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1910	Objecting	More housing is planned for Herne Bay than the whole of Maidstone District - it is too much unsupported development. If this scale of development goes ahead Herne Bay will become as big as Canterbury without the cutural assests. Concerned that some of the site allocations fall within the Plenty Brook flood risk areas. Any development money should stay in the area and not taken away to serve Canterbury. A Herdens New Town approach would be better and gain wider Kent and Government approval.	Don't Overdevelop the Herne Bay Environment Promote Herden to principle focus for development
Policy SP4	778481	Mr A C Lewsey		1899	Objecting	Objects to the reclassification of Barham as a centre instead of village, because: of the increase in traffic due to more properties. More property will be required but it will need to take into account the AONB and be built sympathetically in small numbers.	
Policy SP4	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1757	Objecting	The KDAONB support this policy provided changes are made to LB1 that reflect criteria needed for development within the AONB or its setting.	Changes to LB1 which include criteria for development within the AONB or its setting.
Policy SP4	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	1688	Supporting	We support this policy	
Policy SP4	778733		The John Graham Centre	1857	Objecting	Object to policy SP4 because; it is unclear about housing growth in service centre villages; fails to take into account the future needs and desires of the local population and the need to support the local services; lack of clarity as to how development proposals will be assessed; what is a higher level of development, small scale and minor and how do they relate?; need to clearly define level of development and allocate sites.	This policy needs to be changed in order to remove the ambiguity in the wording and to clarify the level of acceptable development in local centres.
Policy SP4	778738		ARJO Wiggins	1884	Objecting	Considers that the policy towards housing growth in the service centre villages is unclear, lacks clarity, fails to take into account the future needs and desires of the local population and the need to support the local services which exist, and has been formulated in the absence of an evidence base. Need to identify new housing development in the village. Para 1.7 conflicts with policy need to change wording what is meant by a high scale? Allocating site would comply with NPPF.	The policy should explicitly set out the scale of growth at local centres which is considered acceptable especially in the light that there may be no need to approve development at local centres on housing numbers alone Need to change wording to clarify service and local centres.
Policy SP4	778739	Mr A Salvatori		1665	Objecting	The policy for housing growth in the service centre villages is unclear and fails to take into account the future needs and desires of locals and the need to support the local services which exist, because: no evidence; but demonstrated need; unlikely to get grant funding for affordable alone.	The housing allocation at 51 Rough Common Road should be extended to cover the whole of the site in my client's ownership in order to secure sufficient affordable units to meet the identified need
Policy SP4	778740		Stour Valley Estates Ltd	1679	Objecting	SP4 needs to be redrafted to give clarity and housing/mixed use allocations need to be made at local centres	Redrafting of the policy to make sense
Policy SP4	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	1990	Objecting	Object - to the failure of the policy to identify the level of acceptable housing growth at local centres and the contradiction between the provisions of the policy and its Reasoned Justification at paragraph 1.70.	See above
Policy SP4	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1946	Objecting	To avoid any potential confusion between the strategic allocations identified and the hierachy set out in this policy some additional wording is recommended which states "Other than the SP3 allocations.....".	The introduction of the following wording at the start of the Policy " Other than the SP3 allocations....."

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP4	778777	Mr Nick Waldron	The Waldron Family	2114	Objecting	This approach is not advocated in the NPPF, which instead refers to the need for development at the villages to be sustainable, support the rural economy and be responsive to local circumstances. We also object to the proposal that development need be restricted to 'in the identified villages'. The NPPF does not prescribe development only within villages. Please see attached statement.	Please see attached statement.
Policy SP4	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2254	Objecting	SP4 confirms that there should be a focus on urban areas, rural service centres and larger villages for new development. However, the proposed allocations are highly concentrated onto a very few sites. As a result, rural provision is not widespread whilst additional development relies on unidentified sites. Given that the Council rejects the approach to define built confines, it is not possible to determine with which potential housing sites in rural settlements are policy compliant.	
Policy SP4	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2257	Objecting	In the event that insufficient housing is provided at the City to cater for local employment generated by the economy, there is a danger that existing travel to work patterns will be reinforced. Local congestion is already acute on radial routes into the City and the provision of additional housing remote from the District would encourage long-distance commuting to the detriment of the area. There is thus a need to provide for adequate housing within the District as a priority.	
Policy SP4	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2258	Objecting	The ability of the rural population to access market housing is already low (para 2.9). The lack of allocations at the majority of villages will be likely to worsen this position.	
Policy SP4	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2259	Objecting	The requirements of students are recognised as distorting the housing market through the conversion of family housing into HMO's (para 2.71). Despite this reliance is placed in the plan on the promotion of specialist housing for students (under policy HD7), but no specific allocations are proposed. This is considered to be a deficiency and fails to address a specific housing need, which otherwise manifests itself through pressure on existing family housing.	The plan should seek to identify and allocate sites within walking distance of existing campuses in order to ensure that the overall housing needs of the area are fully addressed.
Policy SP4	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2760	Objecting	Is this why CCC have not classed Herne & Broomfield as a village? The house needs survey showed need for affordable housing, but nothing else. We would accept minor infill and what was required by the Housing Needs Survey, as well as a smaller development.	
Policy SP4	778333	Mr Ian Gregory		2610	Objecting	The Rural Settlement Hierarchy, as set out on page 26 of the plan, identifies a considerable number of local centres, villages and hamlets. There is, however, no reference to the extensive development along the Stodmarsh and Littlebourne Roads. Whilst this is not a village per se, it comprises a substantial number of dwellings and other facilities. It is, furthermore, served by public transport and is situated within easy reach of both Fordwich and Canterbury.	Despite the fact that this area is not classified as a village, it should be listed amongst the villages in Policy SP4.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP4	778333	Mr Ian Gregory		2590	Objecting	Additional land releases are required. SP4 provides the framework for this, but the wording and supporting text is vague, and does not provide clarity. The council's approach is to rely on acceptable proposals coming forward during the period of the plan. Such as stance is unacceptable. The council needs to identify land to meet requirement of 22,000 dwellings. This has not been done. The SHLAA needs brought up to date. Site at Stodmarsh Road has only occurred after the last update (2011).	Land at Gowan, Stodmarsh Road, Canterbury, should be allocated for residential development.
Policy SP4	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3041	Objecting	We have no objection to the location of smaller developments providing the Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategies recommended are designed so they include smaller developments within the in-combination assessments of impact and appropriate on and off site mitigation is provided to ensure no impact on the integrity of the Natura 2000 and Ramsar network.	
Policy SP4	779277	Mr Richard Amos		3285	Objecting	The draft Local Plan seems to disregard a firm commitment made by KCC & CCC during the consultation regarding the options to improve the A299 Thanet Way. This was that there would be 'no subsequent development infill between the Blue Route and the then existing Thanet Way' (now the A2990).	
Policy SP4	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3181	Objecting	This policy has been developed to underpin Council's decision to develop South Canterbury. The decision should be revisited in an evidence based approach. Dispersed brownfield sites should be used first. This is not being done so the Council can levy money for the A2 junction and fill holes in its finances. This clearly is not an evidence based approach and reveals the true driver for the current proposals. This is not an acceptable way to make strategic decisions on this scale	
Policy SP4	121820	Mrs IVD Baker		3461	Supporting	Although the Draft Plan contains Policies SP4(5) and EMP12, which I welcome, they are both expressly subject to the allocations made in the Draft Plan - which is a very significant weakness and limits their utility.	
Policy SP4	121830	Mr MJR Baker		3463	Supporting	Although the Draft Plan contains Policies SP4(5) and EMP12, which I welcome, they are both expressly subject to the allocations made in the Draft Plan - which is a very significant weakness and limits their utility.	
Policy SP4	780486	Commerical Land		3368	Objecting	My client agrees with the direction of Draft Policy SP4, where new residential development will be focused within the existing urban areas, however whether or not an individual site is inside or outside of an established urban area is only one of many characteristics that should be considered when determining whether a planning application delivers sustainable development.	
Policy SP4	780827	Mr M P J Baker		3467	Supporting	Although the Draft Plan contains Policies SP4(5) and EMP12, which I welcome, they are both expressly subject to the allocations made in the Draft Plan - which is a very significant weakness and limits their utility.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP4	780828	Mr Jeremy D I Baker		3469	Supporting	Although the Draft Plan contains Policies SP4(5) and EMP12, which I welcome, they are both expressly subject to the allocations made in the Draft Plan - which is a very significant weakness and limits their utility.	
Policy SP4	408497	Mr C Mills		3780	Objecting	This policy has been developed to underpin the decision by the council to develop in South Canterbury. We believe that this decision should be revisited to provide an evidence based approach that is transparent to all.	
Policy SP4	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3815	Objecting	Generally support SP4 subject to changes: Insert and design after types in first para; thereis only one rural service centre and that should be removed; remove the word normally from point 5.	i; In the final sentence of the opening paragraph insert "and designs" after "types"; i; The first paragraph refers to "some of the rural service centres", but in the hierarchy there is only one, Sturry which should be removed. The Policy needs to be amended accordingly. i; In point 5 the word 'normally' should be removed. .
Policy SP4	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4247	Objecting	There is strong objection to this policy because of the low priority given to the assessment of essential infrastructure. Indeed the only reference to infrastructure in the policy reads as an afterthought. The policy needs to be reframed in order to emphasise the fact that the delivery of key development sites will be entirely conditional upon the formulation of viable, fully costed and fundable infrastructure assessment.	The policy needs to be reframed in order to emphasise the fact that the delivery of key development sites will be entirely conditional upon the formulation of viable, fully costed and fundable infrastructure assessment.
Policy SP4	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4410	Supporting	DIO supports the principles in this policy.	
Policy SP4	779662	Mr Graham Kenmir		4470	Objecting	The Canterbury Rural Hierarchy Study does set out constraints regarding development in rural communities. However these policies do not seem to have been applied uniformly. There is no indication that the position of Surry Village as a Rural Service centre will be enhanced by the proposal. The same applies to Hersden as a local centre. Broad Oak is listed as a rural settlement but seems to be getting none of the protections accorded to such settlements.	
Policy SP4	779664	Ms Heather Stennett		4477	Objecting	Broad Oak is classed as a village in the Settlement Hierarchy for Canterbury District. It comprises some ~340 dwellings of which 138 are Park Homes. The proposal to build 450 dwellings is far too many. This contravenes objectives 1.68 and 1.70 which appears to apply to every other village in the same category. Broad Oak needs to be viewed in its own right rather than an area called site 2 on the Local Plan and consideration given to its historic and present position as a village.	
Policy SP4	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4509	Objecting	An appropriate strategy for the plan would see development in the lower mid range equating to scenario B (600 houses/yr, 12000 across the life of the plan) creating 2500-3500 new jobs in total. This will have less environmental impact and be more sustainable as set out in NPPF. The sequential approach should be applied but with some changes as detailed. Rural allocations should accord with the settlement hierarchy. They have presented their calculations and proposed allocations.	Change whole plan strategy to scenario B - 600 housing units/yr.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP4	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4396	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. Support the sequential approach in principle but not the way it is applied, because; 1 the reliance on large greenfield allocations, no justification, loss of Grade 1 land, undeliverable; 2 reliance on new road infrastructure, has driven site selection; 3 failure to address housing needs in all the Market Areas. no regard paid of how need is to be met in areas.	
Policy SP4	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council	4665	Objecting	Broadly agree with the Rural Settlement Hierarchy but consider that Littlebourne should fall into the category of only being able to support 'small scale infilling'.	
Policy SP4	780004	Ms Heather Stennett	Secretary The Society of Sturry Village	4577	Objecting	There is a conflict between the wording of policy SP4 and the proposed levels of development at Sturry/Broad Oak and Hersden. 550 homes for Sturry, 450 for Broad Oak and 800 in Hersden would seem to contravene the recommendations of the Rural Settlement Hierarchy Study and SP4 can these levels be classed as small scale provision?	
Policy SP4	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4666	Objecting	It is essential to concentrate most future growth away from Canterbury itself, if the deterioration in the quality of life is to be halted. Moreover, the majority of new housing should be located with easy walking distance of an improved public transport system. We recommend siting new house-building along the two rail routes radiating from the West and East stations, and along the bus routes that link the city to Whitstable, Herne Bay, Thanet, Dover, Ashford and Faversham.	We recommend siting new house-building along the two rail routes radiating from the West and East stations, and along the bus routes that link the city to Whitstable, Herne Bay, Thanet, Dover, Ashford and Faversham. There is sufficient land within walking distance of these routes to service housing needs for at least 20 years.
Policy SP4	13753	Mr Jeremy Bellamy		4995	Objecting	Sturry Parish Council calls upon the City Council to respect the conclusions within the Parish Plan 2009. The document reflects the views of the population of the Parish. Under section 11 (page 59) of the action plan it is noted that residents did not want the village boundaries expanded or large scale new developments, particularly on greenfield sites. However, smaller mixed developments with good levels of affordable and social housing are favoured.	
Policy SP4	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4942	Objecting	Wherever possible preference should be given to previously developed "Brownfield" sites before resorting to the development of green fields and agricultural land. We are concerned that this essential principle has been disregarded in the emerging Local Plan.	
Policy SP4	780212	Church Commissioners for England		5208	Objecting	The policy and glossary, do not define what is regarded as minor development in villages. The policy ignores how sustainable development can be in Hamlets in supporting the local population and increasing sustainability by more use of local services/shops. NPPF acknowledges development in rural areas will differ in sustainability compared to urban areas. Small scale developments that maintain the character such as infill in hamlets should be allowed.	Amend to define what a minor development is. Allow infill development in Hamlets.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP4	780522	Cantley Limited		5145	Objecting	Why is only 'small scale provision of new housing' appropriate for 'Local Centres'? There is no rational justification how a 'minor development' of 9 dwellings might be acceptable in principle, whilst, a 'major development' of just 10 dwellings would not. Each proposal should be based on a case by case basis; having regard to the NPPF, the development plan policies and other material considerations.	SP4(2) should be revised to read: "Provision of new housing...€".
Policy SP4	782439	Mr Alan Holden	Chairman Broad Oak Preservation Society	5069	Objecting	Development should be more evenly distributed and could include areas such as Barham, Blean, Bridge, Chartham, Littlebourne, Tyler Hill and Chestfield. Dispersing development into a number of different localities each with a smaller number of new dwellings would result in a more sustainable solution to the District's housing need.	Development should be more evenly distributed and could include areas such as Barham, Blean, Bridge, Chartham, Littlebourne, Tyler Hill and Chestfield.
Policy SP4	127115	B.J. Gore		5281	Objecting	The villages of Barham, Herne and Sturry have been given meaningful places in the Rural Settlement Hierachy, or left out altogether (Herne) which completely alters their positions regarding development, without any consultation with their residents. On at least two major public meetings I have attended, there has been no opportunity for public debate but merely a list of questions pre-set by the Council to which responses had to be made electronically. This is not localism.	
Policy SP4	127115	B.J. Gore		5287	Objecting	When the status of Sturry and Barham is seen to have been altered without local consultation, and when Herne is not even included. Hundreds of years of history are ignored, and villages are converted into would-be towns/suburbs. Sturry has had more unpleasant and unattractive development foisted upon it than probably any other village in the District. Why should its residents have to suffer more of this and lose woodland? All these villages should be listed as villages and not service centre	
Policy SP4	781451	M J & E Leggett	Adonai Christian Trust	5291	Objecting	In conclusion the Trust objectect to the proposed development pattern and housing allocation distribution in the draft local plan which excludes most of the well-served larger villages and which disregards the suitability of site 44 in Littlebourne where infrastructural provision and other sustainable factors are already in place. Land owend by the traust adajcent to SHLAA44 could also be included. The Trust objects to the AMEC sustainability appraisal conclusions for SHLAA44.	Include sites in well served villages particularly Littlebourne
Policy SP4	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5408	Objecting	Chartham has a railway station, is situated on one of the main roads into Canterbury and has a cycle lane direct all the way into the city centre. It would appear to be an ideal location for some development therefore and might help to take the strain from some of the other areas.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP4	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5542	Objecting	Given the proposals in this Plan which involve only one strategic site at Whitstable, it is not the case that the urban area of Whitstable will continue to be a principal focus for development in the District. Change required: Drop the reference to Whitstable here. Openly admit the sheer scale of development in and immediately adjacent to Canterbury i.e. in 'Greater Canterbury' €" a term the council use elsewhere!	
Policy SP4	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5799	Objecting	The aims of Policy SP4 are acknowledged but the wording is not consistent with other policies within the draft plan or with the settlement hierarchy. An objection is raised to the current wording and it is proposed that amendments are made to the policy wording to ensure soundness and consistency: The urban areas... will continue to be the principal focus for development... together with development at some of the rural service centres and some of the local centres...	Amendments are made to the policy wording to ensure soundness and consistency: The urban areas... will continue to be the principal focus for development... together with development at some of the rural service centres and some of the local centres...
Policy SP4	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5914	Objecting	Although KCC has no objections to the current wording it should be noted that much of Kent has historically had a dispersed settlement pattern. Development between villages/hamlets and among farm buildings is consistent with the historic character of those areas. English Heritage, KCC and Kent Downs AONB are in the process of publishing guidance on historic farmsteads in Kent and how rural development proposals can be assessed for consistency with character. Recommend CCC adopts guidance as SPD.	
Policy SP4	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5822	Objecting	The aims of Policy SP4 are acknowledged but the wording is not consistent with other policies within the draft plan or with the settlement hierarchy. An objection is raised to the current wording and it is proposed that amendments are made to the policy wording to ensure soundness and consistency: The urban areas... will continue to be the principal focus for development... together with development at some of the rural service centres and some of the local centres...	Amendments are made to the policy wording to ensure soundness and consistency: The urban areas... will continue to be the principal focus for development... together with development at some of the rural service centres and some of the local centres...
Policy SP4	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5918	Objecting	The language used to discuss development is confusing and requires better definition. Term 'infilling' is a meaningless, use term 'minor development compatible with the scale and character of the village' instead. In terms of local centres reference to 'small scale' development lands definition. Specific housing and employment allocation should be made at local centres, optimising delivery through dispersal of development sites and meets market demand, Use neighbourhood plans to locate.	Better define the different scales of development. The use of the term 'minor development compatible with the scale and character of the village' is a preferable term for development in the villages. Specific housing and employment allocations should be made at the local centres having regard to the scale and character of the settlement but making a material contribution to the provision of housing in the District.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP4	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5925	Objecting	There is only one identified rural service centre, change wording to reflect. The general settlement hierarchy is supported. Terme 'small-scale' should be omitted as it is ill defined and too restrictive. Capacity of villages to accommodate development should be assessed. Correct a confusing reference within Policy SP4(2) to service centres which does not reflect the settlement hierarchy set out in Paragraph 1.70. The wording small scale is superfluous and prejudicial.	Reference to Rural Service Centres in the Policy should be changed to the singular or other villages should be elevated in the hierarchy. The generic term 'small- scale' should be omitted. The capacity of villages to accommodate development should be assessed to produce appropriate housing and employment numbers and then sites can be identified through Neighbourhood Plans, Allocations or the development process. Correct a confusing reference within Policy SP4(2) to service centres which does not reflect the settlement hierarchy set out in Paragraph 1.70.
Policy SP4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6065	Objecting	Broadly accepted, however:'Local plan policies' - does this refer to policies in this Local Plan or neighbourhood policies mentioned in SP1? What if there is no neighbourhood plan with associated policies?	
Policy SP4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6066	Objecting	What makes a location 'Rural' ? There should be cross reference to definitions in paras 4.10 and 4.11 (and other relevant references which may appear elsewhere in the Plan eg regarding education and health facilities, open space provision, employment opportunity floor space, access to education and health provision, transport expectations eg number of buses per hour, leisure provision etc.)	
Policy SP4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6067	Objecting	What will be done to protect ALL the rural locations, including service centres, listed in the 'Rural Settlement Hierarchy' so that they remain RURAL and do not become URBAN? House type and design in 'rural' locations should reflect that the area is not, nor is trying to become 'urban'. Again reference to other relevant policies which appear elsewhere would be useful here.	
Policy SP4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6068	Objecting	Request Insert: Further affordable housing in locations where large scale development has occurred during the life of this plan will not be considered.	
Policy SP4	13835	Mr Michael Steed		6998	Objecting	I also support a related point made by Cllr Dixey in his submission: No mention is made of development on brownfield sites in the villages. There are a number of small brownfield sites which could be developed for housing. Ie the Wyevale Garden Centre in Upper Harbledown.	
1.73	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		936	Objecting	District Transport Strategy, paragraph 1.73: The District Transport Action Plan was adopted in 2004. This, as with the traffic modelling, should have been reviewed and updated before this Draft local Plan went out for consultation.	
1.73	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		930	Objecting	The transport strategy must be an integral part of the Local Plan - not an afterthought.	The transport strategy must be an integral part of the Local Plan - not an afterthought.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.73	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1728	Objecting	This undermines the consultation process. The transport strategy MUST be considered WITH the Local Plan in order for either of them to make sense. We residents must be able to read these documents together, to be reassured that the transport strategy adequately supports the proposed increase in population and resulting road use that would arise from the proposals in the Local Plan.	It's hard to see how this fundamental error in planning and preparation can readily be remedied, other than re-starting the consultation when, and only when, ALL the necessary key elements are in place, e.g. economic, transport and environmental strategies.
1.73	404737	Mr Richard Guest		3829	Objecting	District Transport Strategy; Para. 1.73 and Policy SP5 SP5 states existing policy for; "Controlling the level and environmental impact of vehicular traffic; Reducing cross-town traffic movements in the historic centre of Canterbury;" I do not believe the current proposals would achieve these stated aims. Indeed they would increase the environmental impact and increase cross town traffic.	
1.73	408497	Mr C Mills		3783	Objecting	The proposals would increase the environmental impact and increase cross town traffic. This policy is 9 years old means that the updated policy and full traffic modeling data should have been completed and made available before the consultation started.	
1.73	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3817	Objecting	We fail to see how it is possible to prepare a local plan when the transport strategy that underpins it has not been finalised. This is an important part of the evidence base that should inform the strategy of the plan.	
1.73	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6070	Objecting	This Plan will need to take account of the proposals and measures put forward in the DTAP [expected to be adopted in 2013]. This should have been available prior to this Local Plan. It is crucial. How can such far reaching decisions have been made without it? Will it just contain what this Plan needs it to say? How much will change?	
Policy SP5	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		428	Supporting	My client has provided an Access Assessment Report (Upton McGougan 2009) and Transport Assessment & Travel Plan (PTP 2012) in accordance with the Councils District Transport Action Plan (DTP) and if required will update these reports should it be necessary upon the publication of the new DTP.	
Policy SP5	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		426	Supporting	We support Policy SP4 with its focus for development towards the sustainable settlements of Canterbury, Herne Bay and Whitstable. This is consistent with the Councils evidence base and is positively prepared, justified and effective and accords with the NPPF.	
Policy SP5	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		495	Supporting	This paragraph sets out excellent objectives. The proposed development in South Canterbury runs counter to all of them	Serious and credible proposals to mitigate congestion are needed before development in South Canterbury is considered.
Policy SP5	665473	Dr Richard Norman		524	Supporting	Support prioritising of provision for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport.	
Policy SP5	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		939	Supporting	POLICY SP5: District Transport Strategy. I agree with these strategies which are in the existing local Plan.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP5	777517	Mr Keith Groombridge	Barham Court Farms	1409	Objecting	Policy SP5 as currently drafted simply lists existing Local Plan policy measures without any indication of their significance or any review timescale.	Indicate the Council's intentions and the ongoing significance of these objectives and their potential review or continuance through the plan period.
Policy SP5	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1307	Objecting	It is hard to see how the Council intends to lower the impact of vehicular traffic by placing the bulk of its housing in the south of the city when the biggest employer is in the north and the station for commuters is also on the northern side. The Council plans to promote business sites at Barton Farm, but these have existed unsuccessfully for many years already.	The Council should change its locations for house building to more appropriate sites.
Policy SP5	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		2048	Supporting	Traffic noise should be specifically mentioned as something to be controlled and mitigated.	
Policy SP5	778073	Ms Claire Dethier		1521	Objecting	Insufficient regard has been paid to the impact of the proposed housing levels on the already stretched road network. Such impact on the existing road network would be unsustainable. Junction improvements to the A2 would not deal with the traffic leaving the proposed south Canterbury site who wish to access the centre, the University of Kent or rail network.new roads cannot simply be introduced without significant impacts on the historical layout or buildings themselves.	
Policy SP5	778650	Mrs. Rebecca Smith		1385	Supporting	There needs to be more consideration for commuters to Canterbury West Train Station from outlying areas - all bus routes from Thanington simply go to the general bus station and there is not adequate parking at the Canterbury West Train Station. If you want to encourage more commuters to live in Canterbury, there needs to be a way to adequately get to the station.	
Policy SP5	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1918	Objecting	The Coastal Towns need to be dealt with seperately they have different needs and requirements and should not be lumped in to a City proposals. This statement is Canterbury-centric. Parking Charges are being illegally used as 'revenue' by the Council this is wrong! Parking Charges should be recognised as affecting the local economy and policies	Parking Charges are not allowed to be used as Revenue. Parking should be studied, adjusted and reveiw monthly to boost the local economy. Car Parking Fees to be lowered to encourage trade in some areas such as Herne Bay. In some instances higher fees and meters can be used to increase the car parking churn in High Streets to allow there always to be a parking space to allow a shopper to 'stop and shop' on demand. Car Parks should be used to encourage longer visits to certain areas. Sea Front Parking in Herne Bay runs against the development of the Visitor Economy.
Policy SP5	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	1993	Objecting	Object - to the wording of policy SP5	Amendment of plan to take into account the above views.
Policy SP5	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2763	Objecting	Traffic will be hugely increased through Herne if developments are allowed. There is no Transport Strategy or Infrastructure Plan so how will the increased traffic will be dealt with through the village?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP5	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2572	Objecting	SP5 states existing policy for; "Controlling the level and environmental impact of vehicular traffic; Reducing cross-town traffic movements in the historic centre of Canterbury;"I do not believe the current proposals would achieve these stated aims. Indeed they would increase the environmental impact and increase cross town traffic.	
Policy SP5	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2574	Objecting	What we do need in Canterbury are: €€ Proper cycle routes (not just a token sharing of a bus lane) that children can also use, including a route through the town centre from north to south. This may take more traffic out of the city centre . At the moment it is too dangerous to cycle down the main roads since they are so narrow	
Policy SP5	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2575	Objecting	What we do need in Canterbury are: Cheaper buses (Maybe a scheme for residents)	
Policy SP5	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3042	Objecting	Kent Wildlife Trust welcomes many of the methods to reduce traffic within this policy as this will reduce poor air quality and will be beneficial to the health of the natural environment. We however do have concerns regarding some of the proposed infrastructure projects as these are likely to impact on important LWSs. We are particularly concerned regarding the eastern bypass and would value further information if this is to be allocated as part of the Local Plan.	
Policy SP5	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3184	Objecting	They do not believe that current proposal will increase rather than reduce the level and environmental impact of traffic and reduce cross-town traffic. No traffic modelling data has been made available. They believe this compromises the consultation and it should be declared null and void and re-run.	Declare consultation null and void and re-run.
Policy SP5	13751	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Lower Hardres Parish Council	3382	Objecting	We welcome the proposal for new cycle ways, but sadly these have been restricted to the development sites. No consideration has been given to extending them to the outlying villages. There are many residents in Lower Hardres who would welcome a cycleway to the City and as a Parish Council we have been looking into how this can be achieved. This should be included in the local plan.	There are many residents in Lower Hardres who would welcome a cycleway to the City and as a Parish Council we have been looking into how this can be achieved. This should be included in the local plan.
Policy SP5	404737	Mr Richard Guest		3830	Objecting	District Transport Strategy;Para. 1.73 and Policy SP5 SP5 states existing policy for;"Controlling the level and environmental impact of vehicular traffic; Reducing cross-town traffic movements in the historic centre of Canterbury;" I do not believe the current proposals would achieve these stated aims.Indeed they would increase the environmental impact and increase cross town traffic.	
Policy SP5	408497	Mr C Mills		3785	Objecting	The proposals would increase the environmental impact and increase cross town traffic. This policy is 9 years old means that the updated policy and full traffic modeling data should have been completed and made available before the consultation started.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP5	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3818	Objecting	Generally support this Policy, but would wish to see point f. amended to read as follows: "ensuring that necessary up-grades to the road infrastructure is provided to meet the needs of new development and to improve environmental conditions."In point b. after 'public' insert 'non-polluting'.	Amend point f. to read : "ensuring that necessary up-grades to the road infrastructure is provided to meet the needs of new development and to improve environmental conditions." In point b. after 'public' insert 'non-polluting'.
Policy SP5	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4411	Supporting	DIO supports the principles in this policy.	
Policy SP5	780212	Church Commissioners for England		5336	Objecting	Policy SP5 restates the existing saved planning policy position on a number of transport matters. We question the need for such a policy and therefore recommend that it be removed.	remove Policy SP5
Policy SP5	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5454	Objecting	In view of the many missing studies the DLP is premature -we are still waiting for the crucial District Transport Strategy. This has been only promised yet was actually desperately required to shape the Plan from its early stages. The findings of this study needed to be fully integrated into the Draft Local Plan. All of this contributes to legitimate doubts about the rigour of the whole Plan-making process!	
Policy SP5	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5544	Objecting	Hollow, superficial and aspirational words only. There are no tangible policies here to address the existing acute transport issues!	Change required: Delay the DLP until the new District Transport Plan is adopted and then fully 'take into account the proposals and measures put forward in the DTAP' by acknowledging the problems and constraints on future development and by framing clear policies.
Policy SP5	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5545	Objecting	Measuring the DLP against its own policy here i.e. a),b), c) and e) of SP5, it simply flounders! The District Transport Strategy should be tied in more closely to the strategic development plans. We need to do much more than just simply use it to assess development proposals. Rather, given the traffic and transport issues Canterbury faces, is there not a case for saying that a well-thought-out transport strategy should play a crucial role in governing the scale and the pattern of development.	
Policy SP5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6071	Objecting	Policy SP5 - Existing Local Plan Policy Measures a. Controlling the level and environmental impact of vehicular traffic. Is this working? How about copying London and introduce a congestion charge but reduce car parking charges? Greater emphasis and benefit for car share?	
Policy SP5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6078	Objecting	b. Providing alternative modes of transport. The importance of the local train service and the Council's strong support in maintaining this should be mentioned	
Policy SP5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6079	Objecting	c. Reduce cross-town traffic movements. This is unlikely to happen all the time.- all the Secondary schools, bar one, are to the south and west of the city - one private school is in the city centre and the other two are to the north west - the K & C and the private Chaucer Hospital are both to the south west - Ashford hospital is to the south west - etc. For the communities from the north/north-east there is little option but to cross town, and that is before the extra 5,000 houses are built.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6080	Objecting	d. Providing car parks and controlling parking. Appreciated, but car park/park ride charges can work against encouraging shoppers into the district's town areas, particularly when there is free parking elsewhere eg Westwood Cross, Blue Water etc, or none at all via the internet and what happens to the District's economy then?	
Policy SP5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6081	Objecting	e. Seeking construction of new roads and/or junction improvements. This is a laudable intention, but it is the resulting delivery from the search which will matter.	
Policy SP5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6372	Objecting	Why does SP5 not refer to this Policy?	
Policy SP5	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6896	Supporting	Whilst supporting this policy it is considered that the proposals to build 4,000 new dwellings to the south of Canterbury directly contradicts (c) 'reducing cross-town movements in the historic centre of Canterbury.'	In the absence of the long-promised traffic assessment reports being available it is impossible to assess this Policy properly. Additional cross-town traffic movements must be modelled and addressed, notably with respect to shopping, leisure activities, and access to both East and West railways stations.
1.74	779227	Mr Paul Uden		1752	Objecting	The agricultural land off Nackington Road is designated high landscape value which means it is some of the finest agricultural land in the country. The loss of this land to housing will change the character, feel and appearance of our city. The farmland is as significant and historic as the world famous buildings that characterise our Heritage site. Once gone, it is lost forever as a source of food production at a time when environmentally we are being asked to source locally.	
1.74	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3185	Objecting	Agreed with broad aims but objects to concreting over of large areas of the finest grade 1 agricultural land in England. Land should not be sacrificed in times of food shortages, political unrest and climate change. Canterbury is part of a global village competeing for dwindling food supplies/resources.	
1.74	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4761	Objecting	The preparation of a Green Infrastructure Strategy is welcomed. However the need for provision of GI to address local issues (such as deficiencies in Accessible Natural Green Space, responding to potential recreational disturbance on SPAs and for managing access to those areas) should be reflected in the product.	
1.74	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5549	Objecting	We need more than just a generalised description of a potential Green Infrastructure Strategy and its promised preparation! We need the strategy itself €“ the Planning Advisory Service has responded to CCC saying this is a priority! We also require a tangible analysis of what needs to be achieved and planned in our District. This is required to underpin any competent and sustainable LP. What are the main elements of a Green Infrastructure plan and how will they be incorporated into the LP?	
1.75	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1622	Objecting	The council through this plan are riding roughshod over their own policy objectives. It will not be greener, cleaner and they won't be leading by example if they go ahead with the plan as it stands.	Stick by the council policy and remove the extreme elements that will destroy the environment.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.75	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3819	Supporting	Whilst we accept the point made here, it will also be necessary for the Plan to ensure that existing shortfalls in open space are also provided; it is not just the needs arising from new development that need to be addressed.	
1.75	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6082	Objecting	178 hectares of open space required to serve new developments in the district. This is not a lot in total. Declared area, and not just an 'unspecified allocation', needed for Site 2 Sturry/Broad Oak.	
1.76	408497	Mr C Mills		3786	Objecting	Green Infrastructure Strategy - The council proposes to concrete over large areas of Grade 1 agricultural, productive land. We have previously raised the issue of food self sufficiency in the UK. The council must consider this in any policy.	
1.76	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6085	Objecting high quality green space. Open space provision in Sturry is currently below NLP recommendation. Does the green gap proposed between Canterbury and Sturry (and along the A28 Sturry Road) meet the definition for 'high quality'?	
1.77	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1308	Supporting	South Canterbury has no open spaces for play at present. A park would be very welcome. We do have some footpaths through the fields and we should hate to lose those to housing estates. Canterbury has few play and open space facilities and desperately needs them.	A co-ordinated leisure facilities plan for Canterbury would be most appreciated.
1.77	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1758	Objecting	It is generally accepted by other LPAs that the Kent Downs AONB is part of their Green Infrastructure. This was accepted by the East Kent GI group. Mention should be made of the Kent Downs AONB as part of Canterbury District's Green Infrastructure. The Kent Downs AONB provides accessible countryside to many residents (and visitors) of Canterbury district, and particularly to those residents of rural settlements.	Include mention of the Kent Downs AONB as part of Canterbury District's Green Infrastructure. Add to 9th bullet point '.....accessible countryside including the Kent Downs AONB . ' Delete 'in urban fringe areas'
1.77	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3820	Objecting	It should be acknowledged that the countryside as a whole is an important (if not the main) component of green infrastructure €“ not just the 'accessible countryside in urban fringe areas'.	
1.78	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1781	Objecting	We want this policy to recognise the importance of the green spaces and elements next to where we live which we see every day as it is these which have the most benefit to healthy human functioning rather than the bonifide green spaces we visit now and then. See above	Include and recognise the importance of the green spaces and elements next to where we live which we see every day as it is these which have the most benefit to healthy human functioning rather than the bonifide green spaces we visit now and then.
1.78	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2765	Objecting	Herne already has a sense of place which will be destroyed, along with its ancient heritage, if Strode Farm is developed, it is at odds with what is proposed.	
1.78	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3583	Objecting	Green Infrastructure -paragraph 1.78 - Creating a sense of place. Currently there is a green gap between urban Herne Bay and semi rural Herne & Broomfield Parish. The sense of place of these ancient settlements will be destroyed with these large developments close by, swallowing up localities.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.78	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3821	Objecting	In the first bullet point delete the word 'valuable'. What people regard as valuable is subjective and, as shown in the draft landscape character assessment, it is the full variety and diversity of the landscapes throughout the district that makes the place. At the end of the second bullet point add "and social well-being".	Delete the word 'valuable' from the first bullet point. At the end of the second bullet point add "and social well-being".
1.80	13719	Mr Steve Moore	Thanet District Council	4157	Supporting	The recognition of the potential cross boundary impact of proposed development upon the international wildlife sites is welcomed. Residential developments in Canterbury are likely to cause recreational effects on parts of the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar sites. The impact must also be considered in combination with development proposals within Thanet. The current work of the East Kent Green Infrastructure Group is considering this issue and a potential mitigation strategy.	
1.80	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5915	Objecting	It is unclear whether the reference in paragraph 1.80 to the provision of green infrastructure "to meet the requirements of the Habitat Regulations" is pre-empting the HRA or if it has been informed by the screening	
Policy SP6	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		429	Supporting	We support the Councils Policy SP6 which will set out the overall objectives for future Green Infrastructure in the District.	
Policy SP6	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		427	Supporting	My client recognise the broader role of open space in mitigating the impact of growth. We have already planned and engaged with the local community and stakeholders on land off Thanet Way, Whitstable (Policy SP3g) to deliver a strategically planned, high quality green space and other environmental features which will provide a wide range of environmental improvements that will add quality of life benefits for the local community.	
Policy SP6	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		347	Supporting	Oppportunities for delivering infrastructure for walking and cycling routes must not be jeopardised.	
Policy SP6	665473	Dr Richard Norman		526	Supporting	Support commitments to protect and enhance biodiversity, and to protect and promote open space.	
Policy SP6	776757	Mr Adrian Fox	Policy and Projects Manager Dover District Council	732	Supporting	The general commitment and support towards green infrastructure in Policy SP6 is welcomed and we are keen to continue to work jointly to ensure an integrated green infrastructure cross-boundary network.	
Policy SP6	776757	Mr Adrian Fox	Policy and Projects Manager Dover District Council	733	Objecting	There does, however, appear to be some overlap between Policy SP6 and Policy OS11 in terms of their aims and objectives. It will be essential that work on green infrastructure issues are developed alongside the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) in order to ensure that the document addresses any impact on international nature	It will be essential that work on green infrastructure issues are developed alongside the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) in order to ensure that the document addresses any impact on international nature conservation sites.
Policy SP6	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		941	Supporting	POLICY SP6: Green Infrastructure Strategy. I agree with these strategies.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP6	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1759	Objecting	Policy SP6 and its supporting text needs amendment to include the KDAONB. The policy as is stands specifically excludes the AONB - 'areas of undesignated countryside' - and by specifically indicating that the design landscape and biodiversity recommendations in the Landscape and Biodiversity Appraisal should be taken in to account, this also excludes any consideration of the KDAONB (the KDAONB is excluded). We make suggestions for the revision of Policy SP6 and would be pleased to discuss.	Redraft Policy SP6 to address and include the Kent Downs AONB. Redraft the following as indicated in BOLD . 'In particular the strategy should: 1 Provide measures to protect, CONSERVE and enhance LANDSCAPE AND biodiversity and meet the requirements of the habitat regulations, and 2 Create and enhance linkages between natural areas and open spaces and areas of undesignated countryside , as appropriate AND AS INDICATED BY THE DESIGN , LANDSCAPE AND BIODIVERSITY RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE COUNCIL'S DRAFT LANDSCAPE CHARACTER AND BIODIVERSITY APPRAISAL SPD, THE KENT DOWNS MANAGEMENT PLAN AND SUPPORTING GUIDANCE , AND THE BAPS, LIVING LANDSCAPES, BOAS AND BRANCH APPRAISALS COVERING THE KDAONB. DELETE POINT 4
Policy SP6	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2917	Supporting	Kitewood fully supports the provisions of Policy SP6. The concept masterplan for Land at Hillborough fully addresses the requirements of this policy, including in the design of open space to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations for Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs).	
Policy SP6	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3044	Objecting	Welcome the comittment to produce a Green Infrastructure Plan and recommend that projects are identified that will help protect the designations likely to be impacted as a result of this plan. We are surprised that only 178ha of open space is required as a result of the development. Concerned that insufficient natural greenspace is proposed to deflect people for the Natura 2000 network. Welcome general principles within policy and welcome the Landscape Character and Biodiversity Assessment.	Allocate more open space. We would recommend that within the green infrastructure strategy delivery mechanisms are identified to ensure that these aims can be delivered at the same rate as the population increases.
Policy SP6	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3823	Objecting	Generally support this Policy, but would like to see an additional point added after point 2: "Ensure that linkages in and between open spaces and with foot/cycle/bridle ways & paths are provided or enhanced wherever possible to provide joined-up off-road routes€².	Add after point 2: "Ensure that linkages in and between open spaces and with foot/cycle/bridle ways & paths are provided or enhanced wherever possible to provide joined-up off-road routes".
Policy SP6	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4412	Supporting	DIO supports the principles in this policy.	
Policy SP6	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4858	Objecting	Concerned that there is no outline Green Infrastructure and Community Infrastructure plan in place, which sets out a clear vision for at least the main sites at this point of time. There is a risk of the developer driving the agenda and not the needs of the locality. Green Infrastructure and Community Infrastructure policies are key drivers to the deliverability of the Local Plan and need to be "priced in"to any development as such demands may affect their deliverability and viability.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP6	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5027	Objecting	Do not object in principle to development of green Infrastructure strategy. Document has not been made publicly available. It could affect allocated sites so needs to be provided to ensure the effectiveness and soundness of the plan. Due to the absence of the green infrastructure strategy the DLP can not be found sound and is not justified and effective. Produce green infrastructure strategy.	Produce green infrastructure strategy and make available for public comment.
Policy SP6	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5452	Objecting	In view of the many missing studies the DLP is premature -we are still waiting for the crucial Green Infrastructure Study. This was actually desperately required to shape the Plan from its early stages. The findings of these studies needed to be fully integrated into the Draft Local Plan. All of this contributes to legitimate doubts about the rigour of the whole Plan-making process! Planning Advisory Service had identified this as a KEY PRIORITY area for work IN THE NEAR FUTURE.	
Policy SP6	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5548	Objecting	Virtually meaningless policy statement in the absence of the actual Green Infrastructure Strategy! At best only aspirational with no substance as yet and at worst a policy aim ignored or considered/ rendered expendable in the DLP! Change required: Delay progress of DLP until the Green Infrastructure Strategy is produced!	
Policy SP6	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5800	Supporting	Support is registered for the establishment of a green infrastructure strategy as this is crucially important in establishing attractive places to live and creating a real sense of place. The role which development on land at South Hersden can play in achieving these objectives should not be underestimated.	
Policy SP6	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5676	Supporting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:€€ Desire to pursue a Green Infrastructure Strategy SP6	
Policy SP6	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5574	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'sustainable infrastructure'. This includes a commitment to develop green infrastructure and sustainability.	
Policy SP6	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5852	Supporting	KCC support the intention to prepare a green infrastructure strategy and the key aspects that it will incorporate, as stated in Policy SP6.	
Policy SP6	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5916	Supporting	We support the intention to prepare a green infrastructure strategy and the key aspects that it will incorporate, as stated in Policy SP6. The green infrastructure strategy should also seek to utilise and conserve elements of the district's historic landscape. To be fully effective in local planning and development control, the Historic Landscape Characterisation should be backed up by more detailed district-wide or case-by-case analysis, to add greater detail through secondary sources.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP6	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5824	Supporting	Support is registered for the establishment of a green infrastructure strategy as this is crucially important in establishing attractive places to live and creating a real sense of place. The role which development on land at South Hersden can play in achieving these objectives should not be underestimated.	
Policy SP6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6087	Supporting	Policy SP6 - All points appreciated, particularly: 1. Take into account the design, landscape & biodiversity recommendations. The Jacobs' 'Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal - draft August 2012' - notes the historic interest of the Sturry Road, and has associate guidelines. We look forward to seeing these recommendations in place.	
Policy SP6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6747	Supporting	Green Gap Canterbury and Sturry. Policy SP6 - All points appreciated, particularly: 1. Take into account the design, landscape & biodiversity recommendations. The Jacobs' 'Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal - draft August 2012' - notes the historic interest of the Sturry Road, and has associate guidelines. We look forward to seeing these recommendations in place.	
1.81	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		430	Objecting	It is acknowledged that the Council will need to develop a Infrastructure Plan. However such a plan must accord with Government policy set out in NPPF in that it must relate to the site be appropriate, reasonable and proportionate and be viability tested.	
1.81	777424	Mrs & Mrs Edmed		862	Objecting	If Canterbury's infrastructure cannot sustain the housing numbers required, then it should not be planning to do it [the Local Plan]. Can't develop an area that cannot cope, new parts of the county, and country need to be found.	
1.81	777570	Mr J K Rishworth		1074	Objecting	I am concerned that this document at present lacks:- Information on the capacity of water supplies, gas, electricity and sewerage to serve further development. The document states that an Infrastructure Plan is being developed, but we need to see a definite and credible plan before major new development can be considered.	
1.81	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2354	Objecting	It is our firm belief that the principles underpinning Dr. Sloman's Sustainable Transport Blueprint for Canterbury should also guide the transport, housing and infrastructure plans for all of the district. Without significant changes to the proposals in the draft local plan, car use and pollution will increase, health levels worsen and climate change will be exacerbated rather than mitigated. The draft plan as it now stands is not fit for purpose, not sustainable and it therefore cannot be sound.	We ask that the transport section along with the proposed developments be amended and or removed in order to achieve the necessary shift to sustainable transport modes that is an integral part of sustainable development.
1.81	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2786	Objecting	The proposed numbers and sites for houses in the Local Plan take little account of infrastructure capacity.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.81	779274	Mr Graham Duplock	Parish Councillor Parish Councillor Beskesbourne	2823	Objecting	Other infrastructure areas are not sufficiently addressed. Water and Sewage provision will require significant upgrade. Medical provision both at DGH level and Health Centre level will require expansion.	Water and Sewage provision will require significant upgrade. Medical provision both at DGH level and Health Centre level will require expansion. The south Canterbury development if progressed requires inclusion of a Medical Centre.
1.81	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		3255	Objecting	The Sturry developer said they would only be making a contribution to the cost of the new road and bridge: where is the rest of the money coming from? The Draft Plan implied the full cost would be borne by the developments.	
1.81	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		3260	Objecting	I remind you that you have no adequate water supply for the increased population of East Kent.	
1.81	407886	Mr J and P Booth		3525	Objecting	The area of East Kent is the most water stressed in the country, we should be looking at ways in which to minimise development so as not to exacerbate an existing problem. This same principle applies equally to existing sewage facilities, whilst there is mention in the plan of a combined package plant for heat and power (though why heat is required is a mystery) there is no provision for a packaged sewage treatment facility. The present facilities are already woefully inadequate.	
1.81	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3827	Objecting	As the plan relies on new road and other infrastructure, to support proposed development, it is failure not having an infrastructure plan to comment on. It should be consulted on before the final plan is agreed as the infrastructure proposed is undeliverable making the plan unsound. It is necessary to establish an implementation team including members of local communities, add this to para.	the following should be added at the end of the paragraph: ", and which it will invite local amenity groups/residents associations/parish councils to join".
1.81	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4378	Objecting	Traffic is bound to increase from the population living in 15,000 new houses. Unless ALL infrastructure is in place before house building starts, congestion will increase.	
1.81	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5458	Objecting	The Council appears to have ignored the comments of the Planning Advisory Service which had identified KEY PRIORITY areas for work IN THE NEAR FUTURE i.e. completion of the infrastructure plan and related viability assessment work.	
1.81	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5552	Objecting	Infrastructure and Implementation Plans are required now in order to properly assess the wisdom and delivery of the proposals. The Planning Advisory Service have responded to CCC saying this is a priority!	
1.81	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5756	Supporting	Housing at this level will be challenging to deliver, however, an improving economic outlook government determination to tackle housing shortages, the desirability of the district, links, and the attractiveness of the sites mean that the sites and local conditions are sufficiently attractive to encourage a speedy appropriate response from the market. The local workforce can adequately supply the need and it may attract people back from London.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.81	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5931	Objecting	The Infrastructure Plan should be urgently produced consistent with the development ambitions of the Plan. A sound Plan cannot be produced without some certainty about the need for new infrastructure and the timing of it delivery. Provision of infrastructure should not be allowed to delay the delivery of planned development and flexibility therefore needs to be built into the Plan in this respect	
1.81	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6095	Supporting	All sounds sensible and essential	
1.82	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		79	Objecting	The first 4 items must include point-of-planning provisions for walkers, cyclists etc., with safe crossings geared to the needs of non-vehicular traffic.	
1.82	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1762	Objecting	Mitigation of impacts outside the development and not included in the title 'new green infrastructure' should be addressed as elements that could be funded through the CIL or other mechanisms. This is discussed under our comment on para 1.86 and Policy SP7. We would be pleased to discuss before drafting of the pre-submission draft LP.	Include mitigation of impacts in the key elements. Amend policy SP7 as suggested.
1.82	778467	Mr Dylan Hampshire		1945	Objecting	What about the Coastal Towns? All these improvements for Canterbury City bought with money from development in other towns. Despair at the Canterbury-centric nature of the Council. These improvements all work against the sustainability goals by encouraging car travel. Where are any proposals for train links? Fom a coastal town and visitor economy view point what about the endemic congestion on the Thanet Way - M2 corridor during the summer months?	A recogition that the Coastal Towns have significant linkage towards London and not just towards Canterbury Free and More Parking Provision for Railway Stations. The prevention of Money being spent on Canterbury when it is derived from other Towns
1.82	779227	Mr Paul Uden		1753	Objecting	The 4000 homes planned in South Canterbury have more to do with obtaining the housing levy to pay for new roads, than the planning requirements of the PI. New roads are being sold as a way of reducing traffic congestion in Canterbury. However, adding to road capacity is shown to increase traffic, pollution and congestion. Nackington, Old and New Dover Roads are ill-equipped to accommodate extra vehicles.	
1.82	779262	Mr John Bailey		1956	Supporting	All seem good things to do.	
1.82	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2401	Objecting	The first four items must include point-of-planning provisions for walkers, cyclists etc, with safe crossings geared to the needs of non-vehicular traffic.	
1.82	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3047	Supporting	We welcome the inclusion of Green Infrastructure within paragraph 1.82	
1.82	779274	Mr Graham Duplock	Parish Councillor Parish Councillor Beskesbourne	2842	Objecting	We already have great sewerage problems in our villages and provision should be in place. Can the sewage treatment works on Sturry Road cope with this increase?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.82	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		3256	Objecting	The Sturry developer also said they would not be paying for any increase in capacity of the sewerage system.Southern Water has many demands on its finances and having spent significantly in our area, may have difficulty persuading its regulator to fund a massive expansion of the system because the developer did not want to pay.	This is the City Council's Plan and the City Council can ensure the infrastructure is provided.
1.82	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3186	Objecting	LANRA objects to the new / improved A2 junction provision at Bridge. The cost will be prohibitive and is use to justify large scale housing in South Canterbury to extract the levy from the developer does not ring true. Costs, along with the highways authority statements, which do not appear to support such a junction, mean that LANRA cannot support this policy.	
1.82	780651	Mr Kevin Bown	Asset Manager Area 4 (Kent) Highways Agency	3535	Objecting	We note that the Council is developing an Infrastructure Plan to support the Local Plan development which includes a number of projects that relate to the SRN. For the purposes of developing the Infrastructure Plan, we would recommend that consideration is given to funding and delivering these improvements, in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG, 2012).	For the purposes of developing the Infrastructure Plan, we would recommend that consideration is given to funding and delivering these improvements, in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG, 2012).
1.82	408497	Mr C Mills		3787	Objecting	I object to the new / improved A2 junction provision at Bridge. The cost will be prohibitive and as such its use to justify large scale housing in South Canterbury to extract the levy from the developer does not ring true.	
1.82	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3833	Objecting	In the first point after "fast" insert "and less polluting"Add a new second point "Improvement and increase of commuter/schoolchildren/student cycle routes into towns and City"Delete the third point (Park and Ride).	In the first point after "fast" insert "and less polluting" Add a new second point "Improvement and increase of commuter/schoolchildren/student cycle routes into towns and City" Delete the third point (Park and Ride).
1.82	780968	Mr Simon Wall		4354	Objecting	The plan seeks to move existing facilities such as schools. How will this benefit the residents? What plans are there to increase public amenities to support the increased housing? Canterbury has great problems with traffic congestion. Will the planned roads be enough to support the vast increase in road traffic?	
1.82	779662	Mr Graham Kenmir		4474	Objecting	The shadow hanging over the draft plan is the immense cost of the proposed road works, particularly for the bridges at Sturry. In my view, there is insufficient detail of the nature of the traffic problems of the city and in particular of the Sturry railway crossing, to evaluate whether the suggested solutions will be effective in easing traffic problems or justify the costs which seems to be largely responsible for driving the housing numbers north of Sturry crossing.	
1.82	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patribourne Parish Council	4574	Objecting	The large quantity of homes to be built around the city will put a strain on the current medical provision. Can the K&C Hospital and Doctors' surgeries cope? 3 schools are shown on the plans for South Canterbury, but no medical centre. The current access to the K&C is off the Old Dover Road, where hundreds of homes are planned at the Langton Girls School site and the South Canterbury site. Additional congestion in this area will increase the current difficulties in accessing hospital.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.82	781348	Mr David Greenway		4539	Objecting	This City has a poor record of providing open playing areas for families to the extent that you should all be ashamed. From the time I first lived here in 1967 the lack of parks and playing fields was shockingly obvious. I see no great improvement in this situation and can see a situation where we have thousands of new families with insufficient amenities of many types including playing and meeting areas, policing, healthcare and social services and the like.	
1.82	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4860	Objecting	The generality of paragraph 1.82 seems entirely inadequate to facilitate meaningful and credible discussion now at the consultation stage.	
1.82	782028	Terrace Hill		4958	Objecting	The delivery of a pedestrian crossing at Blacksole Bridge, Margate Road is as important as these infrastructure measures for residents and businesses in Herne Bay. The need to improve the Bridge should be the subject of a specific policy.	Terrace Hill considers that appropriate wording would be as follows: The Council will support proposals to improve pedestrian access at the Blacksole Bridge on Margate Road, Herne Bay. Contributions to this will be sought from appropriate development. Proposals which enable the delivery of the improvements will be supported.
1.82	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5644	Supporting	We also welcome the proposals for new schools, including the possibility of a Grammar school, together with sports facilities and other community uses. These are vital in meeting newly generated demand, thereby alleviating pressure on existing facilities.	
1.82	784604	Mr Peter DeCoster		5472	Objecting	What I am concerned about is the infrastructure improvements that need to accompany the proposal. Canterbury is already severely congested, and the Council needs to ensure that the road system is properly improved.	
1.82	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5878	Objecting	KCC note there is no mention of the Richborough Connection and CCC's approach to assessing its impact and ensuring the delivery of their local plan proposals.	
1.82	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5917	Objecting	Paragraph to be amended to include: - New medical/health and social care facilities - Community facilities in line with Strategic Sites Allocation - as mentioned in pages 18-24 and Policies QL1,2,3,4,5,6 Pages 283-285	Paragraph to be amended to include: - New medical/health and social care facilities - Community facilities in line with Strategic Sites Allocation - as mentioned in pages 18-24 and Policies QL1,2,3,4,5,6 Pages 283-285
1.82	476233	Mrs Catherine Cantwell		6720	Objecting	The idea of building new housing to fund unnecessary new roads, to the detriment of our environment, makes no sense. New road developments run counter to the policy to reduce travel demands and should be abandoned. Council should follow the strategy to focus on controlling and reducing road traffic. It has been found that the building of new roads increases traffic. Plans for new roads and link road should be abandoned.	
1.83	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		496	Objecting	The "Provision of fast bus links into Canterbury" requires to be detailed	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.83	775175	Mr Malcolm Bennett		622	Objecting	Significant profits are made by property developers.It is my thought that these high end profits could be further used (outside of the normal Sec 106 Agt. or similar) to enable actual Job Creation to occur.What I am suggesting is that rather than relying on the skills of the new property owner to market his development well and gain tenants or end purchasers that can create jobs, that the Developers and original landowners have an onus put upon them to actually create new jobs.	Wha tl am thinking is that say for every..... X number of new houses or sq.mtrs of commercial or retail floor space built that the Developer creates Y number of new jobs..... not just providing the buildings, for within which new jobs to occur.
1.83	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		934	Objecting	The Council's track record in this is poor - witness the development of Altira Business Park and the nearby housing before any solution was found for Blacksole Bridge. Also, developers are only now looking at road changes at reculver, years after the housing there was built. The Council has a lot of work to do to persuade residents that it is capable of getting necessary infrastructure built before housing.	
1.83	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5932	Supporting	Rydon would welcome an active involvement in the preparation of a phasing plan for South Canterbury Strategic Area andthe integrated approach to infrastructure provision.	
1.84	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5935	Supporting	Rydon would welcome an active involvement in the preparation of a phasing plan for South Canterbury Strategic Area andthe integrated approach to infrastructure provision.	
1.85	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5554	Objecting	Quite good as an aspiration but needs more muscle! Covenants and legally binding agreements with developers are required	
1.85	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6880	Objecting	The relationship between an LPA and the development market is now very dominant, as the proportion of LPA income derived from development rises. We are concerned that CCC is placing too much emphasis on Section 106 monies to fund basic city fabric. Are they exposing themselves to a conflict of interest? It cannot be acceptable that council income is derived so substantially from expansion.	
1.86	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	778	Objecting	We also note that the Council has not established a benchmark or threshold land value in its viability appraisal against which it can make a judgement as to the likelihood that development will come forward. The Harman Review advice Viability Testing of Local Plans recommends that the local planning authority establishes threshold land values as part of its viability to enable a judgement being made as to whether development will come forward.	
1.86	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	779	Objecting	It is unclear what allowance has been made for external development costs. The build costs are derived from a combination of BCIS data and feedback from developers but the report does not state what these are. If no allowance has been made for external works then this represents a significant omission. This will have serious implications for the reliability of of the modelling. It may mean that the viability of the affordable housing rate that has been chosen is unjustified.	The Council should clarify this.

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.86	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1760	Objecting	Where developments will generate access to the AONB the KDAONB will expect a contribution to the management and maintenance of the PRoW and boundaries to reduce trespass and the development of urban fringe problems in the AONB. We would welcome discussion as to whether this should be delivered through CIL or Section 106 agreements. Where major development is proposed a method of funding in perpetuity through such mechanisms as service charges, or the Precept should be investigated and imposed.	Include discussion of impacts on designated landscapes and sites of biodiversity importance, and the cost of mitigation, and funding maintenance and management in perpetuity.
1.86	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2256	Objecting	Para 1.86 confirms that the Council is proposing to utilise S106 Agreements and other mechanisms to fund key infrastructure whilst relying on CIL on smaller sites. It is considered that this strategy may render smaller sites unviable, especially given the Council's view that all residential sites should incorporate measures to provide for affordable housing. This position needs to be reviewed.	
1.86	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2781	Objecting	There is no guarantee that the infrastructure will be completed early enough to ensure minimum disruption. They are worried about the delivery of infrastructure, there needs to be a certainty of deliverability.	
1.86	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3189	Objecting	LANRA does not believe the statement in Para 1.86 and SP 7 is no more than a wish list which could never become a reality. There is little historic precedent that would lead us to believe that the council has the resolve to impose and enforce such an approach.	
1.86	408497	Mr C Mills		3788	Objecting	I object to the new / improved A2 junction provision at Bridge. The cost will be prohibitive and as such its use to justify large scale housing in South Canterbury to extract the levy from the developer does not ring true.	
1.86	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3834	Objecting	Strongly object to nil CIL. Consider it is due to costly new roads. Means the local communities with neighbourhood plans will not receive 15-25% of CIL. It is unacceptable and contrary to Government expectations, will result in substandard communities deprived of the benefits such major development normally affords.	
1.86	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5427	Objecting	I am concerned that the Council are considering a 'nil CIL' for the strategic development sites. This will be a loss of local revenue for the community and a missed opportunity to finance improvements to the local infrastructure.	
1.86	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5855	Objecting	Education should be included within the definition of the paragraph 1.86 terms and states "key infrastructure and other projects which are considered important to the implementation of the wider planning strategy".	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.86	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5919	Objecting	The City Council must note that KCC requires adequate levels of S106 developer contributions and/or CIL receipts to be secured throughout the District in order to provide sufficient funding for the total delivery of the above education infrastructure requirements. The resulting total infrastructure requirements must be incorporated within the infrastructure referred to in Policy SP7. KCC's requirements may change once a detailed, phasing housing trajectory is available. Include Education in para	It is imperative that education is included within the definition of the paragraph 1.86 terms key infrastructure and other projects which are considered important to the implementation of the wider planning strategy.
1.86	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5885	Objecting	Why is there reference to nil CIL?	
1.86	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5936	Supporting	Rydon support the idea that the South Canterbury Strategic Development should employ S106 Agreements rather than CIL contributions as the delivery mechanism for this large-scale allocation, but the approach requires flexibility and the involvement of all landowners/promoters within the allocated area.	
1.86	784495	P Manser		6967	Objecting	I am concerned that the Council are considering a 'nil CIL' for the strategic development sites. This will be a loss of local revenue for the community and a missed opportunity to finance improvements to the local infrastructure.	
1.87	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	1995	Objecting	Object - to the fact that a detailed scheme of implementation is not currently available and will only be at the submission stage.	
1.87	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5553	Objecting	Infrastructure and Implementation Plans are required now in order to properly assess the wisdom and delivery of the proposals. The Planning Advisory Service have responded to CCC saying this is a priority!	
Policy SP7	766797	Miss L Dowle		112	Objecting	Infrastructure: it goes without saying that Canterbury is a compact and ancient city, the existing infrastructure is running to capacity i.e. sewage system, water supply (we face water shortages in the south east), hospital facilities running to capacity, no A&E provision, no maternity unit, no provision for additional secondary school and no road infrastructure improvement.	
Policy SP7	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		431	Objecting	In preparing an implementation plan for the allocated sites any Sec 106 obligations and CIL must be fair, reasonable and proportionate and relate directly to the individual site(s) allocation and community needs and be viability tested (including costs assoc with any Infrastructure Plan).	Ensure the accumulative costs of delivering the allocated site(s) are viability tested for these policies to be sound.
Policy SP7	772200	Solihin Garrard		254	Objecting	It is just as strange and worrying that this massive overall plan is unaccompanied by a really strategic and credible scheme for all the support infrastructure. The Local Plans lack of significant strategic planning for the proposed growth underscores the impracticality of these development plans, and what looks like a lack of realism, even a lack of concern for this city of ours. At best it is a half baked wish list that addresses few of the essential pieces of groundwork for the proposals.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP7	776757	Mr Adrian Fox	Policy and Projects Manager Dover District Council	735	Supporting	We are supportive of Policy SP7 that states that there will be an implementation plan for the allocations set out in the Plan.	
Policy SP7	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		946	Supporting	POLICY SP7: Implementation. I agree with this policy.	
Policy SP7	777517	Mr Keith Groombridge	Barham Court Farms	1411	Objecting	Postponement of Implementation of the emerging Local Plan to a forthcoming 'Implementation Plan' calls into question the effectiveness of this Local Plan.	Incorporate effective and clear implementation policies within this emerging Local Plan - please see our associated representation under Policy HD1.
Policy SP7	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1258	Objecting	The co-dependency of several sites in order to fund the infrastructure resembles a pack of cards. WPC queries the logistics and timing of how the developments and infrastructure will come together. Also the burden of upfront funding requirements for infrastructure could deter developers, or simply price them out of the market, particularly for the south of Canterbury development. CPO cannot be used for roads - what if a site fails highway tests. Lighting and footpaths adds to costs.	The standards required for the roads needs to be clarified to all developers from the outset as the building of the roads etc. must be an early phase and be in place rapidly.
Policy SP7	778931	Miss Gemma Avory	Water Resources Planner South East Water	1510	Supporting	We wish to see an on-going partnership to ensure there is clear planning support for the new water resources required as part our Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP)	Ensure we work together for furture supplies in the area
Policy SP7	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1730	Objecting	The implementation plan, the proposed use of S106 and CIL, and the scope and phasing of infrastructure are all absolutely essential for we residents to be able to assess the Local Plan. But this key information is missing. This is inexcusable. At this stage the Council must be able to provide, at the very least, a broad-brush picture of Policy SP7, but we have nothing.	Policy SP7 must be published BEFORE the next round of consultation.
Policy SP7	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1761	Objecting	Mitigation of impacts and the funding of GI delivery is excluded from this policy and not covered elsewhere. For instance where developments will impact on the AONB those impacts need to be mitigated and managed in the long term. A mechanisms which cover management of the common parts and surrounding areas which will be impacted need to be investigated and imposed on developers and future residents (through service charges or the Precept)	Revise paras 1.82 and 1.86 to discuss the need for funding and mitigation of impacts on landscape and biodiversity in perpetuity. Revise the policy SP7 as indicated in BOLD below : 'The implementation plan will identify the scope of infrastructure to be provided; the phasing of such infrastructure linked to development; and the mechanisms by which the council considers that the infrastructure and ANY REQUIRED MITIGATION IN PERPETUITY would be best delivered.
Policy SP7	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	1690	Objecting	This matter should have formed part of the draft plan for full consultation purposes	
Policy SP7	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	1996	Objecting	Object €“ The lack of implementation plan and mechanisms referred to by the policy (and paragraph 1.87) renders this policy in conflict with a number of NPPF provisions particularly paragraphs 156, 157 and 158.	
Policy SP7	778783	A Briant		2340	Objecting	Where is the infrastructure delivery plan? CCC state 'this will be produced at an appropriate time'. This is just not good enough.	
Policy SP7	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2790	Objecting	The nil CIL, means that the parish council will not receive 15% of the funding which they should get to improvelocal facilities. No evidence has been produced for nil CIL.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP7	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2920	Supporting	Kitewood are keen to work closely with CCC on the development of the Implementation Plan. In summary, Kitewood is committed to making provision for the delivery of necessary infrastructure on Land South of Hillborough.	
Policy SP7	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3046	Objecting	We welcome the inclusion of Green Infrastructure within paragraph 1.82. We note the consideration of CIL payments. Landscape scale Green Infrastructure projects within the BOAs and mitigation measures within the Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites may require pooled contributions and consideration should be given to the appropriate funding mechanisms for the SAMMS and landscape scale projects.	
Policy SP7	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2793	Objecting	Infrastructure delivery plan €“ the deliverability of the infrastructure required by the plan is not defined, and this renders the Preferred Draft unsound. The Core Strategy will need to be supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which assesses the costs and phasing of the infrastructure required, and hence demonstrates that the Plan is viable. This piece of evidence is not currently available, and so the ability to understand if the Plan is actually realistic cannot be established.	
Policy SP7	414960	Cllr Alex Perkins	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3182	Objecting	Canterbury's sewers, roads and hospitals are nearing capacity; the development proposals will only make the issue a great deal worse! Instead of deciding where developers want to build housing - why not map water supply, drainage, sewerage and capacity for the introduction of sustainable transport infrastructure and then plan the housing around that?	
Policy SP7	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3089	Objecting	Schools are provided for in the development in south Canterbury, but what is the lead time for design and build and will they be available before the children need them?	
Policy SP7	779360	Ms Alison Grubb		3329	Objecting	Concern about the lack of planned infrastructure to meet the demands of the developments planned. Canterbury is gridlocked at busy times already (although the return to the pre Westgate Towers experiment has improved things greatly) and will be worse unless adequate road measures are taken. Central Govt is blackmailing CCC to accept housing to fund Road infrastructure, should stand up to this pressure. Understand some devt must take place but lack of infrastructure to go with it. Must reconsider	
Policy SP7	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3190	Objecting	LANRA does not believe the statement in Para 1.86 and SP 7 is no more than a wish list which could never become a reality. There is little historic precedent that would lead us to believe that the council has the resolve to impose and enforce such an approach.	
Policy SP7	408497	Mr C Mills		3789	Objecting	I object to the new / improved A2 junction provision at Bridge. The cost will be prohibitive and as such its use to justify large scale housing in South Canterbury to extract the levy from the developer does not ring true.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP7	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3841	Objecting	As the plan relies on new road and other infrastructure, to support proposed development, it is failure not having an infrastructure plan to comment on. It should be consulted on before the final plan is agreed as the infrastructure proposed is undeliverable making the plan unsound.	
Policy SP7	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3842	Objecting	One Council document states that 'New Infrastructure in place so new developments don't add to traffic congestion', but then goes on the state 'No national or county funds to build new road' If the plan is to 'secure through Binding agreements with developers' to fund the infrastructure, all this means is that properties will be more expensive and therefore can not be 'affordable'.	Funds raised by this means should be used in the area of the development and not used district wide. The proposal for the Sturry relief road, would seem to be planned with money from Herne Bay and this is unacceptable. I do not see how that scheme will ease congestion - it will just move it from Sturry to nearer the City centre.
Policy SP7	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4248	Objecting	The inclusion of this policy serves to highlight the weakness of the Council's evidence base in regard to testing of alternative development locations. In broad terms, the evidence base is deficient and does not justify the allocations. The logical planning sequence would be to rigorously assess infrastructure requirements and then test deliverability before local plan allocations are made not after the event. The danger is that the methodology adopted will lead to a 'non delivery plan'.	
Policy SP7	780963	Mr Harvey Blaymire		4317	Objecting	Any Section 106 monies should be primarily for improving the local infrastructure as affected by the development. Other grandiose plans for the wider area should only benefit when immediate local needs are met.	Any Section 106 monies should be primarily for improving the local infrastructure as affected by the development. Other grandiose plans for the wider area should only benefit when immediate local needs are met.
Policy SP7	780968	Mr Simon Wall		4350	Objecting	What provisions are being made for infrastructure to support the new houses? Will Canterbury City Council obtain statutory guarantees that the utility companies will be able to fulfil demand? Southern Water have had many recent difficulties dealing with sewage disposal. Sturry Parish Council rejected the plan mainly due to concerns about the level crossing.	
Policy SP7	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4372	Objecting	In the Canterbury area, traffic is bound to increase from the population living in 15,000 new houses. School runs will be a nightmare as residents try to cross the city. It is vital that ALL transport infrastructure is in place before house building starts, otherwise congestion will only increase.	
Policy SP7	781159	Mr D R Budd		4398	Objecting	There is no infrastructure delivery plan supplied, CCC state this will be produced at 'an appropriate time'. This is not considered to be good enough.	
Policy SP7	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4859	Objecting	Concerned that there is no outline Green Infrastructure and Community Infrastructure plan in place, which sets out a clear vision for at least the main sites at this point of time. There is a risk of the developer driving the agenda and not the needs of the locality. Green Infrastructure and Community Infrastructure policies are key drivers to the deliverability of the Local Plan and need to be "priced in" to any development as such demands may affect their deliverability and viability.	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP7	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4888	Objecting	The Plan focuses on the delivery of housing numbers on a small number of developer led sites, which will deliver the key infrastructure requirements for the whole. This poses risk to the viability of the Plan, should one or more of the developer led schemes fail e.g. Herne Bay sites are to share the cost of the relief road and South Canterbury the cost of the junction improvements, community infrastructure and fast bus route.	
Policy SP7	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5028	Objecting	Council has not made the infrastructure strategy publicly available. It will identify phasing, obligations and scape of infrastructure and could affect deliverability of allocated sites. The approach goes against NPPF para 177. The infrastructure plan should be subject to examination along with DLP. The absence of the infrastructure strategy mean the DLP cannot be found sound and is not consistent with national policy. Produce an infrastructure strategy	
Policy SP7	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5365	Objecting	Support the preparation of an implementation plan. New and improved infrastructure will be required to meet the demand from new development. Southern Water is committed to meeting this demand. It is important that development is co-ordinated with provision of new and improved infrastructure. To ensure that a high level of service can be maintained to both new and existing customers, and that unsatisfactory levels of service such as ewer flooding or poor water pressure are prevented.	
Policy SP7	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5385	Objecting	New and improved water supply and wastewater infrastructure will be required to serve proposed development. Depending on the exact location of development, it may include improved local sewers, water mains, trunk sewers, pumping stations and treatment works. Delivery of infrastructure improvements needs to be supported by Local Plan etc. None of the policies positively encourage new and improved utility infrastructure. Include a new policy.	Include an additional policy: Provision of utility infrastructure New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and permitted in order to meet the identified needs of the community.
Policy SP7	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5551	Objecting	Weak and inadequate policy statement! Change required: Given the uncertainties regarding the provision of adequate infrastructure and community facilities broad implementation plans are required for each of the strategic sites. SP7 NEEDS SHARPENING UP!	
Policy SP7	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5651	Objecting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:- Desire to see adequate infrastructure provided in tandem with housing development	
Policy SP7	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5654	Supporting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:- Desire to use S106 agreements and CILs to best effect	
Policy SP7	784704	Mrs D Potts		5775	Objecting	The road system could not cope with the number of extra cars which vast numbers of new houses would generate as I do not see that the infrastructure proposed will be sufficient. How can such changes be contemplated without a district transport strategy being put forward and costed?	

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy SP7	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5854	Objecting	CCC must note that KCC requires adequate levels of S106 developer contributions and/or CIL receipts to be secured throughout the District to provide sufficient funding for the total delivery of the education infrastructure requirements need to support development proposals. The resulting total infrastructure requirements must be incorporated within the infrastructure referred to in Policy SP7. KCC's requirements may change once detailed phased trajectory is available see Annex 1 attached.	
Policy SP7	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5922	Objecting	The strategic development sites identified will almost all involve substantial archaeological investigation and will produce significant archaeological materials. Although planning conditions can account for most of these works, the long-term curation of the archaeological archives cannot easily be secured in this way. KCC would request that appropriate provision is made in the S106 discussions for all strategic sites so that the costs of the archiving are fully accounted for.	
Policy SP7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6096	Supporting	Makes sense	
1.88	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3844	Objecting	First sentence after "delivered" insert "or whether alterations have to be made. First point delete "a particular focus on". Second point delete "including" and replace with "especially". Add at the end "(particularly for locally based businesses)". Fourth point define "design quality" - are there any particular standards to be imposed/guidance as to where the best design advice should be obtained? Add a six point "The improvement of AQMAs"	First sentence after "delivered" insert "or whether alterations have to be made First point delete "a particular focus on" Second point delete "including" and replace with "especially". Add at the end "(particularly for locally based businesses)" Fourth point define "design quality" - are there any particular standards to be imposed/guidance as to where the best design advice should be obtained? Add a sixth point "The improvement of AQMAs"
1.88	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5655	Supporting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:- Plan monitoring promised	
1.88	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5801	Objecting	It would also be appropriate and consistent with national planning policy requirements (NPPF Para. 111) to monitor and report on the proportion of development which is achieved on previously developed land, as well as to set a local target for the use of 'Brownfield' land. As such it is requested that this is added as an additional bullet point for the monitoring process as follows: Proportion of development achieved on previously developed land	It is requested that this is added as an additional bullet point for the monitoring process as follows: Proportion of development achieved on previously developed land
1.88	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5825	Objecting	It would also be appropriate and consistent with national planning policy requirements (NPPF Para. 111) to monitor and report on the proportion of development which is achieved on previously developed land, as well as to set a local target for the use of 'Brownfield' land. As such it is requested that this is added as an additional bullet point for the monitoring process as follows: Proportion of development achieved on previously developed land	It is requested that this is added as an additional bullet point for the monitoring process as follows: Proportion of development achieved on previously developed land

Policy / Para	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Cooment Number	Support / object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
1.88	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6097	Objecting	Omitted from list, which although not inclusive, should also feature; Actual Job creation; Travel to work changes (time, cost & ease) ; Traffic congestion; Quality of life.	
1.88	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6100	Objecting	The need for monitoring, and the way in which it will achieved in relation to Policy CC13, is crucial to the well being of all residents throughout the District.	
1.89	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6099	Objecting	Will the Council have any flexibility and beable to react to the monitoring exercise findings? What happens if there is another financial crisis? Should houses be standing empty what will happen? What happens if a developer falls short?	It is not actually stated that: "the Council will consider the results of any monitoring exercise and take necessary, appropriate action". This should be included.
1.90	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1625	Objecting	The timescales are too long for reviews to be spaced at 4 - 5 years. The council need a more proactive hands on approach to ensure delivery to plan on such a strategic project.	Shorten the timescales for review.
1.90	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2791	Objecting	If elements of the strategy are not delivered, will the land be removed from the Local Plan? Why aren't the proposals for monitoring ready now? Why wait until the formal submission stage?	
1.90	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3195	Objecting	Support a 4 €“ 5 year review. Contend that elements of the plan could be deferred, particularly housing allocations, until later. The 5 year housing land supply could be maintained using the current development levels. The proposal to increase the building rate is driven by the need to tap into the government's incentive schemes providing council funding that will finish before 2031. Put these proposals before the electorate at the next election.	Put these proposals before the electorate at the next election and really understand what local people want
1.90	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3193	Supporting	Support a 4 €“ 5 year review. Contend that elements of the plan could be deferred, particularly housing allocations, until later. The 5 year housing land supply could be maintained using the current development levels. The proposal to increase the building rate is driven by the need to tap into the government's incentive schemes providing council funding that will finish before 2031. Put these proposals before the electorate at the next election.	Put these proposals before the electorate at the next election and really understand what local people want
1.90	408497	Mr C Mills		3791	Supporting	Para 1.90 - I would support a review every 4 - 5 years and would contend that many elements of the plan could be deferred, particularly relating to housing site allocations, until later in the period to 2031.	
1.90	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3848	Objecting	In the second sentence after "delivered" insert "or needs alteration" In the third sentence delete "will inevitably" and replace with "may"	In the second sentence after "delivered" insert "or needs alteration" In the third sentence delete "will inevitably" and replace with "may"
1.90	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5555	Objecting	A better approach might be to see the Local Plan as requiring 2 phases covering 2014-2020 and 2021-2031, with a comprehensive review in 2020?	In the meantime, the Council should commit to on-going preparation of policies and proposals to develop a sustainable transport network and an adequate physical and social infrastructure provision that will ensure the well-being of the District in the latter period. The investment costs and possible funding of those must also be comprehensively investigated.

Comments Summary:

Chapter 2: Housing Development

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.1	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		285	Supporting	Sustainable communities is the key	
2.1	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	2162	Objecting	The Council has a major lacuna with regards to Mobile Home and static caravan parks which are used as residential accommodation in the District yet are ignored in this chapter.	Mobile homes should be counted as part of the housing stock (as were 'pre-fabs') as of today but not allowed by their expansion to be part of it in the future given that they do not satisfy the aspiration of the plan for housing stock. In short, no more mobile homes should be permitted in the District. Regarding caravans, the council should know and report the situation. If they are in effect being used as resident accommodation this should be noted and their expansion resisted.
2.1	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3612	Supporting	Chapter 2: Housing development: We largely support the ideals expressed in this section	
2.1	408497	Mr C Mills		3792	Objecting	We note the omission of some important elements that should affect the way the council assesses true housing need. Future consolidation of student accommodation on the Kent university site or the provision of student accommodation by Christchurch and others on city brownfield sites does not get taken into account in assessing demand or the provision of supply.	
2.1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	5909	Objecting	LOCAL' need means different things to different people. To the Council it probably always means the District of Canterbury, to a 'local' resident it means their immediate neighbourhood/community. Was this differentiation made clear to people responding to the IPSOS MORI poll?	Chapter 2 - open with a clear explanation of what the 'local need' actually is: €€ The number of households on the waiting list by each area of the District, what type of property & where would meet their requirements €€ The number of these who are 'in need' as defined by the Government, also by individual area, as above.
2.1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6123	Objecting	Pledge 8 - we plan for the right type and number of homes in the right place to create sustainable communities in the future.This has not been the case for the Parish of Sturry. The scale of housing is a result of the need for infrastructure as a result of a plan to have homes in the 'right place to create sustainable communities'. Policy SP3, nor the site plan for community sustainability. No mention of business, amenity space. etc and no guarantee that developers will be held to account.	
2.1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6153	Objecting	NOTE: NO MENTION OF THE GOVERNMENT'S 'NEW HOME BONUS SCHEME'. see report Kentish Gazette 16th Aug. 2013.	
2.2	776803	Mrs Kathleen Warner		611	Objecting	House prices have always been too high for locals! and the wages have allways been at the lower end. Thats why many of our young familys leave.	
2.2	778242	Mr Richard Ginman		891	Objecting	More houses means more traffic - food production lost due to land being built on.	Keep the present arrangements.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.2	778466	Mrs Barbara Hudgell		1390	Supporting	I agree that it is of paramount importance to build affordable housing to buy and let; and is there any way that rents can be capped as they have already become prohibitive for many people.	
2.2	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1627	Objecting	The council have shown themselves to be lacking the resolve to deliver on this promise. The Littlebourne Rd development has recently had its affordable housing element reduced. The council must take a stronger enforceable position on this and stand up to developers.	Enshrine enforceable policies to make sure affordable housing is built to the required levels.
2.2	777839	Miss Margaret Stirling	Secretart Craddock Road Residents Association	1744	Supporting	Brown field sites to be used before green field sites. Provision of green open space must be provided by contractors, and these are to be fit for purpose, not just a token scattering of tiny patches of land.	
2.2	779227	Mr Paul Uden		1754	Objecting	The Draft Local Plan does not accurately represent the views of residents as expressed in the MORI poll. Over 70% of the community do not want to go ahead on Greenfield land. The majority want the new house building to be within outlying villages which do not have congestion and coastal towns not in Canterbury. This is not just 'Not In My Backyard' as they have weighed up the impact of an already overcrowded and congested route into Canterbury.	
2.2	779228	Miss Margaret Stirling		1768	Supporting	Large open space to be provided by developers. Brown field sites to be used as a priority. Make sure that all homes are able to be rented out even if it means compulsory purchases	
2.3	399017	Mr Andrew Hall		99	Objecting	We are already seeing lots of small units providing affordable homes. It seems that planning policy prevents the building of places with room to swing a cat, space for cupboards etc - i.e the council is intent on the cheap end of the market and looking for high density. This is NOT about raising the quality of district nor will it provide the quality homes for professionals and knowledge workers in senior roles!	I would like to see more larger apartments provided - so that older people could move out of large houses and still have space. I would also like to see the quality of housing stock rise - not just cram in the maximum possible number of units
2.3	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		348	Supporting	A young population shows that a focus on walking, cycling, and bus infrastructure must be a focus.	
2.3	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3586	Objecting	The population density of Herne Ward is 7.7 per ha. Cu district 4.9 per ha & SE 4.5 per ha (source 2011 census)	
2.4	776803	Mrs Kathleen Warner		612	Objecting	Broad Oak, Sturry, Hersden can not cope with the high volume of housing, 1800 houses is far too many. no matter what anyone says the villages will be no more, the the greenbelt is too small. Can the sewerage cope with the extra houses? The ancient woodland and wildlife would also suffer, from noise and light pollution.	
2.4	776051	Mr Rick Strange		861	Objecting	Older people choosing to retire in the Canterbury Area will not continue if the Canterbury area is little more than unsustainable housing estates. Other than the Whitefriars development, almost all other shops in Canterbury have now become cafes, restaurants or purveyors of cheap and shoddy tourist tat. No retired person will want to live in or near all the thousands of badly behaved students who attend the several Universities in the City. Many people are trying to move out of the area.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.6	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		432	Supporting	We support the findings and conclusions of the Councils SHMA (2009). It confirms that property prices are on average £45,000 higher than neighbouring districts.	
2.6	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2732	Objecting	Did CCC take the housing needs survey into account? Does the local Plan meet the requirements for affordable housing? The spatial strategy does not meet the needs of the HMA through use of the SHLAA, as the proposals are based on a district wide target distributed arbitrarily on greenfield land and new road infrastructure.	
2.6	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4853	Objecting	The percentage of affordable housing needed, based on the SHMA 2009 assessment was at 40% of the market for Canterbury and Whitstable (35% elsewhere), however this draft local plan sets out a figure of 30% for developments over seven units. Unconvinced that an appropriate number of affordable homes can be delivered within a realistic time scale on this basis.	
2.6	780277	Yvonne & Mark Culverhouse & Ford		5058	Objecting	This is a worry as young families views and financial concerns have changed since the 2010 Residents survey. I would suggest also the market need profile of the area looked at in Core Strategy Options Report (2010) would be different three years on.	
2.6	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5937	Objecting	The 2009 SHMA should be updated. The nature and degree of co-operation with adjoining authorities is insufficient to satisfy the duty to cooperate. It is a legal duty as well as a test of soundness, the plan has not demonstrated that this duty has been properly fulfilled. Take further action taken on this point in order to avoid any delay to the adoption of the Plan.	The 2009 SHMA should be updated Ensure duty to cooperate fulfilled and demonstrated.
2.6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6135	Objecting	Greater Canterbury ...East Kent Rural North. Where is Sturry Parish in relation to these?	
2.6	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6760	Objecting	East Kent Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicated that to meet the housing needs the total annual housing targets for Swale, Canterbury, Thanet and Dover needs to be 3432* houses/yr. Swale is setting housing at 540/yr, Thanet 480-590 provision of providing 780/yr there will be a shortfall of 932 houses/yr. This shortfall needs to be met across the region and addressed in the plan. The SHMA needs to be updated.	Address shortfall in plan. Update SHMA.
2.6	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6879	Objecting	Value and the market €" LPA funding and Sustainability: A common attitude to the NLP Report, the Experian Reports, and the ELR, is that recent trends show that a majority of house purchasers seek perceived value, and for that reason property in Canterbury will be the target of many. Higher local prices €" more profit for developers.	
2.7	766800	Mr Mark Dowle		129	Objecting	Canterbury is ahead of its targets for housing and has thousands of vacant properties.	There is no need for this development. Bring vacant properties back into market.
2.7	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3588	Objecting	Higher prices due to Canterbury acting as a major economic centre within East Kent. To reduce travel/congestion/journey times new homes should be built closer to Canterbury not 6 miles away.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6136	Objecting	Competition from free market forces, the global and national economic situations, availability of mortgages etc may, perhaps, have something to do with this as well? They are not mentioned.	
2.8	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		497	Objecting	A major influence on house prices, particularly of prices of "affordable" family homes is the number that have been converted into student accomodation.	A statement of intent and impact concerning student accomodation is required
2.8	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4855	Objecting	The issues related to second homes in Whitstable do not appear to be addressed. It is important to Whitstable residents as the matters are wide-ranging and complex and influence the dynamics of areas of Whitstable, including affordability and availability of homes.	
2.8	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5628	Objecting	Whitstable There is a need to acknowledge and address in some policy statements the demand from outsiders for retirement and second homes and the implications for the local residents.	
2.8	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6866	Objecting	DTZ and NLP Reports are purely anecdotal about why developers prefer Canterbury. NLP report (7.7) states historically Canterbury has had the (slight) majority of development, and sees no reason why this should not continue. CCC should address HB's poor employment figures. If employers require housing to have been already created before they will create jobs, surely CCC should take the lead? NLP refers to high value devt which is in conflict with cost of property - whit & rural have higher prices	
2.9	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5938	Objecting	Support affordability of housing in rural areas. Plan needs to make a more of an attempt to address the problem by increasing the supply of housing in rural areas. This can be achieved without loss of character or function in most of the larger villages. High house prices in villages is a function of demand, leading to increased house prices and a lack of affordability, of private and social housing. Positively address this issue.	Positively address affordability in rural villages.
2.10	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		433	Supporting	We fully support the Councils Housing Strategy (2012) to plan for the right number of homes in the right place to create communities in accordance with the areas Settlement Hierarachy.e.g. Land at Thanets Way, Whitstable (Policy SP3g)	
2.10	779227	Mr Paul Uden		1755	Objecting	The plan is a developers dream and doesn't represent the views of residents. Developers have chosen these sites as building on Greenfield, Grade 1 farmland is easier and maximises profit. The extra employment will be driven by a new Business Park off the A2. This is unrealistic. Business will not come to Canterbury where the public transport is not as good as in the west of London. The idea HS1 will provide the impetus to bring those from London to Canterbury has not been thought through.	
2.10	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5561	Objecting	It is claimed that 'The Housing Strategy is based on extensive evidence and the views of our local communities', but this claim is not legitimate.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.10	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6021	Supporting	People enjoy living in neighbourhoods and communities where the streets are free of cars, and are thus much safer environments. They may want to, move to, or stay in the Canterbury district, to raise families because shops, schools and work can all be reached without the need for a car. This has implications for the way that transport and housing are planned.	
2.11	779262	Mr John Bailey		1957	Supporting	Reduction in HMOs is vital as community is being destroyed.	Must be linked to reduction in number of HMOs or restrictions on number in any one area.
2.11	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5811	Objecting	The link between growth and housing is unexplored. Although the suggestion is that more houses are needed to provide for new graduate level jobs, this justification does not occur with all the stress being placed on housing demand from the existing population. The case for housing as a driver in the DLP appears to be passed over. Equally the Economic Land Review does not mention housing as an economic driver, concentrating on business space requirements.	
2.12	778672	Ms Sheila Kesby		2539	Objecting	Inaccurate to say affordable housing shortages are caused by retired people living alone, national policy is to keep people in their homes, families should look after their parents and HMO's have distorted residential neighbourhoods. Don't force elderly people out of their homes, cut back numbers of HMO's	cept and support the national social policies for a) keeping people in their own homes for as long as possible and b) avoiding clinically unnecessary attendance in A & E and emergency admissions to acute hospitals by NOT expecting (?forcing) older people to vacate their homes to provide 'affordable housing' for younger people and families. Instead, severely cut the numbers of HMOs as well building new or converting existing, housing stock suited for older people and those with long-term conditions.
2.12	780273	A D Linfoot		3860	Objecting	It is claimed that the required balance between the working and retired populations needs to be changed. Besides the fact that when houses are built, there is no way of arranging that they will be occupied by one age-group rather than another, the apparent conflation noted above of student-age and working-age populations seriously compromises this argument. There is no reason to believe the population will grow in the way CCC and consultants believe. Increase pressure for student accom	
2.13	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		349	Supporting	I fully support this.	
2.13	665473	Dr Richard Norman		527	Supporting	Agree that increasing the amount of purpose-built student accommodation is necessary to reduce the pressure on the housing market and to release family-sized homes for families.	
2.13	779262	Mr John Bailey		1951	Supporting	There are too many HMOs, so building student accommodation within the city is vital. Beware using open space that separates UKC from local residents.	
2.13	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3196	Objecting	This omits important elements that should be used to assess housing need, including; consolidating student housing thus making more HMO's available. COuncil should instigated a strict student housing policy and make representations to government to highlight the student skewing of the city's demographics.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.13	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3589	Objecting	Higher prices due to Canterbury acting as a major economic centre within East Kent. To reduce travel/congestion/journey times new homes should be built closer to Canterbury not 6 miles away.	
2.13	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3850	Objecting	In the sixth sentence after "student accommodation" insert "on campus or on urban sites at Whitstable and Herne Bay". At the end add "The use of prime urban sites in Canterbury for even more student housing must stop so that such sites can be utilised for private (including affordable) housing"	In the sixth sentence after "student accommodation" insert "on campus or on urban sites at Whitstable and Herne Bay". At the end add "The use of prime urban sites in Canterbury for even more student housing must stop so that such sites can be utilised for private (including affordable) housing"
2.13	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6027	Supporting	Supportive of proposals for the main universities to make greater provision for their student accommodation needs. However, any additional student housing should be counted as part of the Canterbury District's housing allocation because the act of building these student dwellings releases additional housing for the general public.	
2.14	775862	Mr Clive Flisher		334	Supporting	Student numbers and housing not properly addressed. About 5,000 Canterbury homes are student occupied - the plan must show figures - see 2.72 etc.	All comments on student housing need reinforcement.
2.14	109652	Clr Michael Dixey		950	Objecting	Paragraph 2.14: Reference is made to rented homes in the private sector. Several recent research projects have shown that economic growth is highest in areas with a high level of rented accommodation (and relatively low level of owner occupiers). While the reasons may not be fully understood, the results of this research are conclusive. Maybe this should be taken into account in paragraph 2.16.	
2.14	777305	Mr Jason Hobbs	Area Manager Homes and Communities Agency	1602	Supporting	Following the Economic Viability Assessment undertaken, the HCA support the Council's 30% affordable requirement for all residential development provided on site (for 7+ units).	
2.14	780277	Yvonne & Mark Culverhouse & Ford		5059	Objecting	We have moved towards a society of younger people who would prefer to actually have less financial commitment. Renting provides a higher percentage of disposable income to both families and single professionals. No large deposit, no building insurance, no maintenance and up keep costs, no legal costs etc. It allows people the option and the freedom of changing location when job opportunities arise.	
2.15	780277	Yvonne & Mark Culverhouse & Ford		5060	Objecting	In order to retain students we need professional businesses on north of Hersden site. Will this be the case? Speaking to a recent Canterbury graduate obtaining a first in law, I was told the first thing professional graduates do is go home to their parents (if British born) as they are in debt and look for work in London due to financial rewards. They certainly would not wish to look for housing in Hersden or anywhere for 2-4 years after graduation.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.15	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5812	Objecting	The link between growth and housing is unexplored. Although the suggestion is that more houses are needed to provide for new graduate level jobs, this justification does not occur with all the stress being placed on housing demand from the existing population. The case for housing as a driver in the DLP appears to be passed over. Equally the Economic Land Review does not mention housing as an economic driver, concentrating on business space requirements.	
2.15	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6137	Objecting	We already have graduates looking for degree related employment. Without greater business interest the building of more houses first as an answer for economic growth is very uncertain. The plan's estimate of housing needs is against an unknown requirement of new business, who, it is hoped will demand a higher skilled workforce. This is a factor of great uncertainty. What sort of premises will they need? Will there be sufficient land in the right place or will it mean sacrifice of greenfield.	
2.16	775862	Mr Clive Flisher		332	Objecting	Local graduates are not essential. Most graduates are desirable.	Change to a highly educated workforce.....
2.17	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	754	Objecting	SHLAA is the most appropriate way to objectively assess housing requirements. Projections provide a useful starting point, but any objective assessment will also need to take into account other local data relating to housing need and demand such as affordability, overcrowding, concealed households, etc. This is why the NPPF requires that the objective assessment of housing need is to be conducted through a SHMA. Projections cannot fully reflect the the underlying need for housing.	
2.17	778073	Ms Claire Dethier		1516	Objecting	Dacorum Borough Council's Core Strategy was found to be sound despite not meeting their objectively assessed needs. The Planning Inspector concluded that the Core Strategy "does not represent the full need for housing, but rather it is the amount of housing the council considers could be satisfactorily accommodated in the borough over the plan period". The Inspector also highlighted the fact that the NPPF is only guidance.	In light of this recent decision, Canterbury City Council ought to consider whether a similar approach may be appropriate considering the constraints of the City and proposing a lower housing target with a commitment to carry out an early review to assess the impact of the lower target..
2.17	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1950	Supporting	The findings of the NLP report is fully supported and recognised as an important component of the evidence base which supports the overall housing quantum for the district.	
2.17	781238	Mr R N Warnick		4343	Objecting	Bringing empty property back into proper residential use should have a higher priority than promoting the building of new property	
2.18	422109	Ms Ann Parkin		191	Objecting	Any large scale development should be based on informed rational judgement of long term need not on short term political and financial gain	
2.18	117585	Cllr Nick Eden-Green		192	Objecting	Build rate should be at about 500 dwellings per year	change build rate to 500 dwellings per year
2.18	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		434	Supporting	The Council have taken account of its robust evidence base in supporting Scenario E of the NLP report which supports the District Plan housing requirement of 15,600 dwellings for the period 2011-2031(780 dwellings pa)	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.18	408444	Mr & Mrs Bill & Carol Hinchliffe		489	Objecting	Some new housing is needed but the level 50% above SE England proposed does not seem sustainable.	
2.18	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	752	Objecting	The SHMA is the most appropriate vehicle for exploring what the objectively assessed requirement is. This is because it will assess the scale of current housing needs (the backlog) as well as the extent of the future projected need over the plan period. The Development Requirements Study uses official household and populations projections, but does not assess unmet need in the way a SHMA does. Scenarios I and J provide more accurate assessments of housing needs for the plan period.	The NLP paper is clear that scenario E is a policy-led scenario. Consequently, by definition it does not serve as an objective assessment of need. Understanding what the scale of the objective need is must be the first step. The second step is how the plan intends to deal with this. The starting point in plan-making therefore requires the Council to take into account the SHMA and demographic scenarios I and J because this provide the most accurate assessment of the true extent of the need. Once this objective need has been identified the Council can then overlay its policy objectives. How the plan proposes to deal with the scale of the need becomes the plan strategy. If the Council does not expect to be able to address the full scale of needs indicated by the SHMA or the demographic scenarios I and J within its district then the Council must explain through its plan how it intends for these to be addressed elsewhere. This is test of soundness of the plan (paragraph 182 of the NPPF).
2.18	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1207	Objecting	The proposed level of development, adding up to 15,600 new dwellings in the 20-year period 2011-2031, is not justified by projections for employment and the local economy. The Nathaniel Lichfield Report forecasts a 4.7% growth in employment, which would amount to about 4,500 new jobs in the period of the Plan. 15,600 new dwellings would represent three for every new job - far more than could conceivably be needed.	A target of between 500 and 600 new dwellings per year over the 20-year period would be consistent with the economic and employment projections for the period; would be realistic in the light of historic levels of about 545 per year; would be in keeping with local support for a target of 550 a year or lower; would require less building on greenfield sites and would create less traffic congestion; would coincide with the proposal in the Canterbury Society's Vision for Canterbury for a target of about 550 per year.
2.18	778547	Mr. Malcolm Harris		1309	Objecting	There is no justification for increasing the rate from its present level.	The Council should reduce its rate planned to what it is at present.
2.18	778073	Ms Claire Dethier		1518	Objecting	Firstly the preferred approach put forward by the Council proposes 780 dwellings per annum, in excess of the number recommended in the CDRSFR report of between 600 and 700 per annum which they concluded would "appear to accommodate the majority of need for housing arising out of the projected population change based upon recent trends and ONS published" as well as achieving other sustainability aims.	
2.18	777305	Mr Jason Hobbs	Area Manager Homes and Communities Agency	1593	Supporting	They are encouraged that policy seeks to maintain a sufficient supply of land for housing and employment, based on development requirements from background studies, particularly 780 dwellings/yr identified by NLP.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.18	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1629	Objecting	The NLP scenario chosen is not supported by a majority of residents. There is enough of a supply at existing levels and no need to increase that. The fact that there has been over provision recently shows that the district is already building above the national average.	Revert to the residents preferred building option or 510 - 550 or lower. This removes 4000+ dwellings.
2.18	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1739	Objecting	The overall scale of development provided in the emerging Local Plan, particularly in respect of housing land provision, is inadequate having regard to the growth agenda advocated by Government (as embodied, for instance, at paragraphs 17 - 20 and 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework) and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.	Development at the highest end of the scenario ranges assessed by NLP should be adopted (ie at least 1,200 dwellings pa), and Policies SP2 and SP3 and paragraphs 2.18 - 2.28 amended accordingly.
2.18	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1923	Objecting	Employment growth forecasts 4,500 new jobs. 15,600 new houses represent three for each job created - more than is needed. Development targets are also unrealistic. The past average of 545 pa, experienced sluggish sales and an assessment whether supply outstripped demand is needed. If a target of 780 pa is adopted, then, even if houses are not built, the excessive targets will blight large parts of the district. The proposals are also contrary to the wishes of local people as surveyed by Mori.	A target of between 500 and 600 new dwellings per year over the 20-year period · would be consistent with the economic and employment projections for the period; · would be realistic in the light of historic levels of about 545 per year; · would be in keeping with local support for a target of 550 a year or lower; · would require less building on greenfield sites and would create less traffic congestion; · would coincide with the proposal in the Canterbury Society's Vision for Canterbury for a target of about 550 per year.
2.18	778391	Mr Robert Brown		2005	Objecting	The majority of people support 510 units or less. Canterbury's housing rate is already high at 50% over the SE average.	
2.18	779286	Mr Mark Aplin	Planning Policy Team Leader Shepway District Council	2067	Supporting	The housing target of (780p.a.) exceeds that in the former South East Plan (and historic completion rates); but is below that in the EK SHMA for all housing need. There is no prospect of Shepway reviewing its housing need or targets, and it is unlikely to be sustainable for SDC to meet any need derived from Canterbury. Employment-led policy requires verification of its deliverability. For Canterbury, there remains an opportunity for the driving factors behind the scale of growth to be clarified.	
2.18	778777	Mr Nick Waldron	The Waldron Family	2116	Supporting	See attached statement, paragraph 5.12.	
2.18	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2195	Objecting	The proposed level of development, adding up to 15,600 new dwellings in the 20-year period 2011-2031, is not justified by projections for employment and the local economy. The proposed development targets are also unrealistic. The average number of new dwellings built in the district in the period from 1991/92 to 2011/12 was 545 per year. The proposed development targets are also contrary to the wishes of local people.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.18	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2249	Objecting	It is clear from the NPPF that there is a desire for the development to be 'front loaded'. This is not the case under policy SP2 which identifies the phasing of the proposed provision within 5-year periods. The provision for period 2011 to 2016 is actually reduced compared to the others possibly due to the Council's view that there has been over provision in recent years. The inclusion of this over provision has no basis in policy terms and should be discounted when the plan is being considered.	The base date of the housing evidence should be amended to comply with the start of the plan and the resulting calculation on the residual supply (in para 2.18) should also be amended to suit.
2.18	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2280	Objecting	Since years have already passed in the period of the plan in which that rate has not been achieved, the actual annual rate of building that will be required from 2016€“31 to achieve the target of 15,600 will end up being much higher than 780 per year. The Council has subsequently admitted that its drive to build more houses is based on the need to generate extra income (due to government cuts), rather than on a sustainable economic model.	
2.18	778854	Michael & Elizabeth Avery		2410	Objecting	Other than retail and education, it is difficult to see where the economic growth to justify the significant increase in house building (from 550 at present to 780 per annum) will come from.	
2.18	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		3344	Objecting	The development requirement for the District of 15,600 units over the 20 year period 2011 -2031. It is concerning that such a large upgrade in the number of units is now seen to be required. Of the 15,600 units required over the plan period, 9,000 units are shown as distributed over 8 key sites, Policy SP3. In development terms these sites appear to be urban extensions located on greenfield land. Should not greater emphasis have been given to providing some of the 9,000 units on pdl.	
2.18	780273	A D Linfoot		4110	Objecting	So the proposed rate of new house consents, 780 a year on average for the duration of the Plan, is substantially excessive; there may be a case for some increase over the recent historic rate of 556 a year, perhaps up to the 'B' option of 617 a year which is within the range which Nathaniel Lichfield consider to meet the policy objectives, but the argument should be around that level, not 780	
2.18	13719	Mr Steve Moore	Thanet District Council	4154	Supporting	The consultation document indicates that it is proposed to accommodate the entire additional planned housing requirement within Canterbury district and TDC supports this intention. IN this context TDC has some technical queries regarding the components of supply illustrated in the document and will engage at officer level to explore these.	
2.18	780975	Mr Frederic Stansfield		4219	Objecting	I disagree with the plans for housing development described in Chapter 2 of the Draft Plan. Development on the scale envisaged is incompatible with requirements identified elsewhere in the plan, e.g. in relation to Transport (Chapter 5), Climate Change (Chapter 7), Landscape and Biodiversity (Chapter 10) and Open Space (Chapter 11).	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.18	780975	Mr Frederic Stansfield		4220	Objecting	In relation to housing development (Chapter 2), housing in Canterbury is heavily used by students. Higher education is undergoing major technological and economic changes at present, which could result in major changes, probably in terms of reduced demand, to requirements for housing in Canterbury. Although this cannot be foreseen at present, it could have drastic effects on housing demand in Canterbury and the surrounding area.	
2.18	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4355	Objecting	Currently there are approx. 25% international students, who, after the first year, add to the pressure on local housing supply. Because of this sector's short term housing demand, many new builds in Canterbury centre have become buy-to-let dwellings. The population is transient and the hope of establishing sustainable communities via this route is doomed to failure. How many of the projected homes in the Plan are expected to be short term and not life-time homes?	
2.18	781255	Robert & Sandra Shine		4503	Objecting	Assertions are made about the need for greater housing glossing over the fact that much of the need for housing in Canterbury is driven by the high student population.	
2.18	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4646	Objecting	Objects to the provision of 15600 new homes over the next 20 years because: it is not justified by employment projections; is unrealistic as only 545 was achieved in boom times; 780/yr is a 43% increase; excessive target will create a planning blight; contrary to wishes of local people shown in the Ipsos-Mori survey. Have a more realistic target of 550/yr which would be supported by local people and is consistent with economic projections.	
2.18	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4680	Objecting	Level of housing proposed does not relate to previous housing completions; expected population growth; brownfied sites; or employment growth.	
2.18	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5562	Objecting	Scenario E with its 780 houses per year construction rate is not justifiable. Current permissions, existing allocations, likely windfalls via future consents, small additional sites in village hubs, the sites proposed and being investigated at Hersden plus Howe Barracks may well provide almost enough land for this period, especially if the target was kept to the 550 to 625 range? Certainly the pressure to earmark more sites at this stage should be resisted. The need for 4000 estate evaporates.	
2.18	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	6001	Objecting	See the Association's comments on policies SP2 (PO5993) and SP3 (PO5994 and PO6000).	
2.19	399017	Mr Andrew Hall		100	Objecting	I fail to see the logic in the argument that this level of housing is required! Where are these new jobs going to arise. specially as you suggest that 1300 public sector jobs may go in the next 2 years	I would like to see a new assessment of the need for new housing in the context of the current economic context

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.19	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	766	Objecting	In paragraph 2.19 we note that the Council is counting completions achieved since 2006 above the SEP target as contributing to its future needs. We do not consider it to be appropriate to count completions from a previous planning period against the future housing requirement. The base-date for the plan and its assessment of future housing needs is from 2011. The matter of over-supply in the past is immaterial. It merely illustrates the fact that SEP go strategy and calculations wrong.	The Council needs to start from a blank sheet and judge afresh what is needed from 2011 onwards. The Council may count net completions achieved since 2011 and deduct these from the overall target to derive its residual housing requirement.
2.19	779265	Mr Timothy Chancellor		2091	Objecting	More consideration should be given to making better use of unoccupied and under-utilized housing and to making provision for student accommodation on campus.	Review the proposed figures for new housing development after taking into account additional factors, such as those mentioned above.
2.20	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	763	Objecting	Paragraph 2.20 is unclear. The Council is saying that its land supply consists of a) completions and b) unidentified sites. Paragraph 2.23 however, makes a number of strategic allocations. We assume that these strategic allocations do not benefit from planning permission.	It would be helpful to clarify this.
2.20	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		1617	Objecting	The text should make it clear that allocations includes the reserve housing site of land adjoining Richmond Drive , Beltinge (Policy H2 of the Canterbury District Council first review July 2006)	Add the words (including the reserve housing provsion site at Beltinge) after the words (Allocations- new sites identified for housing)
2.20	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2251	Objecting	Care needs to be taken to only include 'deliverable' sites in the commitments. The example of including existing car parks where there is no current resolution to dispose should be reconsidered and dealt with as windfall development if such sites become available in the future.	
2.20	778861	David & Teresa Kemsley		2524	Objecting	At the present time CCC has received a number of planning applications for new build student accommodation which if approved will free up small town houses ideal for young families. It seems bizarre that you have not taken this into account. Equally there are some very interesting schemes underway in Canterbury City centre for the conversion of vacant office blocks into flats.	
2.20	778333	Mr Ian Gregory		2593	Objecting	Objection is made to the approach of the City Council to the issue of housing land supply, especially to the stance that one of its elements comprises unidentified large sites which are not allocated in the plan. Innappropriate for a local authority to admit that it is not going to allocate land for housing - but then argue that it constitutes part of its supply of housing land. The Council is simply hoping that what it deems acceptable sites will come forward over the duration of the plan.	The Council needs to properly assess its housing land supply and then identify in the local plan where all additional development will take place.
2.20	414960	Cllr Alex Perkins	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3166	Objecting	Hundreds of additional student apartments are being built in the city, which the council states doesn't count toward the total housing requirement. However, DCLG guidance states that all student accommodation can be included towards the total housing provision specified in the draft plan. Failure to include student units means that the housing target may have be over-estimated by as many as 2000 units - effectively doubling the pressure on Canterbury.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.20	772200	Solihin Garrard		3254	Objecting	I am very puzzled too about why Canterbury City Council has not taken into its analysis of housing need, as Government says it should, provision of the enormous amount of new student accommodation that has been added in recent years. This has and will continue to complicate things and make the infrastructure services we rely on even more unsustainable.	
2.20	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3781	Objecting	One point that is given no credit in the Plan is the number of one off or small number of units that are built each year by individuals or small developers on 'infil sites' or small plots of land. These all add additional units to the District and should be included, particularly as the Council get a Government payment for them.	
2.20	13812	Mr N J Blake		5185	Objecting	The process by which the finally chosen parcels of land have been selected is not very clear and was driven by overriding pressure, to select enormous sites. The boundaries of such SHLAA sites are, by definition determined by land ownership, not other Planning or geographical constraints. It does therefore seem that the City Council has been unduly swayed by Developer/ Landowner pressure to the detriment of both landscape and community interests which would normally be a core part of its remit.	
2.20	414112	C E Arter		5276	Objecting	Suggests that the student accommodation units count towards the housing supply target. If this is the case, the housing figures should be revised accordingly.	
2.20	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5426	Objecting	There is no evidence of a comprehensive search for and assessment of remaining brownfield sites or low grade, degraded or unused agricultural or horticultural land that could be utilised for development before incursion into high grade agricultural land. This contravenes the requirements of the NPPF. The Sustainability Appraisal report drew attention to this questionable land use strategy adopted, although that assessment and other reservations have not been taken on board by the Council.	
2.20	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5844	Objecting	The DLP's proposals take no account of the fact that student accommodation can now be counted in the number of units provided. Moreover, the more such purpose built accommodation there is, the more HMOs are likely to be released to the market.	
2.20	779020	Mrs Janet Little		6025	Objecting	I say the S A's are totally flawed, the sites proposed have huge difficulties to overcome the whole process is flawed and should be "struck out" by the Inspector.	
2.20	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6028	Objecting	Any additional student housing should be counted as part of the Canterbury District's housing allocation because the act of building these student dwellings releases additional housing for the general public.	
2.20	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6142	Objecting	The stock and new supply of mobile homes seems to be ignored.They are as much part of the data to be considered as any conventional house as they are used permanently, require services/infrastructure/schools etc and have to go through the usual planning application process for residential development.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.21	408497	Mr C Mills		3793	Objecting	Para 2.21- I fundamentally disagree with the housing figures in table HI. Development at such a rate is driven by the council desire to secure the numbers of dwellings they need to provide funding through the levy, or whatever quid pro quo promised by the developer, to deliver infrastructure.	
2.21	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6146	Objecting	The housing land supply is continuously monitoredIs this also in relation to the requirement and location of land for business need?	
2.22	665473	Dr Richard Norman		529	Objecting	There is no good case for these targets, which are incompatible with other commitments in the Plan. There is no evidence that development at this level will create more jobs.	A housing target of between 500 and 600 a year would be sufficient to meet demand and predicted employment levels. On the evidence of the previous 20 years it would be realistically achievable, whereas a target of 15,600 is not. Between 500 and 600 a year would be in keeping with the wishes of local people as revealed by the Ipsos-Mori survey.
2.22	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	757	Objecting	We note that the planned supply is partially back-loaded to the last 3 quarters of the plan period. We see no reason why a general 5 year target of 3,900 homes should not be applied to each of the 4 phases. We note that the land supply consists of two elements: completions and unidentified sites. If future supply consists of unidentified sites, why is a lower 5 year housing land supply target for 2011-2016 appropriate? The Council cannot justify 3000 anymore than 4500 in the last 3 five yr phases	
2.22	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1208	Objecting	The proposed level of development, adding up to 15,600 new dwellings in the 20-year period 2011-2031, is not justified by projections for employment and the local economy. The Nathaniel Lichfield Report forecasts a 4.7% growth in employment, which would amount to about 4,500 new jobs in the period of the Plan. 15,600 new dwellings would represent three for every new job - far more than could conceivably be needed.	A target of between 500 and 600 new dwellings per year over the 20-year period would be consistent with the economic and employment projections for the period; would be realistic in the light of historic levels of about 545 per year; would be in keeping with local support for a target of 550 a year or lower; would require less building on greenfield sites and would create less traffic congestion; would coincide with the proposal in the Canterbury Society's Vision for Canterbury for a target of about 550 per year.
2.22	778931	Miss Gemma Avory	Water Resources Planner South East Water	1515	Objecting	Housing growth appears to be accelerated so we need to ensure we reflect your forecastw within our own in respect of our WRMP.	Ensure we are using the same forecasts in our plans

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.22	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1924	Objecting	Employment growth forecasts 4,500 new jobs. 15,600 new houses represent three for each job created - more than is needed. Development targets are also unrealistic. The past average of 545 pa, experienced sluggish sales and an assessment whether supply outstripped demand is needed. If a target of 780 pa is adopted, then, even if houses are not built, the excessive targets will blight large parts of the district. The proposals are also contrary to the wishes of local people as surveyed by Mori.	A target of between 500 and 600 new dwellings per year over the 20-year period · would be consistent with the economic and employment projections for the period; · would be realistic in the light of historic levels of about 545 per year; · would be in keeping with local support for a target of 550 a year or lower; · would require less building on greenfield sites and would create less traffic congestion; · would coincide with the proposal in the Canterbury Society's Vision for Canterbury for a target of about 550 per year.
2.22	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3198	Objecting	LANDRA disagree with the housing figures in table H1. The numbers are driven to provide funding and infrastructure. The figures is not supported by residents or population figures. This areas has been building above the national average rate and no inspector would find against the Council for building at residnts preferred rate of 510/yr or lower. Building at this rate would remove the need for south Canterbury. Swale and Hertfordshire have restricted numbers.	
2.22	479400	Dr Doreen Rosman		3303	Objecting	Development in Canterbury should be on a smaller scale so the character of the city is maintained and the problems identified. The Canterbury Society's Residents' Vision proposes an increase of 550 house units a year for the whole district, 100 of which would be in Canterbury. This is half the size of the Canterbury development proposed in the local plan in tune with local opinion.	
2.22	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3614	Objecting	We largely support the ideals expressed in this section, but believe that the actual proposals make them unrealisable without seriously damaging the City.	
2.22	408497	Mr C Mills		3794	Objecting	Para 2.22 - I fundamentally disagree with the housing figures in table HI. Development at such a rate is driven by the council desire to secure the numbers of dwellings they need to provide funding through the levy, or whatever quid pro quo promised by the developer, to deliver infrastructure.	
2.22	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4249	Objecting	The housing land requirement figures set out in the emerging Local Plan are not supported by the Council's own evidence base. The latter point to a requirement in excess of 1,000 dwellings per annum rather than the 840 per annum over the period 2016-2031. The corollary is that even if all of the key sites set out in the Local Plan come forward there will be insufficient land to meet district requirements.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.22	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4648	Objecting	Objects to the provision of 15600 new homes over the next 20 years because: it is not justified by employment projections; is unrealistic as only 545 was achieved in boom times; 780/yr is a 43% increase; excessive target will create a planning blight; contrary to wishes of local people shown in the Ipsos-Mori survey. Have a more realistic target of 550/yr which would be supported by local people and is consistent with economic projections.	
2.22	406848	Mr Graham Norton	Land and Planning Director Strategic Land Kent	5564	Objecting	NPPF promotes increased short term land supply to boost economic activity. Council's approach is too negative as only 3,000 are released in the 1/4 (2011-16) with 4,200 in the next 3 quarters. As supply in the past has sometimes been exceeded, there is no reason not to promote a short term supply of approximately 4,000 dwellings. Review phasing of land release to release more housing land in the short term so that the housing and economic benefits are not delayed.	review the phasing of land release so that more housing land is released in the short term.
2.22	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5837	Objecting	Discussion of a range of figures 'around' NLP's Scenario E, implies the precise housing figures are not set in stone; therefore the DLP objectives could be achieved with a lower average annual build. If the 840 per year suggested after 2016 were reduced to the 600 suggested for the first quinquennium, it would remove the need for 3,600 houses. And, the remaining provision could still provide the incentives for producing high tech jobs.	The proposed scale of development proposed should be rethought in the line of the absence of need and the other possibilities ignored.
2.22	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5879	Supporting	Support the target of 15,600 dwellings to 2031, which will assist the City in broadening and strengthening the local economy;	
2.23	770178	Mr Huw Jones	Agent Canterbury RFC	120	Supporting	Canterbury RFC fully supports proposed Strategic Allocation SP3a (Land at South Canterbury) and would be interested in discussing with the Local Authority and the developer the opportunity to assist in the continued management of the proposed sports facilities that will be provided.	Canterbury RFC wish to be formally acknowledged within the indicative Strategic Allocation layout (Appendix 1) as a key component of this site
2.23	117585	Cllr Nick Eden-Green		141	Objecting	Housing is proposed in the wrong places. Most housing should be located at Herne Bay, larger villages, then Whistable and Canterbury. Development should be located at Herne Bay and Hersden.	
2.23	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		498	Objecting	The transport infrastructure, existing or proposed cannot support the addition of 4000 houses in South Caterbury. The idea that we can double(?) the number of houses in South Canterbury without any change to the already overcrowded transport links is unacceptable. New Dover Road already has one of the best bus services in the area with 6 buses an hour in each direction so "improvements" to public transport are unlikely to make much difference. This also goes directly against the stated aims in SP	A significant reduction in scale, perhaps to 400 is required or a significant investment road improvements, both the A2 to A28 link road and improvements to Lower Bridge Street and Military Road and needed before any large scale development could be considered.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.23	665473	Dr Richard Norman		530	Objecting	I am objecting to the proposal for 4000 new dwellings in South Canterbury. This is incompatible with policies on traffic and on the environment elsewhere in the Plan. It would add substantially to congestion on roads into Canterbury centre which are already congested. It would destroy valuable agricultural land and have a detrimental effect on the environment.	If the overall housing target were between 500 and 600 new dwellings a year, this massive development in South Canterbury would not be needed.
2.23	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	764	Objecting	The Council is saying that its land supply consists of a) completions and b) unidentified sites. Paragraph 2.23 however, makes a number of strategic allocations. We assume that these strategic allocations do not benefit from planning permission.	It would be helpful to clarify this.
2.23	778353	Dr chris farnham		1003	Supporting	Ratling Farm House, Ratling Road, Aylesham, Canterbury, Kent, CT3 3HL 20.8.13 Dear Sir, My name is Dr Christopher Farnham and I am Consultant in Palliative Medicine. While I work in London during the week my home is in Ratling and I take a keen interest in local affairs. From the draft local plan I understand a large number of houses are planned to be built in a pristine tranquil landscape on good quality agricultural farmland on the northern side of Hersden. I	
2.23	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1209	Objecting	The proposed level of development, adding up to 15,600 new dwellings in the 20-year period 2011-2031, is not justified by projections for employment and the local economy. The Nathaniel Lichfield Report forecasts a 4.7% growth in employment, which would amount to about 4,500 new jobs in the period of the Plan. 15,600 new dwellings would represent three for every new job - far more than could conceivably be needed.	A target of between 500 and 600 new dwellings per year over the 20-year period would be consistent with the economic and employment projections for the period; would be realistic in the light of historic levels of about 545 per year; would be in keeping with local support for a target of 550 a year or lower; would require less building on greenfield sites and would create less traffic congestion; would coincide with the proposal in the Canterbury Society's Vision for Canterbury for a target of about 550 per year.
2.23	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1283	Objecting	Such a large development in south Canterbury the council will be destroying the one thing it professes to value, "that Canterbury is a pleasant place to live" It will impact on us all. We doubt that potential employers will even wish to come here, to congested roads, poor facilities, and an unhappy workforce.	1. We would wish to see more emphasis on working with the two Universities to build student accommodation, and release family homes for families 2. We would wish to see a full assessment of the potential contained within the Howe Barracks site. 3. We believe that more development should be considered in villages, both large and small. It is essential that families are not forced to leave their home villages because there is not sufficient affordable housing. Villages are also useful potential sites for developing small businesses. 4. Overall, reduce the number of houses to be built overall pa to between 500 and 600

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.23	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1284	Objecting	Such a large development in south Canterbury the council will be destroying the one thing it professes to value, "that Canterbury is a pleasant place to live" It will impact on us all. We doubt that potential employers will even wish to come here, to congested roads, poor facilities, and an unhappy workforce.	1. We would wish to see more emphasis on working with the two Universities to build student ccommodation, and release family homes for families 2. We would wish to see a full assessment of the potential contained within the Howe Barracks site. 3. We believe that more development should be considered in villages, both large and small. It is essential that families are not forced to leave their home villages because there is not sufficient affordable housing. Villages are also useful potential sites for developing small businesses. 4. Overall, reduce the number of houses to be built overall pa to between 500 and 600
2.23	772683	Mr Bruce Woodcock		1320	Objecting	4,000 new houses in Canterbury would greatly increase traffic congestion in the area. Most residents are strongly against the proposed number of new houses. Three times as many new houses are proposed as the growth in new jobs according to the Council's own report. This would therefore lead to a significant rise in unemployment in the area.	We would like a substantial reduction in the amount of new houses proposed in the plan, especially in the South Canterbury area.
2.23	778607	Mr Derek Thompson		1346	Objecting	Objection to development of Strode Farm and other areas in the Herne and Broomfield areas.	I am seeking an and to the proposed development.
2.23	265481	Mr Mike Farrell		1523	Objecting	Concerns about the council's proposal to allow planning for 15.600 new homes by 2031.The big new housing allocations amount to 9,916 dwellings of which South Canterbury, Herne Bay and Sturry/Broad Oak shoulder most of the burden. This also includes building on Greenfield site.Housing allocations in the above areas will cause chaos with regard to traffic congestion and other infrastructure areas such as education, healthcare, social services and welfare and caring for our increasing ageing	
2.23	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1632	Objecting	I object to the strategic allocation of 4000 in South Canterbury. Building at the existing rate, the residents preferred option, removes the need for these 4000+ dwelings in south Canterbury.	Remove the 4000 houses proposed in south Canterbury by listening to residents and following the output of the MORI poll.
2.23	779149	Wortham		1674	Objecting	The spread of built land proposed in South Canterbury will have a detrimental impact on agricultural land, traffic follow into City from south, access to stations from south and change nature of villages to south.	(1) Ensure as much accommodation is released from underutilised existing buildings before embarking on such a large development (2) Spread the development of this number of homes across the city rather than concentrating them in one area.
2.23	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1926	Objecting	The construction of 4000 houses in South Canterbury would be contrary with other Local Plan policies, increase traffic congestion, destroy agricultural land, erode the character of the city and impact on the local economy's key competitive advantages. There is also concern about the proposed closure of the Sturry Crossing and the re-routing of traffic as there is a danger this would simply move traffic congestion to locations further into Canterbury, in particular Sturry and Broad Oak Road.	If the overall development target for the district were reduced from the proposed 15,600 new dwellings to something closer to 10,000, the 4,000 new dwellings proposed for the South Canterbury site would not be needed, and the effect of HD6 policy would reduce the need even further. If some new development in the city is required, we suggest that the possibilities offered by the Howe Barracks site should be investigated more thoroughly than has so far been done in the draft Plan. A more detailed traffic impact study is required.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.23	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1973	Supporting	The identification of strategic locations for growth is supported. Hillreed Homes (part of the Persimmon Homes Group) control all of the land to the north of Hersden and therefore has the ability to masterplan and deliver a comprehensively planned housing led expansion of the settlement. This land assembly by Hillreed represents a unique opportunity for the village to regenerate which could not be delivered without the strategic scale of housing set out in the local plan.	
2.23	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1974	Supporting	The identification of strategic locations for growth is supported. Hillreed Homes (part of the Persimmon Homes Group) control all of the land to the north of Hersden and therefore has the ability to masterplan and deliver a comprehensively planned housing led expansion of the settlement. This land assembly by Hillreed represents a unique opportunity for the village to regenerate which could not be delivered without the strategic scale of housing set out in the local plan.	
2.23	779255		Brett Group	1998	Objecting	This representation is in two parts: 1. An objection to the Strategic Housing Allocation at South Canterbury on deliverability grounds 2. A case for the inclusion of land at Cockerling Road, in the ownership of the Brett Group as part of a replacement housing allocation.	The City Council is therefore requested to allocate the Cockerling Road site for housing either as a extension to the wider "New Thannington" project or as a freestanding development in conjunction with the adjacent Cockerling Farm.
2.23	779286	Mr Mark Aplin	Planning Policy Team Leader Shepway District Council	2087	Supporting	The South Canterbury proposal is near Shepway and close to the AONB and its setting. Site specific evidence is awaited on any cross-boundary issues arising from development proposals so to confirm as n/a to Shepway. It is anticipated that technical work would have screened for any material visual impact, and in particular that the Local Plan's traffic modelling incorporates the A2/A260/B2068 junction as route of national importance for managing international traffic via the Channel Tunnel.	
2.23	779299	Mr John Smith		2109	Objecting	The proposed Strode Park development is too large and will have a detrimental effect on the village of Herne, it will require expensive additional infrastructure and will absorb agricultural land that will be needed in the future to grow food.	Reduce the size of the proposed development and/or move some or all of it to a brown field site.
2.23	779307	Mr John Hickmott		2124	Objecting	I object to the proposed placement of 4000 new homes in South Canterbury, 1000 new homes in Broad Oak/Sturry. The placement of these developments on greenfield locations will irreversibly and negatively impact upon the global carbon cycle, air quality, road congestion and overall quality of life for residents. In particular the proposed South Canterbury development is contrary to Canterbury City Council's own agreement to protect such areas.	I urge Canterbury City Council to think again on scale, location and need in real terms for these schemes.
2.23	779399	Mr Mark Esdale		2168	Objecting	No building should take place on green field sites in the district.	Remove all greenfield sites from district plan.
2.23	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2290	Objecting	If the 4,000 buildings at South Canterbury were removed from the draft plan, the Canterbury District would still build at a rate of 580 dwellings each year on average. And making this up to a figure which would be within the range of the total that the NLP study recommends could be achieved by a number of additional small schemes.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.23	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2753	Objecting	With regard to the spatial distribution of housing throughout the district, Canterbury is recognised as being the principle settlement within the District and should be the focus for strategic allocations and housing delivery in the plan period, To identify a single strategic allocation at 'South Canterbury' effectively 'puts all their eggs in one basket', relying on a site that has not been demonstrated to be viable or deliverable. This strategy is unjustified.	
2.23	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3199	Objecting	Object to the land allocation for 4000 dwellings in South Canterbury. Revert to a build rate of 510. House building does not generate economic regeneration. Site at South Hersden and Howe Barracks provide greater opportunities. Loss of grade 1 agricultural land. Loss of green gap to Bridge. Increase traffic, noise and pollution. railway on opposite of the city. Will destroy the approaches to the city and lose views of the Cathedral. Unhappy about the Premier Inn and it does not bode well.	Revert to the existing building rate (510) which would remove the need for the south Canterbury allocation
2.23	479400	Dr Doreen Rosman		3302	Objecting	Objects to 4000 houses at south Canterbury because: the needed infrastructure is beyond what developers will provide; will exacerbate traffic problems; water supply and sewage issues; new houses exceed job creation; population increase of 20-25%; scale of development will put off families movign into the area; need to consider within current economic climate; won't provide affordable housing; development should be on a smaler scale; only built 100 new houses a year in Canterbury.	
2.23	408497	Mr C Mills		3795	Objecting	Para 2.23 - I objects to the land allocation for 4,000 dwellings in South Canterbury as shown in the table.	
2.23	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3837	Objecting	I am also very concerned about our environment and can see this vision as being detrimental to the area of Herne Bay. It is proposing a very large increase in population - commercial and retail facilities without full consideration to whether the present infrastructure could cope. Every additional building needs services and we already know that water is a particularly scares resource. We already have problems with waste water and and have suffered from flood and breakdown which wil get worse.	
2.23	780985	Ms Jennifer Keaveney		4285	Objecting	I object to the excessive number of proposed houses in South Canterbury (2.23)	
2.23	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4511	Objecting	An appropriate strategy for the plan would see development in the lower mid range equating to scenario B (600 houses/yr, 12000 across the life of the plan) creating 2500-3500 new jobs in total. This will have less environmental impact and be more sustainable as set out in NPPF. The sequential approach should be applied but with some changes as detailed. Rural allocations should accord with the settlement hierarchy. They have presented their calculations and proposed allocations.	Change whole plan strategy to scenario B - 600 housing units/yr.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.23	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4649	Objecting	Objects to the provision of 15600 new homes over the next 20 years because: it is not justified by employment projections; is unrealistic as only 545 was achieved in boom times; 780/yr is a 43% increase; excessive target will create a planning blight; contrary to wishes of local people shown in the Ipsos-Mori survey. Have a more realistic target of 550/yr which would be supported by local people and is consistent with economic projections.	
2.23	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5622	Supporting	Welcome the increased housing allocation in Canterbury. The city is a hub for business, visitors and higher education. It has some of the highest rates of visitors and students per head of population in the country. To support this the city's population needs to grow. The focus on urban areas maximises the potential for transport sustainability and infrastructure improvement and new economic opportunities. It will provide a range of housing options.	
2.23	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5802	Objecting	An objection is registered against the strategic allocations identified under Paragraph 2.23. As detailed earlier in these representations land at South Hersden should be listed as a priority for development early on in the plan period, and certainly well in advance of any allocation for the land North of Hersden. Accordingly land at South Hersden should be added to the list of Rural Sites to provide 600 dwellings, and land North of Hersden should be removed for the time being.	Land at South Hersden should be added to the list of Rural Sites to provide 600 dwellings, and land North of Hersden should be removed for the time being.
2.23	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5826	Objecting	An objection is registered against the strategic allocations identified under Paragraph 2.23. As detailed earlier in these representations land at South Hersden should be listed as a priority for development early on in the plan period, and certainly well in advance of any allocation for the land North of Hersden. Accordingly land at South Hersden should be added to the list of Rural Sites to provide 600 dwellings, and land North of Hersden should be removed for the time being.	Land at South Hersden should be added to the list of Rural Sites to provide 600 dwellings, and land North of Hersden should be removed for the time being.
2.23	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6029	Objecting	Concerned that all strategic allocation for new housing is being made on greenfield land when there are brownfield sites available in the District. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF advocates the use of brownfield land as a priority.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.23	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6143	Objecting	The extant plan allocated huge numbers and a large proportion of new units to Whitstable. There has not been an increase in employment opportunities and the Council has not shown that there has been or will. it is clear that commuting to jobs from but not to Whitstable has increased hugely in the last ten years as jobs growth is elsewhere. Allocations should be close to jobs growth. Extra houses do not generate jobs when road links are good as any economist can advise.	No strategic residential allocations in Whitstable should be made as there is no jobs growth. By contrast it may make sense to locate tertiary campus with accommodation (here or in Herne Bay) or community facilities such as a school given the unsustainable travel of children to a grammar school on the other side of Canterbury or Faversham. The local plan appears to have ignored those retiring. If there is a strategic development in Whitstable it should be for the huge demand for retirement accommodation which , on top of the demand for places near the sea from very well heeled Londoners, is driving house prices up faster than anywhere in the District. Any strategic development should be restricted to bungalows as any estate agent in Whitstable will tell the council that is for what the demand is away from the sea front vicinity . But it seems CCC have not looked at this in research. Central government is now about to swing policy in favour of bungalows. Like social housing , developer have to be forced to build them.'
2.23	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6149	Objecting	City Council has phased the land requirement into 5 year bands. How is this spread over the development sites? This looks like piecemeal development at all sites simultaneously. Is this the best way to build sustainable communities? Is the infrastructure deliverable in advance of increased traffic from the increased population? Affected communities need to see the phasing for their particular site. How does this relate to 3.6?	
2.23	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6438	Objecting	Object to S Canterbury. Unsustainable concentration of new houses will damage attractiveness of City; impact on peak time traffic congestion/air quality; Junction improvements to A2 could not cope; developer must pay for junction but will be to detriment of community provision; need for affordable housing yet area is usually very expensive; Impact on hospital, sewage and water resources; public opinion is against; loss of grade 1 land; impact on AHLV/WHS green gap; incompatible with HE1,HE2,HE3	Changes sought. More appropriate brownfield sites should be considered such as Howe Barracks, the site of the former colliery to the south of Hersden, or lower grade agricultural land such as at Yorklets. As previously stated in our answers to Question 4 above, if the overall development target for the district were reduced as we suggest new dwellings proposed for the South Canterbury site would not be needed.
2.23	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6764	Supporting	Any reduction in housing numbers will have a significant and adverse impact on the locational strategy of the Council for growth along the Sturry, Hersden and Herne Bay corridor. Expansion needs to occur primarily at Canterbury. Development of new hospital may provide new opportunities along with the employment development. If housing numbers reduced will need to e along Sturry/Herne Bay corridor, impacting on infrastructure. Will contest any reduction in housing at Canterbury.	
2.23	13835	Mr Michael Steed		6999	Objecting	Chapter 2, Housing Para 2.23: I object to two of the eight strategic allocations.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.24	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	157	Supporting	It is also suggested at para 2.24 of the draft Plan that the following should be considered: Simon Langton Girls School, Canterbury - 270 dwellings	
2.24	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	158	Supporting	It is also suggested at para 2.24 of the draft Plan that the following should be considered: St. Martin's Hospital, Canterbury - 200 dwellings	
2.24	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	159	Supporting	It is also suggested at para 2.24 of the draft Plan that the following should be considered: Land at Bullockstone Road, Herne Bay- 190 dwellings.	
2.24	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	160	Supporting	It is also suggested at para 2.24 of the draft Plan that the following should be considered: Land at Spires, Bredlands Lane, Hersden - 131 dwellings	
2.24	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	161	Supporting	It is also suggested at para 2.24 of the draft Plan that the following should be considered: Barham Court Farm, Church Lane, Barham - 25 dwellings.	
2.24	773749	Dr Roger Blackman		269	Objecting	I object strongly to the proposal to build 100 houses on Kingsmead Field. This is an important open green space in an area of Canterbury with very limited open space or outdoor facilities, and with minor improvements such as improved access would be even more useful to the community. Undoubtedly houses built in this prime location would be at the higher end of the market and therefore would do nothing to solve the shortage of affordable housing.	Cancel the plan to sell this site to property developers and allocate some funds to providing better access to the site, providing limited recreational facilities such as goal posts and up-keep including conservation of trees and river bank habitat for wild-life.
2.24	775240	M Jeffries		447	Objecting	Objects to the development of Kingsmead field for housing as there is not so much as a postage stamp of green space left. Challenges the legitimacy of the plan as the Definitive map shows no right of way over Kingsmead field or most of Canterbury even though there are many public rights of way shown on other maps, if the plan is based on the Definitive Map it is flawed.	Compare the Definitive Map of Kingsmead Field with other maps of the area which clearly show the public paths.
2.24	775813	Ms Catherine Smith		507	Objecting	Kingsmead field - Please please leave us this field, as you must have realized there is an enormous amount of support for keeping the field as public open space, to build on it would be a travesty and prove yet again that this council does NOT listen to the locals.	
2.24	665473	Dr Richard Norman		531	Objecting	I am objecting to the proposal for 100 new houses on Kingsmead Field, which is incompatible with the policies in the Plan for the protection of existing open space.	
2.24	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		956	Objecting	Paragraph 2.24: I object most strongly to Kingsmead Field, Canterbury being allocated for housing. This should be retained as Open Space for recreational use in this deprived part of the city, and it goes against the approach outlined in paragraph 1.45 on Open Space Strategy. It is also a flood plain, and therefore should not be built upon, as it would contravene draft policy CC4.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.24	778454	Mrs Karen Stone		1163	Supporting	I am writing in relation to the proposed housing development at Barham Court Farm,confirming support of the Council's decision to include the farm area in it's housing allocation. We strongly support the allocation of the site within the forthcoming Adopted Local Plan.	
2.24	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1210	Objecting	We object to the proposal to build 100 new dwellings on Kingsmead Field, Canterbury. The proposal is completely incompatible with the policies on open space in the draft Plan, in particular paragraphs 11.2-11.5, paragraphs 11.18 and 11.25 on the need for open space, paragraphs 11.58-11.59 on the protection of existing open space, and policy OS8.	The old coach park and the Serco site on Kingsmead Road could be used for development. The retention of Kingsmead Field as open space would be all the more essential if further development were to take place in the locality.
2.24	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1285	Objecting	The plan to develop this site is contrary to most of the council's open plan policies/strategies, and is against the expressed wish of a large number of residents. It falls within the zone 2 flood plain, and as a field which has not been previously developed should not be listed for development.	This site should be removed from the plan, and continue to an amenity open space serving two purposes. 1. A place of enjoyment for local residents, in particular catering for the huge increase of population in the Kingsmead area (over 1000 in the past decade and growing) 2. An essential component in flood prevention downstream of the Stour.
2.24	778563	Mrs Susan Langdown		1302	Objecting	Object to Kingsmead Field being included in the list of new housing allocations. It is currently designated as a playing field and is unsuitable for housing because of its importance as a flood plain (allocation contrary to para 7.28 and Policy CC of the draft Local Plan).	Kingsmead Field to be removed from this list of housing allocations
2.24	778387	Mr David Smith		1332	Objecting	I do not agree with Kingsmead Field being allocated for housing development.	Kingsmead Field should be retained as Amenity Greenspace.
2.24	778624	Dr Olaf Chitil		1352	Objecting	Housing should fill in existing gaps, not develop huge new sites, changing the cities.	
2.24	777517	Mr Keith Groombridge	Barham Court Farms	1406	Supporting	Welcome and support the new housing allocations including Barham Court Farm, which is available and deliverable early in the plan period.	
2.24	777842	Mrs Maria Thomas	Secretary Market Way Area Residents Association	1464	Objecting	The proposal for 100 houses on Kingsmead Field should be deleted and the field retained and enhanced as public open space. There are 2 adjoining brown field sites that can be used for housing development instead.	As contained in detailed comments above.
2.24	265481	Mr Mike Farrell		1528	Objecting	The big new housing allocations amount to 9,916 dwellings of which South Canterbury, Herne Bay and Sturry/Broad Oak shoulder most of the burden. This also includes building on Greenfield sites. It will cause traffic congestion and other infrastructure areas such as education, healthcare, social services and welfare and caring for our increasing ageing population will be severely affected should the plan go ahead.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.24	777842	Mrs Maria Thomas	Secretary Market Way Area Residents Association	1566	Objecting	The proposal to build 100 houses on Kingsmead Field should be deleted. The field should be retained and enhanced as public open space in accordance with local wishes. The adjoining two brownfield sites are suitable for the required housing development.	The proposal to build 100 houses on Kingsmead Field should be deleted. The field should be retained and enhanced as public open space in accordance with local wishes. The adjoining two brownfield sites are suitable for the required housing development.
2.24	778754	Mrs Patricia Smith		1585	Objecting	I believe building 25 new homes at Barham Court Farm would cause extra traffic congestion and water usage. In addition there is no proved local need. The SHLAA stated that this development would have significant negative effect on sustainable living and negative effects on the countryside (AONB), the use of land, biodiversity, the historic environment and flood risk zones 2 and 3".	Remove the development at Barham Court Farm from the list of other housing allocations.
2.24	779053		Brett Group	1628	Objecting	This representation seeks the allocation of land at Westbere Lakes outlined on the attached plan for housing purposes.	The inclusion of the site at Westbere Lakes, outlined in red on the attached plan, on the Proposals Map for a housing development of 18 dwellings is sought, together with the inclusion of the site in the list of allocated sites in paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan and in the Schedule of allocated sites in Appendix 2.
2.24	779053		Brett Group	1633	Objecting	Summary as previously submitted for same site - same objection	The inclusion of the site at Westbere Lakes, outlined in red on the attached plan, on the Proposals Map for a housing development of 18 dwellings is sought, together with the inclusion of the site in the list of allocated sites in paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan and in the Schedule of allocated sites in Appendix 2.
2.24	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1634	Objecting	No support by residents or local authority for building on Simon Langtons Girls school site.	Remove the site from the plan as the school will be redeveloped on the existing site.
2.24	778647	Linda & Arthur Davies		1663	Supporting	We are writing in relation to Barham Court Farm, to wholeheartedly support the Council's decision to include the farm as a housing allocation. The inclusion of the housing will have numerous benefits including social, economic, environmental and most of all a huge benefit to the community.	
2.24	779362	Ms Appleton		2117	Objecting	Kingsmead Field should not be allocated for new housing development. It is the only playing field available to the local community, there has been inadequate consultation, and the local infrastructure cannot support housing here. There are alternative brownfield sites available if a housing allocation must be made in this area.	Remove Kingsmead Field from the sites listed for new housing allocations.
2.24	779091	Alan & Maria Thomas		2450	Objecting	Object to the allocation of Kingsmead Field for housing. A public consultation highlighted retention, preservation and enhancement of open space in the regeneration area as a priority; the council pledged to protect existing open space in its Corporate Plan; the field has become even more valuable with the surrounding land already developed for housing; and further development would increase traffic and pollution. Opposed to green space being used when brownfield alternatives lie adjacent.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.24	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2573	Objecting	I object to the inclusion of Simon Langton Girls school site in the Draft Local Plan.	
2.24	779694	Sian Pettman	Save Kingsmead Field Campaign	2974	Objecting	Kingsmead Field should not be allocated for housing for the following reasons: protecting flood plains; importance of open space for disadvantaged communities; importance of open space for ecosystems;strategic location of Kingsmead Field as open space; incompatibility with the Corporate Plan and the Council's commitment to protect existing open space; contrary to NPPF; gaps in open space provision.	Kingsmead Field should not be allocated for housing.
2.24	780329	Brigitte Sharp		3098	Objecting	Objects to Para 2.24 allocating kingsmead field for 100 houses, because: it is contrary to Council's policies OS8, OS11 and CC5 relating to the refusing development that will involve the loss of open space, protection of open space and no development allowed in the flood zone. Put peoples well being before financial benefit and protect the green areas of Canterbury for future generations.	
2.24	780274	Mr Adrian Hudson		3100	Objecting	Objects to Para 2.24 allocating kingsmead field for 100 houses, because: it is contrary to Council's policies OS8, OS11 and CC5 relating to the refusing development that will involve the loss of open space, protection of open space and no development allowed in the flood zone.	
2.24	780324	Mr Chris Hunt		3105	Objecting	Objects to Para 2.24 allocating kingsmead field for housing, because: of the impact on available green open space, which is well used and could be made more valuable by the provision of facilities; it is contrary to Council's policies OS8, OS11 and CC5 relating to the refusing development that will involve the loss of open space, protection of open space and no development allowed in the flood zone.	
2.24	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3202	Objecting	Object to allocation of site for Simon Langton Girls School it is not supported by most residents and stakeholder and is unlikely to proceed. Has been included at behest of developer. Public statements by the head have made it clear that the existing site will be redeveloped. remove site from plan.	LANRA requests that this site is removed from the plan.
2.24	780333	Mr Anthony Epps		3271	Objecting	I strongly oppose the proposal to develop Kingsmead Field for residential housing & I object to the inclusion of Kingsmead Field in Para. 2.24 of the draft Local Plan. Kingsmead Field has been used by my family for recreation over the last 30 years since we moved to this part of Canterbury.This open green space near the City Centre is the essential lung area for the health & well being of existing local residents.	Kingsmead Field must be kept.
2.24	780373	Mr Terry Fulton		3300	Objecting	My objection is that residential development on Kingsmead Field is contrary to the Council's own policies. Paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan allocates Kingsmead Field for development (100 houses).	
2.24	780446	Mr Michael Pocock		3315	Objecting	I object to the inclusion of Kingsmead Field in Paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan. This is contrary to the Council's own Policies OS8, OS11 and CC5.	
2.24	780487	Ms Melanie Hillier		3358	Objecting	As a resident of Canterbury, strenuously object to Paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan. I refer to the paragraph which allocates Kingsmead Field for housing.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.24	776445	Dr Grainne Evans		3375	Objecting	We would like to add to our earlier comments in that we absolutely object to the inclusion of Kingsmead Field in PARA;2.24 as the site for development of 100 houses. This is contrary to all that has been proposed about preservation of open green space, and flies in the face of local democracy, given the large number of objections to this proposal.	
2.24	780768	Dr W G Le-Las	Researcher in Environmental Law & Policy Le-Las Associates	3435	Objecting	If a hundred houses are built on Kingsmead Field, the new residents will just add to the demand for play-space. In the 2006 Local Plan the need to protect Kingsmead Field was recognised in Policies OS8 & OS11. Furthermore the area is classified by the Environment Agency as being within Flood Zone 2.	
2.24	780803	Mr & Mrs T Coleman		3489	Objecting	We wish to register our objection to the proposals to build vast amounts of housing etc in the area of Herne and Herne Bay.	
2.24	780649	Mr Nick Sankey		3508	Objecting	Paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan allocates Kingsmead Field for the construction of 100 houses. This is contrary to your own policy of refusing 'all development which would involve the loss of open spaces and play areas within residential areas' (policy OS8). It is also contrary to your expressed commitment not to allow new development in areas at risk of flooding (policy CC5).	
2.24	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3562	Objecting	I wish to object to the housing allocation for land at Bullockstone Road (190). The scale of development in Herne & Herne Bay will totally surround the parish of Herne and Broomfield almost doubling its size.	
2.24	773749	Dr Roger Blackman		3577	Objecting	Object to development proposals for Kingsmead Fields because it is valued open space; its inclusion is contrary to the wishes of local residents; and it is at variance with policies OS8 and OS11.	
2.24	780496	Dr Edward Asquith		3727	Objecting	Object to development proposals for Kingsmead Fields because it provides; an important space for a disadvantaged community; protection of flood plains; an important space for valuable eco-systems services; and an open space close to the city centre. In addition, development for housing would be incompatible with the Corporate Plan, and the Council's commitment to protecting an existing open space.	
2.24	408497	Mr C Mills		3796	Objecting	Simon Langton's Girls School site is not supported by a vast majority of residents and recent developments make it unlikely that it could proceed as a potential development site.	I request that the Simon Langton Girls site allocation is removed from the plan.
2.24	780518	Mr Ken Fox & Family		3797	Objecting	Object to development proposals for Kingsmead Fields. It would be much better for the residents, the city and the environment if the draft Local Plan designated Kingsmead Field as a Local Green Space.	Designate Kingsmead Fields as Open Space
2.24	404737	Mr Richard Guest		3832	Objecting	Para 2.24 I object to the inclusion of Simon Langton Girls school site in the Draft Local Plan.	
2.24	780995	Mr Dave Colthurst		4073	Objecting	The proposed re-location of the Girls' Langton is a particularly stupid proposal since County have repeatedly and forcefully stated that they will not fund the extra £12-15 million required to build this school after the current site is sold.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.24	780973	Aya Mouri		4216	Objecting	Paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan allocates Kingsmead Field for the development of housing. I object to the inclusion of Kingsmead Field in this paragraph, because of the impact this would have on the availability of green open space in the area - space which is well used by the community and visitors, and which could be made even more valuable to the city through the sensitive development of amenities and recreational facilities.	
2.24	780985	Ms Jennifer Keaveney		4286	Objecting	I object to the proposal for a development of 100 houses on Kingsmead Field (2.24) which should be retained as green space under the Open Space Quality Standard and OS8 noted above.	
2.24	781064	Mr Richard Grayson		4345	Objecting	I object to the inclusion of Kingsmead Field in the Housing Development proposed Housing Allocations section. The Environment Agency has classified Kingsmead Field as Zone 2 ie within an 'Area at Risk of Flooding and development should not be permitted unless an exceptional justification can be demonstrated.	
2.24	781257	Mr Derek Butler		4469	Objecting	I write to object most strongly to the proposal to include the development of the Kingsmead Field in the above and the subsequent loss of an important open space. (Paragraph 2.24 refers).	
2.24	779927	Mr R W Hughes		4595	Supporting	We know new houses have to be built, but not before the infrastructure has been put in place, also why are buildings that are empty not being utilised for new property's for example the old spires school	
2.24	781398	Mr John Anderson		4597	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Kingsmead Fields as it is contrary to para 11.38 and policy OS12, it is an amenity in an area with few open spaces and if developed would create additional traffic on Canterbury's ring road. The Serco depot and the former coach park are referred to as having the potential for 'limited' housing but do not appear in the new housing target. These should be able to provide the same level of housing as would Kingsmead Field without the loss of green space.	The housing potential of the land occupied by Serco and former coach park should form part of the housing target.
2.24	781043	Ms Daphne Iles		4642	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Court Farm in Barham because it is of an inappropriate scale for its setting in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and proximity to a listed building. The proposals as it stands does not fulfill the need 'safeguard or strenthern tranquility, features and patterns that contribute to the landscape, character and local distinctiveness of the area'. Increased traffic and noise would also have a detrimental impact on the area as well as Church Lane.	
2.24	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4650	Objecting	Objects to allocation of Kingsmead field for housing, because: is incompatible with open spaces policies in the plan (ie OS8); failed to take into account the cumulative effect of development in the flood plain, it is one of the last spaces able to absorb water int he floodplain. Use the Old coach park and Serco site for development. Make sure development is of a high quality.	The old coach park and the Serco site on Kingsmead Road could be used for development. Retain Kingsmead Field as open space. · Development should be of considerably higher quality than the developments on the Telephone House and Tannery sites.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.24	781732	Mr Simon Pettman		4760	Objecting	Objects to allocation of Kingsmead field for houses, because: incompatible with plan policies that state a shortage of open spaces and that existing spaces should be protected (OS8/ 11.58). Remove from allocation list in 2.24 and allocate old coach park and Serco site instead.	Kingsmead Field should be removed from paragraph 2.24 and the housing allocation should be transferred to the two neighbouring brownfield sites (old coach park and the SERCO depot).
2.24	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4762	Objecting	These site need to be subject to the considerations as the strategic sites considered above.	
2.24	781637	Mr Brendan Power		4789	Objecting	Object to allocation of Kingsmead Field for Housing because: it is contrary to local plan policies OS1, OS8, OS11, CC5 and para's 11.4-4, 11.10, 11.16, 11.18, 11.2411.29, 11.58-59 relating to protection and improvement of open space, improved access and distribution and filling gaps in open spaces, providing for disadvantaged communities and ecosystems, incompatible with NPPF. Meets criteria for Local Green space should designate as such.	Designate Kingsmead Field as a Local Green Space (as it fulfils criteria) rather than allocating for house-building.
2.24	781595	Ms Laura Jowers		4790	Objecting	Object to allocation of Kingsmead Field for Housing because: it is contrary to local plan policies OS1, OS8, OS11, CC5 and para's 11.4-4, 11.10, 11.16, 11.18, 11.2411.29, 11.58-59 relating to protection and improvement of open space, improved access and distribution and filling gaps in open spaces, providing for disadvantaged communities and ecosystems, incompatible with NPPF. Meets criteria for Local Green space should designate as such.	Designate Kingsmead Field as a Local Green Space (as it fulfils criteria) rather than allocating for house-building.
2.24	781400	Charlie Mount		4897	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Kingsmead Field because it would result in the loss of greenfield land - when there is brownfield alternative (former coach park and Serco) lying adjacent, it is contrary to open space policies OS8 and OS11, it forms an important part of the local habitat and is in the Environmental Agencies At Risk of Flooding Zone 2 and would therefore also be contrary to policy CC5.	Remove Kingsmead Field from Paragraph 2.24
2.24	781045	Mr Barry Iles		4909	Objecting	Object to proposals for 25 houses at Barham Court Farm as it would be contrary to the aims in the Local Plan Forward, paragraph 10.9 and policy LB1, which weigh heavily on conserving landscape and scenic beauty in the Kent Downs AONB. The SHLAA assessment highlights 'existing policy objections' against the site which is also in the Barham Conservation Area. Development would also have an adverse affect on residents due to increased noise and traffic, as well as the diminution of the village.	
2.24	557251	Mr Simon Cavalier		4972	Objecting	I note that in section 2.24 of the draft, that the site at Barham Court Farm has been allocated for approved building development €" 25 dwellings. I believe that the site is currently considered outside the confines of the village and yet it has been included in the development of the village.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.24	782035	Ms Joyce Epps		4975	Objecting	Object to dvlpment of Kingsmead Field. Contrary to draft policies OS8, OS11and CC5. It is in a flood plain; the open space is important for disadvantaged communities and ecosystem services; dvlpment would lead to an imbalance in the open space distribution in Northgate. It is incompatable with the Corporate Plan, the Council commitment to protect existing open space, and the NPPF. The field could help meet gaps in sports pitch provision. OS1 conditions for loss of playing fields are not met.	
2.24	407256	Mr Paul Mansfield	Mansfield Farms	5034	Objecting	We object to the omission of SHLAA submission ref 174, land at Goose Farm, Broad Oak, from the list of sites for residential development at para 2.24.	Add land at Goose Farm, Broad Oak as a site for residential development (14-24 dwellings) at para 2.24
2.24	758936	Mr Mike Walling	Chair Ethnic Minority Independant Council	5053	Objecting	Kingsmead Field, Canterbury must not be built on but retained as a public Open Space for recreational use. It is much loved and used, set in a deprived area of the city and admirably meets all the objectives of 11.2 -11.5 in the Plan for Open Space.	Kingsmead Field, Canterbury must not be built on but retained as a public Open Space for recreational use. There are nearby brownfield sites on Kingsmead Road: the former coach park and the SERCO yard which could be used for housing.
2.24	406381	Ms Julia Gavriel		5209	Objecting	Object to allocation of Kingsmead field for housing because: the few houses will have a large impact on local people; it is the only open space within walking distance for a large number of families; there is no road infrastructure for more traffic; goes against local plan policies OS8, OS11 and CC5 relating to the protection and retention of open space and not building in flood plains.	
2.24	784589	Huei-Rong Wang		5300	Objecting	We object to the inclusion of Kingsmead Field in this paragraph Paragraph 2.24. A key reason on which we object is that residential development on Kingsmead Field is contrary to the Council's own policies, as stated in the draft Local Plan, namely Policy OS8, Policy OS11 and Policy CC5. The houses allocated in paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan for Kingsmead Field could be re-assigned to other sites at Kingsmead.	To stop closure of Kingsmead Field and prevent building houses and leave it as open space as is for residents use.
2.24	784598	V Pamnani		5305	Objecting	We object to the inclusion of Kingsmead Field in this paragraph Paragraph 2.24. A key reason on which we object is that residential development on Kingsmead Field is contrary to the Council's own policies, as stated in the draft Local Plan, namely Policy OS8, Policy OS11 and Policy CC5. The houses allocated in paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan for Kingsmead Field could be re-assigned to other sites at Kingsmead.	To stop closure of Kingsmead Field and prevent building houses and leave it as open space as is for residents use.
2.24	781557	Mrs Crux		5308	Objecting	I object to the inclusion of Kingsmead field as a housing objection in paragraph 2.24. It is contrary to the Council's own policies as stated in draft local plan - policies OS8, OS11 and CC5. please take these comments into consideration. I believe thaqt Canterbury needs green space particularly in this area where there is a high level of traffic. Space is necessary for the menal wellbeing of residents, the enjoyments of families and wildlife.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.24	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5367	Objecting	Site survey identified insufficient sewerage capacity in the network to accommodate increased demand from: Simon Langton Girls School Canterbury St Martin's Hospital Canterbury Kingsmead Field Canterbury Land at Bullockstone Road Herne Bay Land at Spires Bredlands Lane, Hersden Development should connect instead to the nearest point of capacity and any new infrastructure provided. Amend as outlined.	Include the following in each of the site specific policies: Provide a connection to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by Southern Water.
2.24	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5371	Objecting	Sewerage infrastructure crosses: St Martin's Hospital Canterbury Kingsmead Field, Canterbury Land at Bullockstone Road, Herne Bay Barham Court Farm, Barham This should not be built on a 6-13m easement is required. Development layout should take account of this. Any diversion will be at the developers cost. Amend as outlined	Site specific policies should include: Development proposals will be permitted provided existing underground water mains and sewers on site are protected, or appropriate arrangements are made for their diversion.
2.24	784587	Mrs M Mount		5414	Objecting	We object to the omission of land east of Bramley Gardens, Broomfield, Herne Bay, as an allocation for new residential development. The site is considered to be in a sustainable location, with good public transport services, and local services within walking distance. The site is capable of accommodating up to 120 dwellings, and thus contributing to the overall housing land requirement of the district.	Include land as allocation for up to 120 new dwellings in Schedule at Paragraph 2.24.
2.24	515026	Mr Piers Hammond	Halsion Ltd	5790	Objecting	Land at Bakers Lane, Chartham - Proposal to allocate the site for residential development - follows and earlier representation made under ref SHLAA 185. It is surrounded by development on 3 sides and is relatively secluded and self-contained. here are no sites in the village identified for further development to meet the need for expansion and growth. The site could deliver a mix of market and affordable housing which would assist in that growth and help to meet local needs.	We request the Council to include the land as a housing allocation for 10 residential units under paragraph 2.24.
2.24	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5942	Objecting	The Simon Langton Girls School Canterbury should be joined in as part of the Land at South Canterbury strategic allocation with which it has a close relationship in terms of the co-ordination and integration of development. There is no reasoning or justification given for having it as a separate allocation and it is included as part of the Strategic Development Site on the indicative layout for South Canterbury at APPENDIX 1 of the POCDLP.	The Simon Langton Girls School Canterbury should be joined in as part of the Land at South Canterbury strategic allocation
2.24	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	6002	Objecting	We object to the proposal to build 100 new dwellings on Kingsmead Field, Canterbury. The proposal is completely incompatible with the policies on open space in the draft Plan.	The old coach park and the Serco site on Kingsmead Road could and should be used for development. The retention of Kingsmead Field as open space would be all the more essential if further development were to take place in the locality.
2.24	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6057	Objecting	Oppose development on Kingsmead Field as this runs counter to the DLP's own statements on open space contained in Policy OS8, Policy OS11 and Policy CC5.	
2.24	785207	John & Victoria Quinton		6209	Objecting	We would like to express our opposition to the inclusion of Kingsmead Field in para 2.24 of the draft Local plan on the basis that this is already a heavily congested area traffic-wise and we believe the area should be preserved as a green site	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.24	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6278	Supporting	supporting Spires Academy residential allocation. School has been re-provided now and the old school site can be released. Propose for allocation to residential.	
2.24	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6281	Objecting	Object to the inclusion of Simon Lngton Girls' School as a residential allocation. KCC no longer wish for this site to be allocated for residential and should be removed in its entirety. Kcc does not now intend to develop the school site for residential. This site should be withdrawn from the housing site allocations.	This site should be withdrawn from the housing site allocations.
2.24	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6347	Objecting	I strongly object to the inclusion of Kingsmead Field in this paragraph. This allocation is in direct conflict with the Council's commitments to protect existing open space within the district and with the Council's commitments concerning flood plains eg policies OS8, OS11, para 11.4, para 11.5, para 11.24, para 11.58, policy CC5. Delete housing allocation from this site and allocate the 2 neighbouring brownfield sites SERCO depot and old Coach park.	Changes sought: Kingsmead Field should be removed from paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan and the housing allocation should be transferred to the two neighbouring brownfield sites (the old Coach Park and the Serco depot). According to the Kingsmead Development Brief of 2004, these two sites can be used for mixed purposes, including residential accommodation.
2.24	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6440	Objecting	Kingsmead Field, must be retained as a public Open Space for recreational use. It is much loved and used, set in a deprived area of the city and admirably meets all the objectives of 11.2 -11.5 for Open Space in the Plan. It is a flood plain skirted by a branch of the River Stour and building on it would be in breach of draft policy CC4. Paras 11.18 and 11.25 on the need for open space, paras 11.58-11.59 on the protection of existing open space, and policy OS8 argue against its development.	There are nearby brownfield sites on Kingsmead Road, the former coach park and the SERCO yard, which could be used for housing.
2.24	407243	Mr Keith Groombridge		6532	Supporting	Support for the allocation of Barham Court Farm which is consistent with the rural settlement hierarchy as Barham is a local centre. Proposals will provide open market and affordable housing. There are a number of studies that have been carried out Arboricultural survey, Ecological survey including bat survey, Structural survey of listed barn, drainage study, Phase 1 environmental surveys	
2.24	784489	Dr Robert Mayer		6955	Objecting	I am appalled at the short-term greed that is represented by Paragraph 2.24 of the plan to build 100 houses on the Kingsmead Field, which is a flood plain. It is in fact against your own Policy OS8, Policy OS11 and Policy CC5 flood zones. No houses at Kingsmead Field please.	
2.24	13835	Mr Michael Steed		7003	Objecting	I object to Kingsmead Field, Canterbury being allocated for housing. It should be retained as open space for recreational use. It is also in a flood plain, and therefore should not be built upon, as that would contravene draft policy CC4.	
2.25	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		3345	Supporting	Should not greater emphasis have been given to providing some of the 9,000 units on pdl such as the Howe Barracks and Council Office sites (paras 2.25 & 2.26) at this stage?	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.25	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4423	Objecting	The intention is that the surplus land at Howe Barracks will be sold in FY2014/2015, with the benefit of a planning consent. It is a deliverable within a single ownership and available next year.	
2.25	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4424	Objecting	The text identifies a small area of land in MOD ownership, which DIO promoted through the SHLAA process and Council land adjacent, the latter which may not be available during the plan period. DIO is not convinced on the need or desirability of this link road, as it appears potentially contradictory to the Strategy and other policies in the Plan. More detailed comments are made in the Transport section.	
2.25	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4763	Objecting	These site need to be subject to the considerations as the strategic sites considered above.	
2.25	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5406	Objecting	Additional Housing Units: We think that additional housing units from the following could be factored into the overall number required... b) Prison c) 700 empty homes (EDMO's) d) Thanington e) Wincheap f) Chartham (see below) g) Development/ densification of the older residential units on the UKC campus to free up property in the city. h) Densification of underused retail developments in E and W Canterbury i) Development of public and private car paring in/around city	
2.25	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5926	Supporting	KCC would welcome discussion about proposals for the existing council offices. This development has the potential to impact upon heritage assets such as direct impact resulting from construction activities and indirect impacts on the setting and character of neighbouring assets and places. The exceptional richness of historic environment would indicate a good potential for these allocation sites to impact upon presently unknown assets. Advice from CCC archaeological advisor should be sought.	
2.26	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		286	Objecting	The land at Howe Barracks should be considered now, as it could reduce the need for such a large development at the south Canterbury site	Current consideration of Howe Barracks site
2.26	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		499	Objecting	This land would seem to provide the best opportunity for new housing provision and for the infrastructure improvement needed for the other proposals therefore the whole plan makes no sense if this is not included. Development of this land should be detailed before any development South of Canterbury is considered.	Detailed proposals, including the number of houses that could be provided needs to be included in the plan.
2.26	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		3347	Supporting	Should not greater emphasis have been given to providing some of the 9,000 units on pdl such as the Howe Barracks and Council Office sites (paras 2.25 & 2.26) at this stage?	
2.26	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4425	Objecting	The need for the relief road appears to be contradictory to the strategy and other policies of the plan. DIO will seek to ensure that the traffic generated by the barracks development, is accommodated satisfactorily.	
2.27	766803	Miss K Dowle		127	Objecting	Canterbury is ahead of its targets for housing and has thousands of vacant properties.	There is no need for this development. Bring vacant properties back into market.
2.27	766802	Mr Zoe Dowle		131	Objecting	Canterbury is ahead of its targets for housing and has thousands of vacant properties.	There is no need for this development. Bring vacant properties back into market.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.27	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	767	Objecting	The Council may count net completions achieved since 2011 and deduct these from the overall target to derive its residual housing requirement. The table at paragraph 2.27 puts the total completions in 2011/12 as 624. The residual housing requirement is therefore 14,976 dwellings for the period 2012/2013 to 2031/32.	
2.27	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	768	Objecting	The Council will also need to be consistent in the use of calendar years or financial years. If the Council is measuring completions on the basis of financial reporting years then the end of the plan period will be 2031/32.	
2.27	777517	Mr Keith Groombridge	Barham Court Farms	1407	Objecting	We object to the small sites 'windfall' contribution being included in the housing land supply component.	Omit windfall small sites contribution which appears to include double counting. Alternatively provide compelling evidence of past and future supply.
2.27	265481	Mr Mike Farrell		1519	Objecting	I wish to make concerns the council's proposal to allow planning for 15,600 new homes by 2031. The big new housing allocations amount to 9,916 dwellings of which South Canterbury, Herne Bay and Sturry/Broad Oak shoulder most of the burden. This also includes building on Greenfield sites.	
2.27	778583	mr jonathan linnane		1636	Objecting	Strategic requirement of 15,600 houses not supported by NLP report or MORI poll results.	Revise strategic requirement downwards to reflect current building rates or lower as per residents wishes.
2.27	407926	Ms Frances Farrell		1641	Objecting	Rejection of additional 9,916 in the proposed 2013 local plan. 1) Forecast housing number requirements look to be wrong. (2) No electoral mandate to instigate such a large expansion program. (3) The infrastructure for such large scale development does not exist. (4) Using up Greenfield sites for housing development up and down the country will lead to over reliance on food from abroad with dire consequences for future UK generations. (5)	
2.27	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	1691	Objecting	We object to the provision made for 'over supply' housing for the reason set out in our report submitted separately. We also have concerns over the lack of contingency relating to the potential lack of allocated sites from coming forward. Many of the latter sites have been identified for many years and we question whether they are truly available. We believe that a 10% contingency to cover this item needs to be incorporated	The provision for 'over supply' should be omitted. 10% of the allocated site numbers needs to be taken off the figures
2.27	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1983	Objecting	The inclusion of a small site windfall in housing land supply calculations is not favoured by NPPF guidance and this approach is not consistent with the practice of other LPA's in the south east region.	A review of the small site contribution to future land supply.
2.27	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1985	Objecting	The inclusion of a small site windfall in housing land supply calculations is not favoured by NPPF guidance and this approach is not consistent with the practice of other LPA's in the south east region.	A review of the small site contribution to future land supply.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.27	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2246	Objecting	The proposed increase in housing provision from 10,200 in the period 2006 to 2026 to 15,600 for 2011 to 2031 is considered to be a reasonable response to the pressures facing the district. However, it is the case that the previous policy stance did not take into account deficits or surpluses from previous policy periods. There is thus no reason why there needs to be a change in position now. The net requirement of 15,600 dwellings in the period 2011 to 2031 should thus be adhered to.	
2.27	778333	Mr Ian Gregory		2595	Objecting	Object to the Council's decision to argue that the alleged "over-supply" that occurred in the period 2006-2011 be discounted from its requirement for the plan period. Such a stance is utter nonsense and has simply been adopted in order to reduce the need to allocate land in this local plan. Furthermore, given the fact that there are substantial outstanding needs at the start of the plan period, it is ridiculous for the Council to argue that it has over-supplied in the five years up to 2011.	The table in paragraph 2.27 therefore needs to be re-calculated in a realistic manner that could stand up to detailed scrutiny. If not, then a considerable amount of time will be taken up at the Local Plan Inquiry going through these figures in great detail. In this respect, the Council should adopt the approach of Maidstone BC, which has decided to work with landowners and developers in the lead-up to the publication of a draft local plan by going through housing land supply provisions in considerable detail. This has already resulted in a substantial narrowing of differences between both parties and, as is mutually accepted, will save considerable time at the Inquiry. This process constitutes good practice and is something that the City Council would do well to replicate.
2.27	778304	O W Presland		2603	Objecting	The housing supply calculations underpinning the plan are unsound. The total requirement of 15,600 dwellings over the plan period is reasonable. This reflects the option selected. However, the detailed calculations are considered unsound.	
2.27	778304	O W Presland		2609	Objecting	The overall requirement within the plan period is reasonable but the phasing and calculations shown in table H1 and the un-numbered table at 2.27 are not sound.	
2.27	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2792	Objecting	15,600 is too high, higher than that put forward by Amec (9,741), double predicted need in SE Plan, why the massive increase? The plan is not driven by housing need but by infrastructure need. The Entec report says that development at the coast does not score highly against economic objectives and is to the detriment of Canterbury. It may boost the coastal economy but rural communities should not lose their identity. Doesn't support planned developments.	
2.27	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2921	Objecting	We do have some concerns about the calculation of housing land supply as set out in the Table at paragraph 2.27. We would therefore contend that the level of historic delivery against targets developed in an entirely different policy context is irrelevant in determining current housing supply.	The figure of 1003 should not be discounted from the total supply and should be met through the allocation of additional land for housing over the period 2011-2026.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.27	780273	A D Linfoot		4112	Objecting	Planning consent and houses built are not the same thing i.e. unimplemented permissions. Developers only develop when they can make a profit and will develop greenfield rather than brownfield sites as they are easier eg those on good quality agricultural land. Although planning is blamed for housing shortage the economics of house building extend wider than this. High monthly rents in relation to income, mortgage rates are artificially depressed by Govt.	
2.27	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4250	Objecting	The evidence base does not support the figure of 1,226 given for existing sites with planning permission. An objective assessment of the suitability, availability and deliverability of these sites would produce a significantly lower figure. The small sites contribution at 2,204 is greatly inflated. It is wholly unrealistic to expect small sites contributions to continue at a level of 116 per annum.	
2.27	780986	Mr Peter Taylor-Gooby		4299	Objecting	In short it appears that the planning process has been misled by the desire to generate income to the Council through large-scale development. It is unlikely to succeed in this, is likely to damage further the charm and character of Canterbury through more congestion, poorer air and deteriorating environment, and perhaps show a net cost to the Council. A much smaller scale development process at the level of 100 to 150 dwellings a year is required.	
2.27	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4513	Objecting	An appropriate strategy for the plan would see development in the lower mid range equating to scenario B (600 houses/yr, 12000 across the life of the plan) creating 2500-3500 new jobs in total. This will have less environmental impact and be more sustainable as set out in NPPF. The sequential approach should be applied but with some changes as detailed. Rural allocations should accord with the settlement hierarchy. They have presented their calculations and proposed allocations.	Change whole plan strategy to scenario B - 600 housing units/yr.
2.27	781435	Ms Margaret Young		4694	Objecting	There are already hundreds of new student flats being built in the City and the Council refuses to count these towards the total number of new houses that are required. This effectively doubles the pressure on local infrastructure.	
2.27	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5023	Objecting	The Council's calculation of its housing land supply is 'Unsound '. The DLP fails to allocate sufficient sites to meet requirements. Revise Table 3. Make efficient use of sites, such as the Former Herne Bay Golf Club (400 to 600 dwellings). This will comply with sustainability provisions of the NPPF (para 7 & 58), as it would optimise the use of the Site, increase economic output, deliver additional units and social infrastructure without compromising local environment. Amend Table as outlined	2.27 Table changes - the strategic housing requirement should be seen as a minimum; remove the oversupply; correct the 5% buffer; remove small sites contributions;
2.27	406848	Mr Graham Norton	Land and Planning Director Strategic Land Kent	5576	Objecting	In order for the Council to meet its own objectives it is important that there should not be a focus on strategic sites alone and a reliance on windfalls to provide consumer choice. In short, the Plan should make a provision to allocate smaller sites and in this regard our site at Cockerling street is an ideal small site for release without harm to its environment on the edge of Canterbury City.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.27	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5803	Objecting	The significant increase in the proposed level of housing delivery from the SEP requirements is welcomed and as such is clear that the council's housing needs have completely reviewed. However there still appear to be some anomalies within these calculations when considered in the context of the supporting evidence. The fundamental point is that the Local Plan should demonstrate that they will meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area.	The Local Plan should demonstrate that they will meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area to be in accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF.
2.27	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5827	Objecting	The significant increase in the proposed level of housing delivery from the SEP requirements is welcomed and as such is clear that the council's housing needs have completely reviewed. However there still appear to be some anomalies within these calculations when considered in the context of the supporting evidence. The fundamental point is that the Local Plan should demonstrate that they will meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area.	The Local Plan should demonstrate that they will meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area to be in accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF.
2.27	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5944	Objecting	Consider table is over optimistic and not realistic on delivery, because: Oversupply 06-11 is not an appropriate element of supply as it was suppressed demand; existing allocation need to be more thoroughly examined in terms of deliverability and why they have not come forward; small sites figure is unduly optimistic due to changes in attitude to garden development and the need to retain employment sites.	
2.27	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6762	Objecting	Query elements in the table, including: The over provision figure for 2006-11, is balanced by undersupply for earlier plan periods; volume of houses with PP or allocated takes no account of some sites failing to come forward, need a 10% contingency; some sites have been allocated for years and not developed; the 5% excess/tolerance figure needs to be applied for whole plan period; address by increase housing supply by 2000 for plan period.	increase housing supply by 2000 for plan period.
2.28	776757	Mr Adrian Fox	Policy and Projects Manager Dover District Council	736	Objecting	In terms of the phasing of the housing development, you may wish to consider whether at the Submission stage you remove the detailed phasing information from the document as this is very time dependent and as such, may well alter.	In terms of the phasing of the housing development, you may wish to consider whether at the Submission stage you remove the detailed phasing information from the document.
2.28	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	769	Objecting	As strategic allocations tend to be more complex to deliver, and because it can take at least two years to secure an implementable planning consent one might question whether it is realistic to assume that all these site will produce units from 2015-16 onwards at the pace described. We also note that the Other New Allocations will not really begin to yield units until 2015-16. Whether these can make a material contribution to the housing land supply for the next five years is questionable.	We suggest for contingency (to ensure the plan is flexible) that the Council considers bringing forward other identified sites that are deliverable (available now, suitable location and achievable in the next five years). If the SHLAA has not identified any other deliverable sites other than those already included in the five year housing land supply, then we suggest that the Council reconsiders its assessment criteria to widen the parameters of the search for sites.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.28	778333	Mr Ian Gregory		2594	Objecting	An analysis of the schedule of allocations and permissions, as set out in Appendix 2, suggests that the Council has adopted an over-optimistic approach towards assessing its housing land supply. As can be seen from the information in that appendix, the Council is assuming that strategic allocations will come forward fairly quickly, despite the fact that such large developments tend to take several years before development actually takes place.	Rather than go into detail at this stage, it is proposed that the Council works with landowners and developers to assess the rates of forecast provision, as advocated in the Framework. The Council needs to properly assess its housing land supply and then identify in the local plan where all additional development will take place.
2.28	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2618	Objecting	On behalf of my clients, it is submitted that adopting a strategic requirement of 15,600 dwellings will not deliver sufficient dwelling completions to meet the level of need identified by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which concludes that affordable housing need is in excess of 1,000 dwellings per annum. Furthermore, the Local Authority have adopted an over optimistic contribution from existing allocations, existing sites with planning permissions and small sites contributions.	
2.28	417774	Tory Family		3191	Objecting	On behalf of my clients, it is submitted that adopting a strategic requirement of 15,600 dwellings will not deliver sufficient dwelling completions to meet the level of need identified by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which concludes that affordable housing need equates to 1,104 dwellings per annum. Furthermore, the Local Authority have adopted an over optimistic contribution from existing allocations, existing sites with planning permissions and small sites contributions.	
2.29	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	765	Objecting	The Council is saying that its land supply consists of a) completions and b) unidentified sites. Paragraph 2.23 however, makes a number of strategic allocations. We assume that these strategic allocations do not benefit from planning permission. It would be helpful to clarify this. Also it is unclear what status the Strategic allocations and Other New allocations enjoy as listed in Appendix 2.	
2.29	779243	Mr Alister Hume	Hume Planning Consultancy Limited	1986	Supporting	The identification of the strategic allocation at Hersden is supported together with the quantum of development, although it is contended that the delivery programme is too pessimistic.	
2.29	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4258	Objecting	The whole schedule will need to be reworked following the removal of undeliverable key sites eg South Canterbury and sites with planning permission that will not come forward for development during the plan period eg sites in employment use where there is no relocation strategy.	The whole schedule will need to be reworked following the removal of undeliverable key sites.
2.30	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		961	Objecting	Paragraph 2.30: I am concerned at the possibility of disposing of more city centre car parks for housing. The retail sector is a major component of Canterbury's economy. Congestion and the lack of convenient and inexpensive parking are already deterring some people from shopping in Canterbury. Reducing the number of car parks will only drive away more shoppers. The need to safeguard the city's strong retail offer is referred to in paragraph 4.6	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.30	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2250	Objecting	Care needs to be taken to only include 'deliverable' sites in the commitments. The example of including existing car parks where there is no current resolution to dispose should be reconsidered and dealt with as windfall development if such sites become available in the future.	
2.30	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6151	Objecting	Car parks allocated for housing.The removal of car parking could well encourage an economic shift away from Canterbury, to other areas with free, or cheaper, car parking. On-line trading will continue to grow a pace anyway diluting the need for face-to-face financial transactions, with serious implications for Canterbury's retail experience scenario.	
2.30	476233	Mrs Catherine Cantwell		6729	Supporting	No need to plan for a large population expansion. New housing proposals should be scaled down, and not be permitted on greenfield sites. New build should always be on brownfield sites, car parks might be acceptable.	New housing proposals should be scaled down, and should never be permitted on green field sites
2.31	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		500	Objecting	The proposal not support this type (student) of development on allocated housing sites seems counterproductive as there is no way of preventing the units, once completed being rented out to students.	Better planning of purpose built student accomodation is required.
2.31	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5669	Supporting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:€€ Possibility of building over Council car parks whilst retaining public parking below or at rear	
Policy HD1	765413	Mr John Rogerson		45	Objecting	Object to Simon Langton Girls School. The builder has offered to build a new school next to the Langton Boy's Grammar -planning gain (persuasion) in return for consent to build on the existing Girl's Grammar School site which has recently had a lot of rate payers money spent on it. Add to this all the other proposed houses, 4k in total, to be built in S Canterbury stretching to the Bridge by pass and this will result in a complete infrastructure breakdown.	Listen to your rate payer who fund the Council salaries for once and this crazy plan to move a school 2 kilometres.
Policy HD1	767055	Ms Julie Mecoli		95	Objecting	The proposed plan to build 4000 new homes at the end of Old and New Dover Road is of great concern and should not happen. Where is the convincing evidence new houses are actually needed in this location? At what point does the council actually take a stand and put forward a sustainable future for Canterbury,not one of constant expansion? If some houses are needed, there are new 'windfall' sites available at The Prison which should be exploited.	
Policy HD1	767055	Ms Julie Mecoli		96	Objecting	The proposed plan to build 4000 new homes at the end of Old and New Dover Road is of great concern and should not happen. Where is the convincing evidence new houses are actually needed in this location? At what point does the council actually take a stand and put forward a sustainable future for Canterbury,not one of constant expansion? If some houses are needed, there are new 'windfall' sites available. Why not consider building over car parks which are brownfield sites.	
Policy HD1	766797	Miss L Dowle		114	Objecting	Alternative and better placed existing brown field sites have not been included into the draft, ie, Chartham St Augustines	Include Chartham, St Augustines as a houings allocation
Policy HD1	766797	Miss L Dowle		116	Objecting	Alternative and better placed existing brown field sites have not been included into the draft,ie Canterbury Prison	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	164	Objecting	Other brown field Canterbury sites should be pursued and included, perhaps as windfall sites, namely former Canterbury Prison	
Policy HD1	408452	Mr & Mrs Raymond and Marion Bell		200	Objecting	The Plan completely ignores brownfield sites at the recently vacated Prison on the Littlebourne Rd. The Council has a duty to develop brownfield sites before using Grade 1 farmland.	
Policy HD1	773146	Dr Peter Thomas		266	Objecting	As an alternative to the proposed Strode Farm development, I suggest that consideration could be given to possible housing development in the following location: · Areas of idle land (nominally agricultural) between the A2990 and the railway.	
Policy HD1	773146	Dr Peter Thomas		267	Objecting	As an alternative to the proposed Strode Farm development, I suggest that consideration could be given to possible housing development in the following location: · Areas of waste or run-down agricultural land at Studd Hill in the so-called 'green gap' between Herne Bay and Whitstable.	
Policy HD1	772987	Mrs Doreen Louren		310	Supporting	Potential development opportunities for the St Martin's Hospital site	
Policy HD1	772987	Mrs Doreen Louren		311	Objecting	Potential development opportunities for the HM Prison site	
Policy HD1	775862	Mr Clive Flisher		335	Objecting	The policy is not thought through.	Amend as per my suggestion above, and see 2,72 etc.
Policy HD1	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		435	Supporting	Generally support Policy HD1 in particular the safeguarding of the allocated housing sites identified on the proposal map i.e. Site 7: Land north of Thanet way, Whitstable (Policy SP3g).	
Policy HD1	380253	Mr J McLoughlin		483	Objecting	Would like his small parcel of land included in the Broadoak allocation.	Extend the boundary of the Broadoak development to include his land.
Policy HD1	776445	Dr Grainne Evans		634	Objecting	Objects to the development proposals for Kingsmead Fields [for housing].	
Policy HD1	776113	Mr Steve Carr		682	Objecting	I would like to take this opportunity to register my clients interest for this land to be considered for future development. The land is approximately 18 acres in size and is located adjacent the junction of Bushy Hill Road with Island Road, opposite The Spires Academy. Access is via the gated entrance at this junction but there are other points of access just past the mower centre.	
Policy HD1	366511	Mr Tony Couperthwaite		807	Objecting	Object to development at South Canterbury. There are other alternatives including Wincheap Industrial Estate.	
Policy HD1	366511	Mr Tony Couperthwaite		809	Objecting	Object to development at South Canterbury. There are other alternatives, including Canterbury Prison.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		947	Objecting	There is a significant imbalance in the number of houses planned for Henre bay and the number of jobs the Council hopes will be created on the sites set aside for housing. Moreover, the town does not have enough secondary school places now. The plan will bring 4167 new homes. This suggests thousands of children. There is no land set aside for a new secondary school - only a small extension to Herne Bay High. The suggested land use in the plan is unbalanced and these sites should not be set aside	A clear employment creation strategy plus proper provision of school places
Policy HD1	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	1048	Objecting	The paperwork does not include the availability now of the Prison site for the future	
Policy HD1	778048	Mr Stuart Read		1082	Objecting	The Prison should be taken into full consideration in the draft Local Plan	
Policy HD1	776710	N & R.J Smith		1107	Objecting	Concern about the waste of resources, cost, and environmental damage involved in the proposed demolition of an existing school [Simon Langton Girls School] and the erection of a replacement,	
Policy HD1	777478	Mr John J Davis		1139	Objecting	Development should be confined primarily to Brown Field sites in this area such as the prison.	Development should be confined primarily to Brown Field sites in this area such as the prison.
Policy HD1	777478	Mr John J Davis		1146	Supporting	Development should be confined primarily to Brown Field sites in this area such as St Martin's hospital site.	
Policy HD1	777479	Ms Jennifer S Davis		1155	Objecting	Development should be confined primarily to Brown Field sites in this area such as the prison.	Development should be confined primarily to Brown Field sites in this area such as the prison.
Policy HD1	777479	Ms Jennifer S Davis		1157	Supporting	Development should be confined primarily to Brown Field sites in this area such as St Martin's hospital site.	
Policy HD1	777517	Mr Keith Groombridge	Barham Court Farms	1408	Objecting	The policy lacks any clear and effective delivery commitment	Add a new second paragraph to Policy HD1: The City Council will support proposals for development of all strategic and other new housing allocations as set out in paragraphs 2.23 and 2.24 and Appendix 2.
Policy HD1	778805	Mr Richard Marsh		1466	Objecting	Canterbury West Station car parks are already too small, so reducing car park spaces for short term building more flats that Canterbury doesn't need, will not help long term train use.	Dont sell of this land. Keep this as an overflow car park, and also use the Roper Road sites for additional car parking and north side access to the west station.
Policy HD1	421407	Ms Carol Mather		1495	Objecting	There is a local available brownfield site - Canterbury Prison. Why has consideration not been given to these site.	
Policy HD1	778478	Mr Paul Masters		1537	Objecting	Objects to 40 houses on the Station's Overflow Car Park and undeveloped land.	
Policy HD1	778484	Mr & Mrs Hodge		1542	Objecting	Objects to 40 houses on the Station's Overflow Car Park and undeveloped land.	
Policy HD1	778379	Mrs Sarah Obee		1548	Objecting	Objects to redevelopment of the Overflow Car Park, because: changes will discourage rail travellers, cause additional traffic chaos, there is not enough parking at present, the car parks are well used.	
Policy HD1	778943	Mrs P Fuller		1553	Objecting	Objects to 40 houses on the Station's Overflow Car Park and undeveloped land. More parking is needed, more residents will make more congestion.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		1621	Objecting	The reserve housing site on land adjoining Richmond Drive, Belting is part of the allocation provision set out in table paragraph 2.27. As such it should be made explicit that it is no longer subject to monitoring of housing provision before it can be released.	The following words should be added to policy HD1:- (The previous reserved housing site on land adjoining Richmond Drive, Belting will be treated as a firm allocation no longer subject to monitoring of housing provision.)
Policy HD1	773027	Ms Sofiah Garrard		1637	Objecting	I object to the outrageous proposal in the draft local plan to build 40 houses on the Canterbury station Road West existing overflow car park and adjoining underdeveloped land.	
Policy HD1	778191	Mr Jamie Paton		1639	Objecting	I object to the plan to develop houses on the station's existing overflow carpark and undeveloped land, and ask that the city safeguard the 2 sites in roper road currently owned by network rail for car parking/taxi ranks and access to canterbury west from the north.	
Policy HD1	262393	Mr Kevin Heath		1643	Objecting	Objects to exclusion of SHLAA 171 because: not greenfield as it was used as a water treatment filterbed with associated equipment; is next to recently constructed houses and 1950's Council houses; the tree line would provide a soft edge to countryside; access has good visibility along Station Rd; the village needs new houses to sustain its viability; difficult to say it does not lie within the village; a effective cul-de-sac could be designed in an attractive landscape; no impact on surrounds.	Verify SHLAA 171 for inclusion
Policy HD1	778739	Mr A Salvatori		1668	Objecting	The proposals map should identify my client's site at Rough Common Road for housing development	Residential allocation on the proposals map
Policy HD1	778740		Stour Valley Estates Ltd	1680	Objecting	The policy needs to identify the scale of development at local centres and be reworded to make sense and be compatible with other parts of the plan.	The policy needs to identify the scale of development at local centres and identify sites on the proposals map
Policy HD1	13742	Mr G Eaton	Clerk Chislet Parish Council	1697	Objecting	The Parish Council has been and is keen to progress an affordable housing scheme within the Parish but this has not been possible to date because of the lack of a suitable site. Recently the Parish Council has been advised that the Church Commissioners are willing to look at a site at Grove Ferry Hill for a mix of affordable and full value housing. Consequently the Parish Council is keen to see this potential site included within the Local Plan for affordable housing.	The Parish Council is keen to see a site at Grove Ferry Hill included within the Local Plan for affordable housing.
Policy HD1	778733		The John Graham Centre	1859	Objecting	Object to the failure of the proposals map to identify the Lucketts Farm site for housing development. It is needed for enabling development. The Local Plan is unsound as there is no certainty that development will come forward in the villages/local centres or that sites approved following adoption will contribute to a sustainable pattern of development. There needs to be certainty/allocations to ensure planning by appeal does not occur and for local people and for consultation.	Allocation of land at Lucketts Farm for residential development
Policy HD1	778738		ARJO Wiggins	1888	Objecting	The policy does not identify the sites at Charthem PAprers for development and the proposals map should be amended to show this. The allocation will meet the sequential test in that previously developed land will be used.	This site should be allocated for residential development
Policy HD1	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	1997	Objecting	Cross-referencing with policy SP4 needed	Cross-referencing with policy SP4 needed

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		2050	Objecting	Amendment is required to the boundary of the development opportunity site at Howe Barracks to avoid intrusion on the AHLV to the east of the line of the proposed new link road.	In proposals map inset 1: the extent of the development opportunity site at Howe Barracks should be corrected to exclude the triangular area shown to the east of the line of the proposed new link road and to the northwest of the boundary of the urban area.
Policy HD1	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		2051	Objecting	Proposed Barracks Link lacks robust evidence in support and needs to be subject to up to date review in the light of the Visum model, Transport Modelling Options Report, new prospect of availability of MOD land, success of Park and Ride, and continuing long term improbability of an eastern bypass, to determine whether it would be beneficial, and if so what would be the best alignment (both for traffic reasons and for best preservation of and least damage to the AHLV).	Insert "possible" before "new link road". After "from Chaucer Road" add "or from the A28" At the end, add "or contribute to the costs of an eastern bypass."
Policy HD1	778777	Mr Nick Waldron	The Waldron Family	2125	Objecting	Seek allocation of Representation site (Land at Great Bossingham Farm) under Draft Policy HD1 and in the Proposals Map. See attached statement.	Allocation of Representation Site (Land at Great Bossingham Farm) under HD1.
Policy HD1	779377	Mr John Ison		2147	Objecting	In Whitstable, the desperate need for more car parking provision should be met by using redundant industrial sites presently designated for housing and mixed development. Other sites should also be sought. Existing car parks should be protected and any new development should contain adequate off-street parking.	In Whitstable, the need for additional car parking provision should be met using redundant industrial sites designated for housing and mixed development. Other sites should also be sought. Existing car parks should be protected and any new development should contain adequate off-street parking.
Policy HD1	778716	Ms Sue Pratt		2173	Objecting	Kingsmead Field would be an excellent venue for good provision ie running track, exercise bars, bike/skate boards, etc.	
Policy HD1	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2196	Objecting	We object to the proposal to build 100 new dwellings on Kingsmead Field, Canterbury.	The old coach park and the Serco site on Kingsmead Road could be used for development. The retention of Kingsmead Field as open space would be all the more essential if further development were to take place in the locality.
Policy HD1	121447	K P Poole		2219	Objecting	Abandon the policy. Increase in use of Canterbury West Station makes necessary increased parking space off-road for (1) long stay train travellers, (2) for cars awaiting or dropping off travellers; for tickets to be bought and enquiries to be made, and (3) for taxis to wait. Fortunately the public car park adjacent to the station could be turned to these uses.	It is difficult to estimate just how many spaces are required for (1) but I suggest that at least 12 marked spaces are necessary for each of (2) and (3). I suspect that once these needs are met there will be little or no space available for continues use as a public car park, or for business development. If further provision for a public car park is considered necessary then it should be provided by conversion and up-grading of the existing overflow car park, rather than using that for housing development.
Policy HD1	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2253	Objecting	Under draft policy SP3, the proposed strategy involves a high proportion of development on strategic sites: some 9,000 on 8 strategic sites and a further 916 on 6 large sites. This position is highly likely to leave the plan severely exposed if a small number of allocations are compromised or delayed. This concentration inhibits both flexibility and competition. It also reduces the ability of the plan to provide for a contingent approach, all contrary to the NPPF	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2287	Objecting	The draft plan says Canterbury should provide locations for 42% of the new housing: a total for the City of 6,552 dwellings. This understates the impact of new housing on the City since a further 1,000 units are allocated to Sturry / Broad Oak, with 931 going to Hersden, all close to Canterbury. Housing in these two locations will impact on the City of Canterbury just as much as other locations on the edge of the City. These locations together mean that Canterbury bears the effect of over 50%.	
Policy HD1	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2294	Objecting	New housing within the range of the total that the NLP study recommends could be achieved by a number of additional small schemes. Additional building as well as acquiring existing housing at Howe Barracks, together with additional housing at Canterbury West Station would mean that housing at south Canterbury could be dropped.	Allocate land for additional housing at Station Road West.
Policy HD1	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2353	Objecting	It is our firm belief that the principles underpinning Dr. Sloman's Sustainable Transport Blueprint for Canterbury should also guide the transport, housing and infrastructure plans for all of the district. Without significant changes to the proposals in the draft local plan, car use and pollution will increase, health levels worsen and climate change will be exacerbated rather than mitigated. The draft plan as it now stands is not fit for purpose, not sustainable and it therefore cannot be sound.	We ask that the transport section along with the proposed developments be amended and or removed in order to achieve the necessary shift to sustainable transport modes that is an integral part of sustainable development.
Policy HD1	778803	Mr Robert Atkins		2403	Objecting	Policy HD1, Development Site CA481 in Appendix 2 - I understand that the effect of this policy will be to reduce the availability of car parking space at Canterbury West Station's overflow car park and in Station Road West. I also object to any proposal to use the station's existing overflow car park for housing, at least until substantially increased alternative car parking facilities for the station have been provided.	I ask the City Council to add to the Draft Local Plan an additional policy to safeguard the two sites in Roper Road opened by network rail for future use for car parking, a taxi rank and passenger access to Canterbury West Station from the northern side.
Policy HD1	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2419	Objecting	Current housing locations do not comply with the SEA Directive. Sustainable communities have to live within environmental limits. The Plan has little regard to environmental restraints as the proposals for huge growth in housing and population demonstrate. It would allow a substantial loss of the best farmland, would worsen air pollution and congestion, increase the district's carbon footprint, lead to greater water stress and destroy yet more biodiversity.	The Draft Plan is playing Russian Roulette with our future and must be thought out again in order to achieve sustainable development
Policy HD1	778868	Mr Tom Tomaszewski		2497	Objecting	I am generally opposed to any further building of properties anywhere unless as council housing, as part of a socialist programme of regeneration for individuals and families for whom the property market remains inaccessible. There is no shortage of property in this country, but an over-abundance of accommodation unaffordable to most people.	
Policy HD1	778884	Mr Ian Johnson		2588	Objecting	Why, oh why, is there not a plan for limited growth by use of brownfield sites? HM Prison is an obvious candidate.	
Policy HD1	778884	Mr Ian Johnson		2589	Objecting	Why, oh why, is there not a plan for limited growth by use of brownfield sites? The front of the Peugeot site in Rheims Way is an obvious candidate.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	778333	Mr Ian Gregory		2600	Objecting	It is surprising that, other than a few strategic allocations, no new smaller allocations are identified in the plan. Instead, the Council is simply hoping that the sort of sites on which it feels planning permission can come forward. The failure of the Council to both plan for its objectively assessed housing needs and then to identify precisely where those needs will be met, suggests that the plan could be found unsound, unless substantial changes are made.	In these circumstances, the Council may wish to halt its current process and issue a new call for sites. That would at least allow it to consider a range of possible sites and select the best of these. Whilst this would result in some delay, the plan would invariably become much more robust.
Policy HD1	778333	Mr Ian Gregory		2604	Objecting	It is surprising that, other than a few strategic allocations, no new, smaller allocations are identified in the plan. Instead, the Council is simply hoping that the sort of sites on which it feels it can grant planning permission come forward. The approach to the production of this Plan is therefore flawed.	Land at Gowan, Stodmarsh Road, Canterbury, should be allocated for residential development.
Policy HD1	778304	O W Presland		2613	Objecting	Our client's agent's submitted a proposal for a mixed use development on land at Chestfield in response to the core strategy preferred options consultation in 2010. The form of development set out in that submission is fully justified by the following analysis of the Local Plan. The Master Plan in the 2010 submission showing the form of development proposed is appended (Appendix 1). Recommendation - include site south of John Wilson Business Park for mixed use employment, leisure and housing.	Recommendation - include site south of John Wilson Business Park for mixed use employment, leisure and housing.
Policy HD1	779099	Ms Jennifer Lennard		2639	Supporting	I would like to support policy HD6.	
Policy HD1	779130	Mrs D Phippard		2721	Objecting	Raised concerns about a sewage spill. Objects to the huge housing developments in Herne Bay, Herne Village, Bullockstone Rd, Greenhill, Strode Farm and the golf club, because: some are on flood plain; no plans for sewage, the system is under strain now; planners should create a new village further inland with enough space for services, include Sturry or Canterbury.	create a new village further inland with enough space for services, at Sturry or Canterbury.
Policy HD1	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2761	Objecting	Development at New Thanington would deliver local facilities, new junction to the A2, 1,250 dwellings, employment, school and neighbourhood centre, park and ride and public open space. This can be accommodated without adverse impact upon the landscape setting and retains key views to and from Canterbury Cathedral. The proposed development can be accommodated on the highway network and can deliver infrastructure without subsidy. It would facilitate sustainable travel, and wincheap regeneration.	Allocate land at New Thanington
Policy HD1	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2794	Objecting	CCC has changed development allocations in the past.	
Policy HD1	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2872	Objecting	The parish council accepts the proposal for dwellings, Land at Bullockstone Road, but feels that the figure of 190 is overdevelopment and should be reduced slightly.	
Policy HD1	780332	Ms Lucinda Malster		2900	Supporting	Welcomes the decision not to consider the southern slopes of the University of Kent for a housing development of 200-300 houses as it would violate sustainability objectives.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3048	Objecting	Site that could have an impact on the Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites individually include:- St Martin's Hospital Canterbury (Stodmarsh) There is likely to be an in-combination impact on Chequers Wood & Old Park SSSI from St Martin's Hospital Canterbury with the strategic sites as it is only 457m away from the SSSI.	
Policy HD1	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3049	Objecting	Site that could have an impact on the Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites individually include:- Land at Bullockstone Road Herne Bay (Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay)	
Policy HD1	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3050	Objecting	Site that could have an impact on the Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites individually include:- Land At Spires Bredlands Lane Hersden (Stodmarsh)	
Policy HD1	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3053	Objecting	There are a number of sites that are either adjacent to or within close proximity to LWSs and therefore are likely to have an impact that will need to be considered. Of greatest concern are the housing developments located adjacent to AS27 Great Stour, Ashford to Fordwich especially when viewed in combination with the mixed development sites and the transport strategies. KingsMead Field Canterbury, White Horse Lane and the builder yard and scrap yard are adjacent to the river.	We welcome the safeguards within later policies however we would like to discuss the possibility of preparing a set of guidelines to ensure protection of the LWS from in Combination impacts from the above developments. Such guidance could then be incorporated into the relevant Policies. We would recommend that guidelines include:- No development within the boundaries of the LWS A buffer of at least 15m from the boundary of the LWS free from development. Management and monitoring of the river system.
Policy HD1	780210	Maria Diemling		3088	Objecting	I object the plans to use the Kingsmead field for residential building due to the importance of playing fields in the community, the importance of open space for disadvantaged communities (of which the Northgate ward is one), the importance of open space for ecosystem services and the importance of protecting flood plains. Please designate Kingsmead Field as a Local Green Space.	Please designate Kingsmead Field as a Local Green Space.
Policy HD1	780301	Ms Gemma Duckworth		3093	Objecting	Objects to the proposed development on Kingsmead field as it will adversely affect a much wider area in removing the only open green space in the area which is much used.	
Policy HD1	780298	Ms Sharon Patmore		3108	Objecting	Objects to allocation of kingsmead field for houses, because: it has been used for recreation for a long time; it suffers from flooding and traffic congestion; communities fair better with enough green spaces and natural habitats; it is contrary to Council's policies OS8, OS11 and CC5 relating to the refusing development that will involve the loss of open space, protection of open space and no development allowed in the flood zone.	
Policy HD1	780276	Mary & Terry Jewiss		3111	Objecting	Object to allocation of Kingsmead Field because: there is minimal recreation space and the small play area is used by teenagers; with high density housing on the Serco site as well play spaces are needed; it is the only place away from fumes and noise on this side of Canterbury; it is a flood risk area; how will the infrastructure cope with extra traffic and school places, the roads are already gridlock.	
Policy HD1	777509	Mrs Monica Blyth		3155	Objecting	The proposal for the development in Bullockstone Road should be reduced from 190 to 125.	The proposal for the development in Bullockstone Road should be reduced from 190 to 125.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	414960	Cllr Alex Perkins	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3176	Objecting	Support for the consideration of the old prison site.	
Policy HD1	417774	Tory Family		3194	Objecting	Additional allocations are required to meet housing needs. Land to the east of Hollow Lane is in a highly sustainable location, suitable for residential development and sustainability credential high (as stated by previous inspector). Transportation and ecology reports demonstrate the land is relatively unconstrained and can deliver housing in the plan period. The site is not dependent of off-side strategic infrastructure, does not require relocation of an existing use. It is available.	It is therefore requested that the emerging Local Plan be amended to identify land to the east of Hollow Lane as a residential allocation.
Policy HD1	780295	Mr Charles Gooderham		3205	Objecting	Lodge my objection to the proposed development of houses on the station's overflow car park and adjoining land	
Policy HD1	780292	Mrs Marianne Fearnside		3223	Supporting	I welcome the provisional decision not to consider the Southern Slopes as a potential site for housing development (200-300 houses) because this would dramatically violate Sustainability Objectives. Chaucer Fields are a beautiful and valuable local amenity and should be protected and kept for public use. They should be given Village Green status so that they can no longer be threatened with development..	
Policy HD1	772200	Solihin Garrard		3253	Objecting	Apart from any extension, the prison site as well as other brownfield sites ought to be drawn into this plan to respect the environment and the Canterbury population.	
Policy HD1	780442	Keat Farm		3307	Objecting	National policy requires a mix of housing to meet the needs of different groups including older people and people with disabilities and the identification of size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations. Park homes are a small but important part of the mix of housing especially in addressing the needs of some older people, including those with impaired mobility. However, they will not be delivered on sites allocated for general housing.	The text within paragraphs 2.1 through to 2.31 should be amended to acknowledge the need to plan for park homes as part of the mix of housing types and tenures to address local need and demand particularly from older people including those of impaired mobility. Our clients' site at Keat Farm (SHLAA ref 198) should be included within the local plan policy map and specifically for use for all-year residential park homes.
Policy HD1	780449	Daniel & Elizabeth Rikh		3327	Supporting	We approve of the decision not to consider housing development on the Southern slopes.	
Policy HD1	780486	Commerical Land		3357	Objecting	We would suggest that you reconsider the boundaries of this proposed strategic allocation SP3g to include my client's site. Development of this additional area would sit comfortably within both the existing urban area around Whitstable and also the proposed new residential development as part of the strategic allocation. (see attachments)	We would suggest that you reconsider the boundaries of this proposed strategic allocation SP3g to include my client's site. Development of this additional area would sit comfortably within both the existing urban area around Whitstable and also the proposed new residential development as part of the strategic allocation. (see attachments). Allocate my clients site for development as shown on the attachment.
Policy HD1	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3419	Objecting	Reference to the importance of retaining existing trees and planting new ones should be included in policy HD1 as applying to all housing developments.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3420	Objecting	Objects to the proposal to build 100 houses on Kingsmead Field. It is contrary to the Council's own policies of OS8, OS11 and CC5 relating to protection of open green space and play areas and no development in the flood zone.	
Policy HD1	121820	Mrs IVD Baker		3436	Objecting	Objects to allocation for housing on West Station overflow car park and adjacent land, because: essential for commuters on HS1, there is not enough Station parking already; the Council car park is needed for customers of local businesses; studies concluded 120 additional parks are required by 2014; parkings needs to be retain unless alternative parking is provided as per brief; no reference to commuter parking in plan; policy is unsound; include approved development brief text	Please modify Policy HD1 by including equivalent text to that in the Development Brief : 'The temporary commuter parking should remain until alternative provision, either in the decked car park on sites 2 and 3 or elsewhere in the regeneration zone, is made available.'
Policy HD1	780827	Mr M P J Baker		3440	Objecting	Objects to allocation for housing on West Station overflow car park and adjacent land, because: essential for commuters on HS1, there is not enough Station parking already; the Council car park is needed for customers of local businesses; studies concluded 120 additional parks are required by 2014; parkings needs to be retain unless alternative parking is provided as per brief; no reference to commuter parking in plan; policy is unsound; include approved development brief text	Please modify Policy HD1 by including equivalent text to that in the Development Brief : 'The temporary commuter parking should remain until alternative provision, either in the decked car park on sites 2 and 3 or elsewhere in the regeneration zone, is made available.'
Policy HD1	780828	Mr Jeremy D I Baker		3441	Objecting	Objects to allocation for housing on West Station overflow car park and adjacent land, because: essential for commuters on HS1, there is not enough Station parking already; the Council car park is needed for customers of local businesses; studies concluded 120 additional parks are required by 2014; parkings needs to be retain unless alternative parking is provided as per brief; no reference to commuter parking in plan; policy is unsound; include approved development brief text	Please modify Policy HD1 by including equivalent text to that in the Development Brief : 'The temporary commuter parking should remain until alternative provision, either in the decked car park on sites 2 and 3 or elsewhere in the regeneration zone, is made available.'
Policy HD1	121830	Mr MJR Baker		3442	Objecting	Objects to allocation for housing on West Station overflow car park and adjacent land, because: essential for commuters on HS1, there is not enough Station parking already; the Council car park is needed for customers of local businesses; studies concluded 120 additional parks are required by 2014; parkings needs to be retain unless alternative parking is provided as per brief; no reference to commuter parking in plan; policy is unsound; include approved development brief text	Please modify Policy HD1 by including equivalent text to that in the Development Brief : 'The temporary commuter parking should remain until alternative provision, either in the decked car park on sites 2 and 3 or elsewhere in the regeneration zone, is made available.'
Policy HD1	778675	mrs gwyneth linnane		3478	Objecting	I wish to make the following comments on the draft local plan. I live near Kingsmead field and use it regularly. Lots of families use it too. It would be a shame to lose this wonderful community resource. Please do not build on it.	
Policy HD1	780690	Ms Rosemary Cane		3520	Supporting	I strongly agree with the CCC provisional decision not to consider the Southern Slopes as a potential site for housing development, which would violate Sustainability Objectives.	
Policy HD1	407886	Mr J and P Booth		3532	Objecting	When there is concern at strategic level about the amount of food we have to import it is wrong to turn quality agricultural land over to housing. This is especially so when it appears that insufficient consideration has been given to utilising the former Prison site.	Consider allocating the former Prison site.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	780300	R & J Fullford		3557	Objecting	Protests in the strongest terms. The development will destroy the village environment. Concerned about: local schools are at capacity where are the additional children to be educated; traffic chaos; water supplies; flooding at Stode Farm, inadequate sewers and raw sewage flooding, local doctors surgeries at capacity. If development is necessary then it needs to be significantly reduced to be acceptable.	If development is necessary then it needs to be significantly reduced to be acceptable.
Policy HD1	780505	Dr Jeremy Kendall		3734	Supporting	Support the decision not to consider the Southern Slopes as a potential site for 200-300 new houses because it would violate the Council's Sustainability Objectives; and have 'major' negative effects on Canterbury's "countryside and historic environment"; and on local "geology and biodiversity".	
Policy HD1	408497	Mr C Mills		3736	Objecting	The council should exhaust all other areas first (even outside the district before touching farming land) Canterbury prison and many other possibilities should be used first.	
Policy HD1	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3767	Objecting	Two sites in the area which I am told were agreed in the last plan, but have not yet been developed - Bullockstone Road (and Greenhill) . Surely these sites should be the priority and no others should be considered until developed. If housing is so important and all that are built can be sold then the question has to be asked - 'Why has no developer taken on these two sites?' The simple answer is that they can not make a profit.	
Policy HD1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3852	Objecting	This Policy allocates existing housing allocations in the 2006 Local Plan, including mixed-use sites, as listed in Appendix 2, as well as the new sites proposed. For clarity, Policy HD1 needs to include a specific reference to Appendix 2 (with the exception of those allocated in the Herne Bay AAP €“ see our comments on Policy TCL10) as this is the only place that people can see where these sites are. See also Part 1 of our response for comments on proposed new housing sites.	
Policy HD1	779026	Ms Amanda Sparkes	Clerk Barham Parish Council	4200	Objecting	With regard to the housing allocation at Barham Court Farm its scale is against the stated wishes of the vast majority of the community. The proposed level of allocation, particularly in an AONB and in a Conservation Area, would be transformational to the village. It would have a detrimental impact on the community and character of Barham. It would have a negative effect on sustainable living and whilst Barham must be living and evolving it deserves to have its character and style retained.	
Policy HD1	780732	Mr Jonathan A Cane		4211	Supporting	€€ I strongly agree with the CCC provisional decision not to consider the Southern Slopes as a potential site for housing development, which would violate Sustainability Objectives. I hope that the Canterbury City Council planning department will prevent further development on this site which is of real landscape and environmental significance to the city of Canterbury.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	780973	Aya Mouri		4215	Objecting	Object to the proposed development of Kingsmead Field. I object because of the impact this would have on the availability of green open space in the area - space which is well used by the community and visitors, and which could be made even more valuable to the city through the sensitive development of amenities and recreational facilities. I particularly object on the grounds that residential development on Kingsmead Field is contrary to the Council's own policies: OS8, OS11 and CC5.	
Policy HD1	780980	Ms Cecilia Duggan		4232	Objecting	I am opposed to building on Kingsmead Field. This is a "visual and recreational amenity" to quote policy OS8 which should be preserved and developed in accordance with this policy. In addition Kingsmead Field is within Environment Agency Zone 2 and is prone to risk of flooding.	
Policy HD1	780980	Ms Cecilia Duggan		4233	Supporting	I support the idea of relocating Simon Langton Girls and using the land for housing	
Policy HD1	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4244	Objecting	Land at Cockerling Farm should be included as a free standing development or, included within a much larger urban extension. The site could deliver approximately 600 dwellings, and is preferable in landscape and transport terms to some of the other strategic allocations.	The land at Cockerling Farm should be included as a free standing development or, included within a much larger urban extension.
Policy HD1	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4259	Objecting	The owners of Cockerling Farm strongly support Pentland Homes' proposals in respect of New Thanington. The project is an exceptionally well thought out proposal for a sustainable urban extension capable of delivering over 2,000 new homes and mixed uses.	The owners of Cockerling Farm strongly support Pentland Homes' proposals in respect of New Thanington.
Policy HD1	780982	Mr John Hedington		4264	Objecting	Brown field sites and empty spaces elsewhere within the District should be fully exploited, particularly the old prison.	
Policy HD1	780965	Mrs D Jeffers		4326	Objecting	The spatial distribution of housing proposed is inappropriate and unsustainable, especially in respect of south Canterbury site for the following reasons: wrong location in the city; transport problems; won't deliver affordable housing where needed.	
Policy HD1	780968	Mr Simon Wall		4351	Objecting	Does Canterbury City Council still plan to build houses on Kingsmead Field? Surely the Local Plan makes such a proposal unnecessary.	Does Canterbury City Council still plan to build houses on Kingsmead Field? Surely the Local Plan makes such a proposal unnecessary.
Policy HD1	780971	Mr Tom Cane		4362	Supporting	I strongly agree with the CCC provisional decision not to consider the Southern Slopes as a potential site for housing development.	
Policy HD1	781154	Mr A R Blake		4381	Objecting	Could vacant brown field sites in Canterbury be used for houses e.g. the old Peugeot site, the old tannery building, Howe Barracks, the recently closed prison.	
Policy HD1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4414	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. comments on the sites proposed for inclusion in the Plan, in policies SP3a - h, HD1, EMP1, TCL7 and TCL10. As a general point, though, we find that the policy guidance on the proposed sites is lacking. In particular we consider that more supporting text is required to explain what is actually proposed for each site and how they will actually be developed. This should then be reflected in the individual policies themselves.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4419	Objecting	Object to allocation of: South Canterbury SP3a (PO4418) Land at Sturry/Broad Oak SP3b (PO4445) Hillborough Site SP3c (PO4446) Strode Farm SP3e Land north of Hersden SP3h Simon Langton Girls School (not now relocating)	Delete
Policy HD1	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4426	Objecting	DIO welcomes the inclusion of part of the Barracks site as a development opportunity site. However the boundary on the Proposals Map does not follow the submission site boundary. The landscape in the excluded area could be treated sensitively within the Barracks site development area. The Proposals Map should show the whole of the MOD land edged red on the submitted plan as a development site. The hatched land is considered suitable for development and should be included as part of the urban area	
Policy HD1	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4427	Objecting	DIO supports the inclusion of the majority of the Barracks site as a Development Opportunity Site, but as stated above believes the whole of the surplus MOD land at the Barracks should be included. The need for the link road to serve the Barracks development will be explored in the transport studies carried out in the preparation of the planning application.	
Policy HD1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4455	Supporting	Accept HD1 housing allocations of: Herne Bay Golf Club Land at Greenhill Thanet Way site, Whitstable St Martin's Hospital Land at Bullockstone Road Land at Spires White Horse Lane Roger Britton Carpets Kingsmead The Warehouse, Whitstable Harbour	
Policy HD1	779662	Mr Graham Kenmir		4475	Objecting	It is not clear that the plan has been justified as the most appropriate strategy considered against alternatives since these alternatives have not been spelt out. Why, for instance has the Cockering Farm area been rejected as an alternative site?	
Policy HD1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4482	Objecting	Accept allocation of site, provides an opportunity to meet the future needs of Herne Bay. Should include SHLAA sites 12 and 199, giving an extra 75 units. Also the access and traffic concerns will need to be resolved.	Include SHLAA sites 12 and 199 in allocation
Policy HD1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4487	Objecting	Object to development of Kingsmead field because: been used for recreation for 60 years; is in a flood plain, buildings will decrease absorption capacity; important open space for disadvantaged families; important open space for ecosystems; provides strategic open space in northgate ward; incompatible with corporate plan, NPPF and plan policies protecting open space; gaps in open space provision; an important playing field; put houses on brownfield sites; local green space designation applies	
Policy HD1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4488	Objecting	While Hersden could be expanded to provide community facilities, development should take place on the southern side of Hersden. They object to allocation for development on the northern side of Hersden. The southern side is previously developed land, a buffer/barrier could be provided to the SSSI, it will involve the loss of less agricultural land and maintain more of a green gap between Westbere and Hersden. Hersden be redesignated as a rural service centre. Allocate SHLAA 41 and 187, instead.	Delete allocation of north Hersden and allocated 800 units on SHLAA41 and SHLAA187 instead

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4489	Objecting	Object to allocation of site for 25 houses because: no information provided about the allocation; needs of rural communities not addressed; no community engagement; impacts on character of conservation area; SHLAA assessment says site should not be allocated and SA says it will have a major negative impact.	In consultation with parish council allocate for fewer houses.
Policy HD1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4493	Objecting	Object to the allocation of this site as proposed. Accept that the site provides opportunities for retail/leisure, believe that residential development will provide part of a mix of uses that comes forward. Plan states a residential element and was previously allocated for more residential development. Policy TCL7 should require an element of residential development to contribute towards the overall housing target, this will be a minimum of 200 units.	Policy TCL7 should specifically require an element of residential development as a contribution towards the overall housing target, and that the Policy should state that this will be a minimum of 200 units.
Policy HD1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4510	Objecting	An appropriate strategy for the plan would see development in the lower mid range equating to scenario B (600 houses/yr, 12000 across the life of the plan) creating 2500-3500 new jobs in total. This will have less environmental impact and be more sustainable as set out in NPPF. The sequential approach should be applied but with some changes as detailed. Rural allocations should accord with the settlement hierarchy. They have presented their calculations and proposed allocations.	Change whole plan strategy to scenario B - 600 housing units/yr.
Policy HD1	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	4552	Objecting	We OBJECT to the South Hersden site appearing as a provisional allocation in the Canterbury District Draft 2013 Local Plan and believe it should be confirmed as a formal site specific allocation forthwith - brownfield land; suitable for mixed-use; sustainable settlement; nearby employment opportunities; no loss of best and most versatile farmland.	The South Hersden site should be confirmed as a formal site specific allocation.
Policy HD1	781413	Dr Adam Bartley		4589	Supporting	Support for the non-allocation of the Southern Slopes for housing development	
Policy HD1	117526	Mr Robin Townsend		4620	Supporting	Support for barham Court Farm housing allocation. This is the lowest No. of units (25) of all those listed in appendix 2. Considering the size of the village I think this is a modest and proportionate allocation over the planned upto 2031, follows historic development trend in Barham. The proposal has been consulted upon and prepared over several years, and could also benefit the village with a donation of land. Welcome any affordable housing as needed in village.	
Policy HD1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4682	Objecting	We strongly oppose the proposal to place residential development on Kingsmead Field. This is contrary to the Council's own policies, as stated in the draft Local Plan, namely Policy OS8, Policy OS11 and Policy CC5.	
Policy HD1	781719	A M Terry		4757	Objecting	Then there is the space formerly used by the Prison, all that land should be made available. If we are not having a prison for penal requirements lets knock it down and use the land for the houses that you are being told you have to build.	
Policy HD1	781040	Ms Dawn Stroud		4811	Objecting	Support for the former prison site to be investigated further in terms of its potential to contribute towards the housing supply target.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	380690	Hollamby Estates		4976	Objecting	HEL does not support the omission in the Consultation Document of the two housing development sites in Bullockstone Road at the former golf driving range and land adjacent to it.	HEL does not support the omission in the Consultation Document of the two housing development sites in Bullockstone Road at the former golf driving range and land adjacent to it.
Policy HD1	380690	Hollamby Estates		4977	Supporting	HEL supports the inclusion of land west of Bullockstone Road as a housing allocation under Policy HD1.	
Policy HD1	782035	Ms Joyce Epps		4982	Objecting	Object to development at Kingsmead Field. It should be noted that there is an alternative location for development on two neighbouring brownfield sites (the Old Coach Park and Serco Depot). Under the Kingsmead Development Brief (2004), these sites are designated for mixed use, including residential development. The houses allocated in paragraph 2.24 of the draft Local Plan for Kingsmead Field could be re-assigned to one of these two sites.	
Policy HD1	380690	Hollamby Estates		4986	Supporting	HEL supports the allocation of land west of Bullockstone Road.	
Policy HD1	380248	Mrs V McDonald		4987	Objecting	Our client Mrs V McDonald, is the owner of land at Brewery Lane/Bourne Park Road, Bridge; this land has been put forward for consideration for new residential development through the call for sites and SHLAA process. (SHLAA 139). However, despite the identification of Bridge as a local centre, no land is allocated at Bridge for new residential development. The site will be capable of accommodating a combination of market and affordable housing, to meet the need for both types of accommodation.	
Policy HD1	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	5002	Objecting	it is worth drawing your attention the fact that the development option favoured by the Jacobs report, Option 1, includes significant development (including 1500 units of residential) on the land promoted by our client. The report concludes that Option 1 is the preferred scenario. It is comforting, therefore, that the City Council's transport consultants support our assertions that the New Thanington site can be considered part of the most sustainable transport solution for the city.	We therefore reiterate our assertion that the proposed allocation at New Thanington should be included by the City Council in the next stage of the Local Plan, due to its sustainable location which accords with the principles in the emerging plan and is considered part of the most sustainable transport solution for the City recommended by the City Council's transport consultants.
Policy HD1	380246	Mr R Dickson		5037	Objecting	Our client Mr R Dickson is the owner of land east of Rattington Street, Chartham; this land has been put forward for consideration for new residential development through the call for sites and SHLAA process. (SHLAA 140)	Include land east of Rattington Street as a site for residential development.
Policy HD1	782070	Julie Rowe		5042	Supporting	I welcome the provisional decision not to consider the Southern Slopes as a potential site for housing development (200-300 houses) because this would dramatically violate Sustainability Objectives (Evidence base: the SHLAA sites Analysis conducted by AMEC for CCC in 2012).	
Policy HD1	782433	Eastling Farms Ltd		5052	Objecting	Eastling Farms Limited are the owners of land east of Upper Harbledown, submitted for consideration as a development site under SHLAA 173. The site is considered suitable for a combination of new residential development, including the provision of a village green. We consider that the site is suitable for perhaps between 12 and 15 dwellings, which would include affordable housing to meet local needs.	Eastling Farms Limited are the owners of land east of Upper Harbledown, submitted for consideration as a development site under SHLAA 173. The site is considered suitable for a combination of new residential development.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	782048	Mr & Mrs Dey		5065	Supporting	Farmland adjacent to Folly Farm. We wish to support the poicy to protect the biodiversity and ensure that this land will continue to survive as it has for many years- vital in prsent times.	
Policy HD1	782446	John & Stuart Earl		5080	Objecting	I also wish to record my objection to the proposal in the Draft Local Plan to develop 40 houses on the Station's existing Overflow Car Park and the adjoining undeveloped land. The undeveloped land does need developing but the Canterbury West Station Overflow Car Park needs to be retained as a car park.	The Canterbury West Station Overflow Car Park needs to be retained as a car park.
Policy HD1	380375	Wrentham Estates		5086	Objecting	Allocate land at Greenhill (SHLAA 71) for residential development. The site could be delivered early in the plan period and ensure a good land supply. The only reason precluding the site being rolled forward is the Green Gap issue. The Landscape Character assessment describes this landscape as poor and therefore the Green Gap designation is not justified by landscape character. The site would round off existing development set in a structured landscaped buffer.	
Policy HD1	380262	Mr and Mrs Gibbon		5090	Objecting	We consider that the representation site (Underdown House, Herne Bay) is appropriate for development being within the defined urban area on the Proposals Map to both the 2006 Adopted Local Plan and the Consultation Draft Preferred OptionsLocal Plan and we seek an allocation of the site under Policy HD1 and on the Proposals Map.	We seek an allocation of the site under Policy HD1 and on the Proposals Map.
Policy HD1	780522	Cantley Limited		5123	Objecting	Raise concerns about the scoring of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for SHLAA/201. The following areas of the SA should be revised based on the developable area rather than the entire site, and in doing so this would significantly reduce the perceived adverse sustainability impact: Water Quality, Countryside and Histroic Environment, Ecology and Biodiversity and Climate Change. As such, the decision not to include the site as potential site for development should be revised.	Land at Bridge (SHLAA/201) should be identified in the CDLP table below paragraph 2.24 for an allocation of 10 dwellings.
Policy HD1	380258	Mr Mavaddat		5128	Objecting	We would submit that the representation site (land at Westbere) is in a location with good access to an extensive range of retail services, community facilities and employment opportunities in the vicinity, as well as good access to public transport services. It is submitted that the representation site could be delivered early in the plan process and thus assist with the aims of the plan in ensuring a good land supply as part of the sustainable development approach for the District.	We would submit that the representation site (land at Westbere) is in a location with good access to an extensive range of retail services, community facilities and employment opportunities in the vicinity, as well as good access to public transport services.
Policy HD1	380675	Mr D Bryant and Mrs.M.Robinson		5146	Objecting	It is submitted that the representation site could be delivered early on in the plan process and thus assist with the aims of the plan in ensuring a good land supply as part of the sustainable development approach for the District. The site is within the built-up area, is adjoined by Strategic Development Site 3 - Hillborough - and is, therefore, a suitable location for residential development.	We, therefore, seek a residential allocation under Policy HD1 and the Proposals Map.
Policy HD1	781721	Ms Lynne Broadbent		5188	Objecting	Support for the former Prison site to be investigated further in terms of its potential to contribute towards the housing supply target.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	406381	Ms Julia Gavriel		5211	Objecting	There are numerous brownfield sites that could be used for development and would make more sense. The Ford garage on the Sturry Road has acquired a new site and has planning consent for housing. Why is that not included in the plan?	
Policy HD1	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5227	Objecting	I object to Kingsmead Field being designated for development. This must be retained as green, open space for local residential use and amenity. Appropriating this land for development is contrary to the Council's own Open Space Strategy which calls for enhanced open space in the Kingsmead area. Many residents use this field for sporting events and, as it is on a flood plain, would be inappropriate for development.	
Policy HD1	784481	Fabio Hedayioglu		5256	Objecting	i,\$ I welcome the provisional decision not to consider the Southern Slopes as a potential site for housing development (200-300 houses) because this would dramatically violate Sustainability Objectives (Evidence base: the SHLAA-sites-Analysis conducted by AMEC for CCC in 2012)	
Policy HD1	407243	Mr Keith Groombridge		5258	Supporting	I write briefly on behalf of the owners of Barham Court Farm to support the Council's decision to include the farm as a housing allocation. The merits of the proposal are well documented elsewhere and the delivery of the housing will have a wide range of social, economic, conservation, environmental and community benefits. We therefore strongly support the allocation of the site for housing within the forthcoming adopted Local Plan.	
Policy HD1	784453	Bill Willsmer		5263	Objecting	We have submitted proposals for 5 terraced cottages on this site (Hoath Road, Sturry) as part of the SHLAA process. The site currently lies outside but adjacent to the built confines of the settlement of Sturry. The location is also sustainable. It is a short distance from a range of village facilities and public transport. We consider this site to be suitable for housing development over the medium to long term.	We request that the Council includes the site as a small allocation in the next version of the Draft Local Plan.
Policy HD1	414112	C E Arter		5275	Objecting	Support for the former prison site to be investigated further in terms of its potential to contribute towards the housing supply target.	
Policy HD1	127115	B.J. Gore		5277	Objecting	Objection to Kingsmead Field. The Council is being two-faced in its approach. On the one hand it promotes open space as providing health and social well-being, whilst on the other it proposes to take away Kingsmead Field in the City, Dengrove Wood Sturry, Strode Farm and S Canterbury. All the "amenity spaces" in the world cannot compete with nor replace these areas. The areas also assist considerably in air cleansing and improvement of air quality.	
Policy HD1	781543	D T . D G Pratt		5292	Objecting	The arguments in favour of retaining Kingsmead Field have already been well rehearsed and ignoring the cause for its retention would undermine the confidence of the electorate in the determination of CCC to maintain its own guidelines and sacrifice a valued open space, already in public ownership and which should be a hallmark of the intention to maintain the human dimension in all future planning decisions. I am therefore opposed to the sale of Kingsmead Field for housing.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5373	Objecting	Site survey identified insufficient sewerage capacity in the network to accommodate increased demand from: Simon Langton Girls School Canterbury St Martin's Hospital Canterbury Kingsmead Field Canterbury Land at Bullockstone Road Herne Bay Land at Spires Bredlands Lane, Hersden Development should connect instead to the nearest point of capacity and any new infrastructure provided. Amend as outlined.	Include the following in each of the site specific policies: Provide a connection to the sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by Southern Water.
Policy HD1	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5374	Objecting	We have been unable to assess this site with respect to water and wastewater capacity. This is because there is no indication of number of dwellings on the site thus we are unable to estimate the anticipated flows to and from the site.	
Policy HD1	781600	Ms Avril Leonard		5388	Objecting	Object to a development of 40 new houses by march 2014 on the station's existing overflow car park. These draft proposals are very inappropriate given the already limited parking spaces and facilities to drop off and pick up commuters and accommodate taxis. i know this as I regularly pick up my daughter who commutes to London. Additionally the council claims to promote environmentally friendly travel, trains are key to this, thus parking here is essential to this.	
Policy HD1	780830	Mr Peter Sands		5393	Objecting	Having owned the site for 30 yrs the campaign for development has been long and complicated, ie inclusion by recommendation of the national inspectorate and subsequent exclusion. We are advised by unbiased planning professionals that there is no earthly planning reason why this site should not be included, hence over the subsequent weeks prior to your submission version we will send in to yourselves a log of all relevant information to evidence cedars case.	Include site as shown on attached plan.
Policy HD1	781622	Mr T Whiting		5397	Objecting	I have attended all the meetings in the Guildhall with regard to St. Stephan's field and as a neutral observer who has played on those fields as a younger man I have been impressed with the arguments put forward by the public to save the fields as an open space for all to use. In contrast I have been shocked by the content and presentation put forward by the council, ill researched and blatantly incorrect.	
Policy HD1	779673	R H & A Godfrey-Faussett		5421	Objecting	Object to allocation of Barham Court Farm for 25 dwellings, because: There is strong resistance from residents; it is illogical esp as a green gap is put in between Bridge and Canterbury but a major development is inflicted on Barham; the principle of localism has been ignored; no need for affordable housing so contrary to policy HD3a; involves excessive scale so contrary to policy HD3b; no need for development in conservation area (contrary to HE6f); contravenes policy LB1 development in AONB	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	407243	Mr Keith Groombridge		5428	Supporting	Supports the housing allocation at Barham Court farm, because: previously developed land; located close to and will support village services and facilities; providing affordable housing; improve visual amenity by replacing agricultural buildings with houses; Barham is a rural hub due to amount of houses, shops, school, church, industrial estate; development within village boundary does not impact on AONB or other environmental aspects; limited development will give community benefits as per NPPF	
Policy HD1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5531	Objecting	Commitment is required to more investigative work Canterbury Prison for potential new housing.	
Policy HD1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5556	Objecting	Is housing actually being planned in the right place to create sustainable future communities? What prior and cast-iron guarantees are being insisted upon or being given that the necessary building blocks of community life will be provided by developers?	
Policy HD1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5566	Objecting	THE NLP Study stated that there were sites available for development without any constraints! Where are they? There is no evidence that the Council has sought to locate and identify them. Why is there no mention at all of brownfield sites? A rigorous search for these and for suitable lower grade, disused and degraded agricultural land should have been carried out.	
Policy HD1	406848	Mr Graham Norton	Land and Planning Director Strategic Land Kent	5579	Objecting	The Council should not focus on strategic sites and windfalls, smaller sites should be allocated. Cockering st is an ideal small site for release without harm to its environment on the edge of Canterbury City, giving only a small extension of the defined urban area to match that on the southern side of Cockering Road. The land is unproductive scrub land that could be developed for a small housing scheme. Allocate for housing.	we wish to have the site allocated for frontage housing.
Policy HD1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5668	Objecting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:€€ Idea of using Council HQ for housing and relocating Council offices	
Policy HD1	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5766	Objecting	Savills has been instructed jointly by The MHP Partnership and George Wilson Developments Ltd (acting for the owners of the land) to submit representations to the Canterbury District Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation in support of a formal site allocation at South Hersden. These representations formally request that land at South Hersden is allocated as a strategic allocation instead of Land at North Hersden.	As such these representations formally request that land at South Hersden is allocated as a strategic allocation.
Policy HD1	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5768	Objecting	Savills has been instructed jointly by The MHP Partnership and George Wilson Developments Ltd (acting for the owners of the land) to submit representations to the Canterbury District Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation in support of a formal site allocation at South Hersden. These representations formally request that land at South Hersden is allocated as a strategic allocation instead of Land at North Hersden.	As such these representations formally request that land at South Hersden is allocated as a strategic allocation.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	784456	Mr Stephen Griffith	Thanet International Ltd	5791	Objecting	Land south of 4 Shrubhill Road, Chestfield. We promote this land shown on the attached plan for small-scale, low density housing and a substantial landscape buffer to the Thanet Way. The northern boundary abuts the long rear gardens of houses in Molehill Road. The landscape in this area is adversely affected by the presence of the Thanet Way. The site would take pressure of other sites and could provide additional woodland and landscape buffer to built development.	We ask the Council to include the land as a housing allocation on the Proposals Map of the Local Plan.
Policy HD1	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5796	Objecting	The identification of South Hersden as a development site, within Para's 1.58 to 1.61, and the acknowledgement of the role it can perform in achieving wider strategic development goals is fully supported. However an objection is lodged to the fact that this site is not formally allocated for development. Priority should be given to focusing future development towards sustainably located previously developed land such as South Hersden.	As such there are no bars whatsoever towards South Hersden coming forward for development now and the opportunity should be seized to formally allocate the site for development within the Canterbury District Local Plan.
Policy HD1	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5819	Objecting	The identification of South Hersden as a development site, within Para's 1.58 to 1.61, and the acknowledgement of the role it can perform in achieving wider strategic development goals is fully supported. However an objection is lodged to the fact that this site is not formally allocated for development. Priority should be given to focusing future development towards sustainably located previously developed land such as South Hersden.	As such there are no bars whatsoever towards South Hersden coming forward for development now and the opportunity should be seized to formally allocate the site for development within the Canterbury District Local Plan.
Policy HD1	784811	Dr Emily Blake		5840	Objecting	The proposal does not make any provision for using Brownfield sites such as The Prison.	
Policy HD1	784811	Dr Emily Blake		5841	Objecting	The proposal does not make any provision for using Brownfield sites such as the old Peugeot Garage	
Policy HD1	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5876	Objecting	The DLP seems to influence against making up the deficit of open space in the area. In particular the proposals for Barton Farm and Kingsmead Field seem in direct opposition to the policy on open spaces. South Canterbury residents feel that the proposals would deny them their one piece of open land. A similar, and even stronger, feeling exists over the idea of houses on Kingsmead Field.	
Policy HD1	784807	Mr John Pike		5949	Objecting	Reference to the importance of retaining existing trees and planting new ones should be included in policy HD1 as applying to all housing developments.	Reference to the importance of retaining existing trees and planting new ones should be included in policy HD1 as applying to all housing developments.
Policy HD1	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5950	Objecting	Capacity assessments and additional development allocations, including housing, are required to deliver the vision and objectives of the Plan.	Capacity assessments and additional development allocations, including housing, are required
Policy HD1	784808	A M Bartlett		5951	Objecting	I wish to register my objection to the building of new homes on Kingsmead Field and feel it is vital to keep areas of green space for future generations to use. I believe it is contrary to the Council's policy OS8 for development and loss of open space which contribute to recreational amenities and will be refused.	
Policy HD1	781206	Mr David O'Keeffe		6026	Objecting	Site SHLAA 135 (Land at Golden Hill, Whitstable) should be included and then correctly reassessed. For the avoidance of doubt, all of the owners of SHLAA 135 are of one mind and the site is immediately deliverable.	Site SHLAA 135 (Land at Golden Hill, Whitstable) should be included.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6056	Objecting	It would better to distribute housing into smaller dispersed clusters based on existing transport arteries or nodes and that these should be factored into the overall number required, reducing the scale of development proposed for certain sites. Clusters would include the following sites: Howe Barracks, Prison, Thanington, Wincheap, EDMOs etc.	
Policy HD1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6154	Objecting	There appears to be no flexibility if a radical shift of emphasis required, eg: economic scenarios change drastically, transport considerations change, communities are not proving sustainable, etc. The funding for the provision of a very expensive new link road by even more house building looks very doubtful, either during or after the Local Plan period. By then Canterbury will be totally grid-locked with appalling air quality. Is this sustainable?	
Policy HD1	781581	UNITE Group PLC		6197	Objecting	The following alteration is necessary: delete in policy HD1 "including purpose built student accommodation" as this is now included in CLG - Definition of general housing €€ Housing research by the CLG confirms purpose built, self contained flats should be included in overall housing supply. €€ This was clarified in Parliament by the Housing Minister in December 2011.	The following alteration is necessary: The City Council will safeguard those sites identified on the proposals map for housing and for mixed use development where there is an element of residential development. Development on allocated housing sites for other non-residential uses including purpose built student accommodation will not normally be permitted.
Policy HD1	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6258	Objecting	To the non-inclusion of Cow Lane as a residential allocation. This is proposed for housing / commercial development although it is understood CCC redevelopment plans for the area may indicate part of it being used by highways. Presently in temporary occupation by FSC, KCC. Propose for allocation to residential.	
Policy HD1	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6260	Objecting	Object to non-allocation of land adjacent to SLBS. Currently in agricultural use 5.77ha. This area of land is currently allocated for Education use. However, KCC are now proposing to modernise Simon Langton Grammar School for Girls on a phased basis on their existing site, rather than move them to this allocated site. This means the allocated site could be redesignated for residential. Propose for allocation to residential.	
Policy HD1	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6266	Objecting	Object to non-inclusion of site as residential. Currently subject to a three year lease to Canterbury High for a Pupil Referral Unit. After that it is proposed that it become part of larger modernisation / redevelopment of the Leisure Centre. Propose for allocation to residential.	
Policy HD1	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6267	Objecting	Object to non-allocation of site as residential. Possibly too small for this purpose. KCC would propose to allocate this for residential. Library use would need to be reprovided as part of the Future Library Service, subject to consultation. The likely timescale for this to become available is 5+ years. Propose for allocation to residential.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6268	Objecting	Objecting to non-allocation of Whitstable Youth Centre as residential. KCC would seek to allocate this site for residential. The existing use would need to be relocated locally, subject to consultation. The likely timescale for this to become available is 5+ years. Propose for allocation to residential.	
Policy HD1	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6272	Objecting	Objecting to the non-allocation of Ladesfield Vulcan Close, Whitstable. Unused care home. Propose for allocation to residential.	
Policy HD1	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6288	Objecting	Object to the non-allocation of Swalecliffe Day Opportunities Centre Longfield Close Swalecliffe for residential. Currently a day centre. Within the plan period and following consultation, a change in how services are delivered could result in this centre becoming available for alternative uses including residential development. Propose for allocation to residential.	
Policy HD1	784458	Mr Jim Pace	Amos Dawton Finn	6477	Objecting	Object to HD1 as land east of Lakesview has not been allocated for mixed use development. See site representation and attached file.	
Policy HD1	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	6529	Objecting	Previous submission and related information attached. Site assessment show no obvious constraint to housing on this site, is a sustainable location. Promote prosperous rural communities by allocating this site. SCI confirms general support. To comply with NPPF need positive approach to sustainable development/allocations for housing and mixed use in villages. Unless addressed soundness of plan at risk.	
Policy HD1	407243	Mr Keith Groombridge		6534	Objecting	Object to the non-allocation of East Kent Gospel Hall, 1 Nunnery Road, Canterbury - SHLAA 142. The site at the East Kent Gospel Hall, lies within the urban area of Canterbury, and has been reviewed favourably in the site assessment form, and accompanying sustainability appraisal. Accordingly, we consider that the site should be allocated for residential development, and listed in the schedule at paragraph 2.24, for between 5 and 12 dwellings.	Allocate land for residential development, listed in Schedule under paragraph 2.24, for between 5 and 12 dwellings.
Policy HD1	476233	Mrs Catherine Cantwell		6725	Objecting	No need to plan for a large population expansion. New housing proposals should be scaled down, and not be permitted on greenfield sites such as Kingsmead Field, because: motive is raising money; flood prone; loss of amenity; impact on disadvantaged area; community opposition; loss of leisure and sporting facility forever.	New housing proposals should be scaled down, and should never be permitted on green field sites such as Canterbury's important Kingsmead Field
Policy HD1	778739	Mr A Salvatori		6749	Objecting	Object to the failure to extend the existing allocation of this site for housing, because: there is affordable need and no certainty development will come forward to meet need; logical to extend allocation; needs to be certainty. SHLAA flawed, takes no account of local needs, fails to tackle results of housing needs survey, no comparative assessment available. No justification for omitting site. Fails to assess if landscape impact can be mitigated and if site has less impact than other sites.	The proposals map should identify my client's site at Rough Common Road for housing development

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD1	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6859	Objecting	Argue for a more diversified mix of housing solutions at a lower rate. Factors not accurately allowed for: potential alternative site at Cockering Farm which offers regeneration potential for Wincheap and Thanington; destudentification and changes to CCCU UCCA masterplans; Howe Barracks; ridlands farm; densification of existing built up areas; market factors and economic need for coastal communities; housing access and affordability.	
Policy HD1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6885	Objecting	"Development which would involve the loss of open spaces and play areas within residential areas which contribute to the visual or recreational amenity of the area will be refused." The proposal to develop Kingsmead Field is an example of the sort of development which should therefore be refused.	
Policy HD1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6934	Objecting	Supportive of these statements [paragraphs 12.33, 12.34 & 12.36], particularly as they seem to strongly preclude any development on Kingsmead Field. Preference would be to see development on the brownfield sites in Kingsmead i.e. the Old Coach Park and Serco Depot.	
Policy HD1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6935	Supporting	Supportive of these statements [paragraphs 12.33, 12.34 & 12.36] as they would also seem to preclude any development on Chaucer Fields.	
2.32	777305	Mr Jason Hobbs	Area Manager Homes and Communities Agency	1598	Supporting	It is reassuring that the Plan seeks to ensure affordable housing meets local need. Evidenced through the indicative affordable housing targets set out in the SHMA reinforcing your commitment to providing the affordable housing required.	
2.32	779227	Mr Paul Uden		1756	Objecting	The plan is a developers dream and doesn't represent the views of residents. Developers have chosen these sites as building on Greenfield, Grade 1 farmland is easier and maximises profit. The extra employment will be driven by a new Business Park off the A2. This is unrealistic. Business will not come to Canterbury where the public transport is not as good as in the west of London. The idea HS1 will provide the impetus to bring those from London to Canterbury has not been thought through.	
2.32	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4842	Objecting	The Plan should do more to connect business growth with housing demand, facing head-on the problems of affordability. Such a link is called for in Canterbury City Council's Corporate Plan (Pledge 1 "Support Growth" and Pledge 3 "Homes in the Right Places". The NPPF also seeks a joined up and proactive approach by local authorities to sustainable development as set out in paragraphs 7, 8 and 9.	
2.32	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6155	Objecting	LPAs are required to identify the size, type tenure and range of housing that is required in a particular location, reflecting local demand. Where are these reports for each location? They should be in the supporting evidence for this Local Plan and available for public consultation. How can discussions have taken place with developers without them? How can financial decisions be taken for infrastructure funding without them? This information should already be in the public domain.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.32	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6162	Objecting	Needs of different groups ...Insufficient mention of the provision of more supported active living accommodation similar to Sturry's Franklyn House and Sturry Court Mews. This would be an encouragement for the older generation across all social groups to release larger properties if there was a greater range of this type of establishment In the district.	
2.32	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6165	Objecting	How will needs v. the range and mix be assessed? Will this be the same for each site? When will this be made known? Different groups have different support/social needs. If, as rumoured, there is to be a concentration of single units in the Sturry/Broad Oak Site 2 development, then who will live in them? What are their needs?Will their needs be met in the community? Where will they socialize? What will the quality of their lives be? How much consideration has been given to these points?	
2.34	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	233	Supporting	An important and necessary definition of "€affordable housing".	
2.34	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	235	Objecting	It would be helpful to include some examples of "on-site provision" where no affordable housing is envisaged in a development.	
2.34	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2785	Objecting	Affordable housing is paramount and any land that the Council owns should be considered for social housing built by Housing Associations. This would guarantee rented accommodation for those unable to get on the housing ladder and could be dovetailed to the needs of local people.	Any land that the Council owns should be considered for social housing built by Housing Associations.
2.37	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	210	Supporting	A welcome commitment to provide a varied range of housing, including an appropriate level of affordable housing, given the clearly identified need for this.	
2.37	772987	Mrs Doreen Louren		314	Supporting	There is a need for moderately priced, social housing.	
2.37	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3853	Objecting	In the second sentence, delete "necessary" and substitute "essential".	In the second sentence, delete "necessary" and substitute "essential".
2.37	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6059	Objecting	It is important that excellent public transport provision is a primary consideration on new development sites. Only once this condition has been met should the underlying policy of development be implemented. This requires detailed discussion between the relevant stakeholders to design a viable Public Transport Plan, which can be realistically implemented before any house building gets underway. Larger new sites should include an area dedicated to parking-free and car-free living.	A Public Transport Plan should be incorporated into and central to the Local Plan
2.37	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6168	Objecting	The style and build quality of affordable housing has a profound effect on existing communities and is one of the first factors if integration is to be successful. What criteria will the Housing Strategic Policy and Enabling Team consider for each site? Will this take into account the need to balance an existing community? The potential exists for a clash of interest between the balance of housing type, local need, services provided, infrastructure funding contribution & developer profit.	How will this be managed?

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.38	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3854	Objecting	At the end of the first sentence add: "with designs in keeping with the respective sites and the use of locally based materials where possible".	At the end of the first sentence add: "with designs in keeping with the respective sites and the use of locally based materials where possible".
2.38	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5534	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'On Housing'. This includes the stress on affordable housing and having a variety of tenures	
2.39	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		16	Objecting	I was glad you raised the issue of affordable housing and that housing is anything but affordable. House prices are not only affected by supply and demand, but also by the Chancellor's stoking up the market with the initiatives he announced in the 2013 Budget. I suspect the concept of affordable housing is even more meaningless than it has been over the last 20 years. I reiterate the point about the cost that need to be borne by the developer before a trench is dug.	
2.39	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		952	Objecting	what is the ratio for Herne Bay given that housing is much cheaper here?	Please provide the ratio for Herne Bay
2.39	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2798	Objecting	2.39 states affordability is an issue in the Canterbury District, with the average house price 6.85 times the average salary. Is all the proposed development sustainable? To be affordable a property should cost no more than 3.5 times the gross household income.	
2.39	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3590	Objecting	Affordability - housing for local needs, however laudable does not prevent people from areas with high land/property values.Any social housing should be for local people only in perpetuity.	
2.40	665473	Dr Richard Norman		532	Supporting	Agree with the proposal to prioritise affordable housing.	
2.40	777305	Mr Jason Hobbs	Area Manager Homes and Communities Agency	1599	Supporting	It is reassuring that the Plan seeks to ensure affordable housing meets local need. Evidenced through the indicative affordable housing targets set out in the SHMA reinforcing your commitment to providing the affordable housing required.	
2.40	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4883	Objecting	For many Canterbury people their quality of life is constrained by housing problems. A longer term solution to housing problems and homelessness depends on building more housing which local people can afford.	For many Canterbury people their quality of life is constrained by housing problems. A longer term solution to housing problems and homelessness depends on building more housing which local people can afford.
2.41	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		436	Objecting	We question the findings of the Economic Viability Assessment of Development in Canterbury District in particular as it relates to affordable housing provision and the general delivery of housing within this draft District Plan as it needs to take into account the accumulative impact of costs associated with the Infrastructure Plan or implementation plan for which information is not yet currently available.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.41	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	776	Objecting	It is important for the Council to consider whether it is realistic to model on the basis of a nil financial contribution to s106. The allowance of £40 psm that is allowed for the CIL could very quickly be absorbed in paying s106 contributions, leaving no spare money to pay the CIL. The Council must ensure its CIL is policy compliant and ensure that total cost of the CIL does not exceed £40 which would make the viability appraisal redundant. Even with nil s106 registers very modest land values.	
2.41	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2002	Objecting	Object - to the citation of 'sheltered housing' in this Reasoned Justification for policy HD2	Revisions to the Reasoned Justification in line with the representation
2.41	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3856	Objecting	In the last sentence delete "require.....justification" and replace by "not grant consent"	In the last sentence delete "require.....justification" and replace by "not grant consent"
2.41	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6860	Objecting	The effect of building affordable housing as a priority may have detrimental effects on developer profit and the contributions they make. prospective purchasers may be less attracted to sites with well established affordable housing in situ. If mix of housing is to be built simultaneously on each site then it will be some time before local need is met.	
Policy HD2	268778	Mrs Janet Hall		171	Objecting	Much is talked about building of housing. Will this be council or private or both.	
Policy HD2	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	211	Supporting	A welcome commitment to provide a varied range of housing, including an appropriate level of affordable housing, given the clearly identified need for this.	
Policy HD2	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	234	Objecting	It would be helpful to include some examples of "on-site provision" where no affordable housing is envisaged in a development.	
Policy HD2	772443	Mrs Jillian Johnson		262	Objecting	Ensure affordable housing is above the benefits cap.	Affordable housing should be of a high quality, at least three bedrooms and have a good garden; so as to obtain a rental value over the benefits cap. Preferably houses unsuitable for the rental sector.
Policy HD2	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		437	Objecting	Policy HD2 provides a requirement of 30% affordable dwellings on sites of 7 or more units. Although a commendable objective by the Council this figure needs to be appropriately tested against the costs associated with any future CIL, Sec 106 or Infrastructure Plan.	
Policy HD2	665473	Dr Richard Norman		533	Supporting	Agree with the policy of prioritising affordable housing.	
Policy HD2	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	770	Objecting	We consider that the case for a 30% contribution to affordable housing has not been demonstrated. The Council should make an allowance for s106 to ensure that it is providing a realistic assessment of viability. The Council should also factor in the cost of policy DBE7 as it is unclear how the viability appraisal has accounted for the cost of this policy, and for Lifetime Homes which appears to have been omitted from the calculations (it is not included in C for Sustainable Homes).	
Policy HD2	777305	Mr Jason Hobbs	Area Manager Homes and Communities Agency	1601	Supporting	Following the Economic Viability Assessment undertaken, the HCA support the Council's 30% affordable requirement for all residential development provided on site (for 7+ units).	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD2	778733		The John Graham Centre	1860	Objecting	Object to policy HD2 which requires the provision of 30% affordable housing in relation to the allocation of this site as the proposal is necessary to fund the running of the John Graham centre and for the building of 8 units of specialist accommodation for people with learning disabilities. We consider that in this particular case the affordable housing requirement could be set aside.	If the Lucketts Farm site is to be allocated then a note needs to be inserted into the plan or at the end of the policy to signify that this development is exempt from the requirements of HD2
Policy HD2	779262	Mr John Bailey		1947	Supporting	Need more family homes	
Policy HD2	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	1999	Objecting	Object - to the wording of the policy as being contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, particularly paragraph 50	Revisions in line with representation made
Policy HD2	422982	Cllr Martin Vye		2412	Objecting	As for affordable housing, I agree that this should be an urgent priority for the District. However, experience shows that the percentage level of affordable housing within any development tends to be much reduced as developments proceed. To meet the high level of need for affordable housing in the District(and elsewhere) enablement of council and housing associations to make direct investment in social housing is required. Hoping for the need to be met on the back of open market ho	
Policy HD2	778868	Mr Tom Tomaszewski		2499	Supporting	I am generally opposed to any further building of properties anywhere unless as council housing, as part of a socialist programme of regeneration for individuals and families for whom the property market remains inaccessible. There is no shortage of property in this country, but an over-abundance of accommodation unaffordable to most people.	
Policy HD2	778304	O W Presland		2611	Objecting	Policy HD2 should be qualified to allow for exceptional circumstances. There has been a failure in the past to bring forward development sites where existing use values are high. There should be reference to exceptional circumstances with high existing use values.	
Policy HD2	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2802	Objecting	Not convinced that new infrastructure will be in place to avoid existing infrastructure capacity being exceeded.	
Policy HD2	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2922	Objecting	We would urge the Council to allow some flexibility in the delivery of this target where it threatens scheme viability; for example where a strategic site is required to fund expensive infrastructure works in order to unlock later phases of development.	In such a scenario, where evidence to demonstrate reduced viability is provided, we suggest the policy is amended to enable the Council to reduce the amount and alter the tenure mix of affordable housing associated with each phase, and review implications for overall provision as the scheme progresses, in the light of strength of the housingmarket and availability of funding.
Policy HD2	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		3259	Objecting	No jobs, who will buy the "€œaffordable" homes. Are you going to create another Valencia with vast unoccupied housing estates funded by the taxpayer.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD2	780486	Commerical Land		3370	Objecting	It is accepted that the delivery of affordable housing is a key requirement of any Local Plan. However , delivering this should not be at the detriment of also delivering housing for market sale. Costs upon development such as affordable housing should have enough flexibility in their application to allow them to adapt to the individual circumstances of different development proposals and sites. On this basis, Draft Policy HD2 should be re-written.	Draft Policy HD2 should be re-written to include the following: 'Any provision of affordable housing will be subject to Viability assessment of the proposed scheme to confirm the maximum achievable contribution within an individual development proposal. The normal target of 30% of additional units will be required, except where this would render a scheme unviable and thus prevent the delivery of new residential units as a contribution to the Council's overall target to deliver 15,600 additional dwellings over the life of the Local Plan. A financial contribution, in lieu of on-site provision, will be accepted where this ensures the viable delivery of required residential units. '
Policy HD2	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3774	Objecting	I accept that what is needed in the area is 'social housing' which I understand as very different from 'affordable housing' as mentioned in the Plan. In the present economic environment it is extremely difficult to be able to purchase a first house and as first time buyers fuel the housing market I see little need for an additional 4,200 houses even over the next 20 years.	
Policy HD2	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3857	Objecting	Support this Policy, but the following should be added at the end of the Policy:"The City Council will not permit any application to remove or reduce the amount of affordable housing set out in planning consent conditions."	Add at the end of the Policy: "The City Council will not permit any application to remove or reduce the amount of affordable housing set out in planning consent conditions."
Policy HD2	780620	Mr David Birmingham		4223	Supporting	Supports any increase in availability of low-cost housing for working residents and potential residents.	
Policy HD2	780986	Mr Peter Taylor-Gooby		4300	Objecting	In short it appears that the planning process has been misled by the desire to generate income to the Council through large-scale development. It is unlikely to succeed in this, is likely to damage further the charm and character of Canterbury through more congestion, poorer air and deteriorating environment, and perhaps show a net cost to the Council. Greater attention to social housing is required.	
Policy HD2	780963	Mr Harvey Blaymire		4315	Objecting	Any social housing allocated to each development should be for locals. To end up with the council importing other districts unemployed, i.e. London, merely for the council tax revenue would be a very cynical move but one that is not above many councils!!	Any social housing allocated to each development should be for locals.
Policy HD2	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4428	Supporting	DIO supports this policy. The detailed implementation of the amount and type of affordable housing will be dealt with in the preparation of the planning application in close liaison with the Council and other stakeholders.	
Policy HD2	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patribourne Parish Council	4673	Supporting	Support the provision levels for affordable housing in all new developments as set out in Policy HD2	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4683	Objecting	There is a systemic problem with providing the level of affordable housing that is needed both locally and nationally. This problem can only be resolved when national government takes the decision to make this provision a funding priority. Until then the proposals in the Local Plan to provide three affordable houses for every seven private houses, at the developers' expense, can only be an interim measure which will not be sustainable in the long term.	
Policy HD2	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4847	Objecting	Concerned that the Draft Local Plan draws its figures for affordable housing from the 2009 Strategic Housing Marketing Assessment as some parts of the country have experienced a rise in the need for affordable housing in the time since. The Plan should use an up to date assessment of the need for Affordable Housing as its evidence base. This omission must raise questions about the assumptions on affordable housing.	
Policy HD2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4953	Objecting	The issue of affordable housing is now a very difficult problem nationally and the emerging Local Plan offers no solutions to this problem. Something exceptional needs to be done about this. It may be for example that a number of "exception sites" need to be identified and safeguarded, spread across the district, specifically for affordable housing, where the land would only be given planning permission if the site could be purchased at a price that enabled affordable housing to be provided.	It may be for example that a number of "exception sites" need to be identified and safeguarded, spread across the district, specifically for affordable housing, where the land would only be given planning permission if the site could be purchased at a price that enabled affordable housing to be provided. Suitable policy wording would need to be devised to ensure that such sites could not be transferred to open market development.
Policy HD2	788181	Mr Gary Day	McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	4967	Objecting	There is a considerable challenge to the Council to provide the necessary quantity of housing to accommodate the needs of an aging population. Private sheltered accommodation, such as those provided by McCarthy and Stone should have a key role to play. We therefore commend the Council for taking a positive approach in seeking to provide appropriate accommodation to meet the needs of its aging population.	
Policy HD2	788181	Mr Gary Day	McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	4968	Objecting	The Council's use of 'self-containment' as a means of determining whether and Extra Care Development is C2 or C3 Use Class and consequently exempt from affordable housing contributions appears to arbitrary and contrary to recent case precedent (see 'Gladman'). Clearly self-containment is not a valid means of determining whether a development is C2 or C3. Further Extra Care Development have a tight viability threshold and unjustified burdens will be counter-productive.	The Council's proposed requirement for seeking Affordable Housing Contributions from self-contained residential institution is a radical departure from the accepted stance on seeking affordable housing contributions from C2 developments and as such needs to be robustly justified.
Policy HD2	13753	Mr Jeremy Bellamy	Assistant Parish Clerk Sturry Parish Council	4992	Supporting	Whilst a level of affordable and social housing would be more than welcome, there is concern that Sturry Parish will receive a proportionately high level of social and affordable housing as part of the proposals. Assurances are sought that no more than 30% of the developments in Sturry Parish would be affordable or social housing, in line with the standard guidelines issued by the City Council.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD2	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5029	Objecting	In principle raise no objection to the provision of affordable housing, but Policy HD2 does not comply/nor is consistent with the NPPF (paras 50, 173-177, 205). As it may threaten site viability, is inflexibly worded and is not positively prepared. Amend as outlined	In the second sentence of first para include words 'up to' 30%... After first para insert a para as follows: ' Where it is demonstrated that the provision of affordable housing would make a development unviable, then an alternative level of affordable housing provision, either on-site or via a contribution to the provision of affordable housing off-site, will be negotiated on a site-by-site basis.'
Policy HD2	780212	Church Commissioners for England		5337	Objecting	Object to Policy HD2. Although viability is referred to in the supporting text, the policy is confused and unclear that the level of contributions will vary depending on viability. Viability is a key aspect of planning, especially with regard to affordable housing. It is vital that the references to viability appear in the policy. The policy should make it clear that it applies to net additional units. How financial contributions will be sought should be clarified.	References to viability should appear in the policy . The policy should make it clear that it applies to net additional units. The manner in which financial contributions are sought lacks clarity and should be amended accordingly.
Policy HD2	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5372	Objecting	Sewerage infrastructure crosses: St Martin's Hospital Canterbury Kingsmead Field, Canterbury Land at Bullockstone Road, Herne Bay Barham Court Farm, Barham This should not be built on a 6-13m easement is required. Development layout should take account of this. Any diversion will be at the developers cost. Amend as outlined	Site specific policies should include: Development proposals will be permitted provided existing underground water mains and sewers on site are protected, or appropriate arrangements are made for their diversion.
Policy HD2	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5557	Objecting	Is the 'compelling' affordability issue being seriously addressed? Should and could more be done whilst minimising the greenfield land-take and traffic generation? Urban sites may prove best.	
Policy HD2	406848	Mr Graham Norton	Land and Planning Director Strategic Land Kent	5572	Objecting	We object to a 30% provision to sites of seven or more units. We wish to see the first 10 dwellings free of obligation in order to promote the development of small sites in the borough so that a choice of housing is provided.	The first 10 dwellings free of affordable housing obligation
Policy HD2	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5670	Objecting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:€ Acknowledgement of the key affordable housing problem and desire to tackle it	
Policy HD2	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5845	Objecting	The likelihood that 30% of 'affordable' housing will be provided is limited. Development phasing means it will be many years before this type of housing becomes available; plus, can affordability targets be met if development is in Canterbury - being one of the dearest parts of the District and where infrastructure costs are likely to be highest because of the DLP's other ambitions i.e. A2 slip at Bridge.	
Policy HD2	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5952	Objecting	The pragmatic approach of setting a target for affordable housing provision that reflects economic viability is supported. However, the policy should be worded as an 'expectation' rather than a 'requirement' to allow for the possibility of negotiation of different levels of provision, where individual circumstances require, without involving a departure from the Policy. The Policy needs to be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time (NPPF Para 50)	the policy should be worded as an 'expectation' rather than a 'requirement'.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD2	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6058	Objecting	Why have the previous (higher) affordable housing recommendations from the SMHA have been rejected? All issues of viability and affordability should be kept under review.	
Policy HD2	781581	UNITE Group PLC		6193	Objecting	Mindful of the specialist provision purpose built student accommodation makes to overall housing supply within the plan area (see below), it is necessary to clarify within the affordable housing policy that the affordable housing trigger does not apply to student accommodation development. This ensures the local plan is clear and is consistent with national guidance.	Add to end of policy: Purpose built student accommodation is not required to contribute towards affordable housing provision.
Policy HD2	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6869	Objecting	Request CCC to reword Policy HD2, to acknowledge the problems caused by NPPF policy 173, and set robust margins to ensure that average minimum affordable housing remains at 30% or higher. Recent devts have already seen relaxation. Also, we would point out that the waiting list in Canterbury is acknowledged as 3290 in 2010, rising from 2600 in 2009 - i.e. 2.2%. If household size is 2.39 this requires 1375 affordable houses. At 500/pa would generate 150 units. Must protect 30% if not increase.	We would request CCC to reword Policy HD2, to acknowledge the problems caused by policy 173, and set robust enough margins to ensure that the average minimum proportion of affordable housing remains at 30% or higher. Recent developments have already seen CCC relaxing this argument.
2.44	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		501	Supporting	The objective "to ensure that existing infrastructure capacity is not exceeded and made worse by new development" is supported but there would seem to be no indication that the proposed South Canterbury development meets this objective.	The proposed development in South Canterbury (and elsewhere) needs to be made conditional on improvements to the infrastructure.
2.44	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		954	Objecting	The plan does not provide the necessary transport or education infrastructure. The plan will add 12,000-15,000 people to Herne Bay - what evidence do you have that the health infrastructure envisaged can meet this extra demand?	
2.44	771556	Mr Phil Rose		2011	Objecting	"ensure that existing infrastructure capacity is not exceeded and made worse by new development" should be re-worded to: "ensure that existing infrastructure capacity is not exceeded OR made worse by new development".	"ensure that existing infrastructure capacity is not exceeded and made worse by new development" should be re-worded to: "ensure that existing infrastructure capacity is not exceeded OR made worse by new development".
2.44	771556	Mr Phil Rose		2012	Objecting	It is well-known locally that we do not have enough secondary school places in Herne Bay. The Plan is for thousands more people to live here, but there is no new secondary school proposed for us. This can only make the current shortfall of local school places worse. We're also worried that this big population increase cannot be served by just two new doctor's surgeries.	Adequate educational and medical "infrastructure" must be EXPLICITLY included in the Local Plan.
2.44	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6073	Objecting	It is important that excellent public transport provision is a primary consideration on new development sites. Only once this condition has been met should the underlying policy of development be implemented. This requires detailed discussion between the relevant stakeholders to design a viable Public Transport Plan, which can be realistically implemented before any house building gets underway. Larger new sites should include an area dedicated to parking-free and car-free living	A Public Transport Plan should be incorporated into and central to the Local Plan
2.44	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6201	Objecting	The entire paragraph Crucial to the point of being an understatement.	Request rewording: From - "new housing accommodation should be provided alongside" To - "new housing accommodation must be provided alongside"

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.45	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	238	Objecting	Delightfully imprecise. However, an important recognition that not every vacant plot should be deemed suitable for development €“ open spaces often make an important contribution to the character and setting of a village.	
2.45	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		287	Supporting	There needs to be a clearer definition of Minor Development in small villages	Definition of Minor Development in small village
2.45	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1763	Objecting	Unless criteria for development within the AONB and its setting are set out in LB1 the KDAONB object to the inclusion of settlements within the AONB or its setting in the settlement hierarchy. The KDAONB have made suggestions for the revision of LB1.	Changes to LB1 to include criteria as set out in our comments under Policy LB1 and LB2
2.45	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2004	Objecting	Object - to the wording of paragraph 2.45 with this Reasoned Justification inferring that the NPPF will not support development outside of the urban areas	We suggest the deletion of the first sentence (€œ Outside the urban areas, housing provision is restrained by the NPPF ").
2.45	778777	Mr Nick Waldron	The Waldron Family	2123	Objecting	This approach is not advocated in the NPPF, which instead refers to the need for development at the villages to be sustainable, support the rural economy and be responsive to local circumstances. The NPPF does not prescribe development only within villages. Please see attached statement.	See attached statement.
2.45	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3858	Objecting	Object to the last sentence of the paragraph. Rural settlements should have their built confines defined giving a definite boundary between countryside and built environment, rather than relying on arbitrary inconsistent planning decisions.	CPRE Protect Kent is strongly of the view that boundaries should be defined for the villages, local centres and rural service centres, as well as for the main urban areas.
2.45	380258	Mr Mavaddat		5131	Objecting	The Draft Local Plan does not identify or promote more modest development at any of the other rural settlements through allocations, despite guidance in the NPPF. The text in Paragraphs 1.71 and 2.45 is overly restrictive, limiting reasonable development at Rural Settlements that would be in accordance with the NPPF.	The text in Paragraphs 1.71 and 2.45 is overly restrictive, limiting reasonable development at Rural Settlements that would be in accordance with the NPPF.
2.45	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6202	Objecting	Please confirm that this covers Sturry - a RURAL service centre and the RURAL VILLAGES of Hersden and Broad Oak.	
2.45	13835	Mr Michael Steed		6997	Objecting	This is too cautious about the contribution that small-scale rural development can make. A lot of people want to live in villages. See my points B and C above for the appropriate strategy. There are several villages on radial routes with good public transport which could benefit from limited growth. Why select the biggest of these, Sturry-Hersden, and put all the extra-urban area growth there?	
2.46	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		289	Objecting	Objecting to the importance being given to this Study and lack of reference to the Conservation Area Appraisals	More emphasis being placed on Conservation Area Appraisals
2.48	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3859	Objecting	In the second sentence after "living" insert €œor working in businesses". At the end of the para add "/businesses"	In the second sentence after "living" insert "or working in businesses". At the end of the para add "/businesses"
2.49	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3861	Objecting	In the last sentence delete "should" and replace with "must"	In the last sentence delete "should" and replace with "must"
2.50	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3563	Objecting	There is no reference in the document to a Housing Needs Survey despite the fact that one was carried out for Herne & Broomfield Parish in 2010.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.50	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3863	Objecting	The final sentence should be deleted as it conflicts with the NPPF which explains that rural exception sites should seek to address the needs of the local community by accommodating households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection. This does not suggest that the needs of one community should be met at another community.	
2.53	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3862	Objecting	Add at the end "and to suit the characteristics of the village or hamlet"	Add at the end "and to suit the characteristics of the village or hamlet"
2.54	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2809	Supporting	Support para 2.54	
2.54	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3594	Supporting	I support paragraph 2.54	
2.54	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6075	Objecting	Supportive of shared equity schemes and agree that occupiers should be prevented from buying the property outright. It is recommended that the scheme is managed by the Council, and that a Community Land Trust be established where land is 'gifted' for this purpose to preserve it as a community-owned asset. Self-build should also be encouraged; and where the unemployed work on such schemes they should not be subject to withdrawal of social security benefit.	
2.55	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3864	Objecting	In the third sentence after "assessor" insert "appointed by the City Council, the fees of whom will be payable by the applicant" In the fourth sentence alter the percentage to 15%.	In the third sentence after "assessor" insert "appointed by the City Council, the fees of whom will be payable by the applicant" In the fourth sentence alter the percentage to 15%.
Policy HD3	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		288	Objecting	Objecting because of the omission in the Policy of any reference to housing generally, outside the urban areas, as expressed in 2.45. You ignore the points made in 2.45 and limit your Policy to Affordable Housing.	Inclusion of a separate Policy number to cover 2.45 , (with greater clarity on minor development,) or at least an additional point to introduce Policy HD3, which would clarify minor development in villages and make it clear that any development should be in keeping with the character, appearance and historic environment of the village.
Policy HD3	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1764	Objecting	'environmental protection policies' needs defining. Do they cover LB1 and LB2 etc? or are they confined to flooding etc? We object to this policy unless environmental protection polices cover all the LB policies and others relating to criteria for development.	Make para 'e' clearer. There is no definition of 'enviromntal protection policies. This para needs to cover all the LB policies and others that relate to criteria for development.
Policy HD3	778733		The John Graham Centre	1863	Supporting	The exceptional circumstances of the John Graham Centre's proposals could be the subject of criteria set out as part of this policy to ensure the availability of the supported living in perpetuity	
Policy HD3	778733		The John Graham Centre	1866	Objecting	The only criterion which is unacceptable to the John Graham Centre is the requirement that market housing should be limited to 30% of the total development. Each case should be considered on its own merits and in this case the amount of market housing is required to fund the supported living and the facilities at the Centre.	In allocating land at Lucketts Farm a footnote needs to be added to the allocation to make it clear the 30% rule will not apply in this case.
Policy HD3	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2008	Objecting	Object - to the over-prescriptive requirements or paragraph (g) of the policy.	Revisions to text in line with the NPPF

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD3	779945		Berkeley Home (Southern Counties) Ltd	2255	Objecting	The plan refers to exception sites in policy HD3 located outside the built confines of villages, despite the fact that these boundaries are not identified.	
Policy HD3	13837	Mr William Leetham		3280	Supporting	Priority for seeking and building affordable housing in the villages especially Blean.	
Policy HD3	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3865	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent generally support this Policy but: i. in point d. after "trust" insert ",parish council";. In point g. add to the end of the second sentence "appointed by the City Council." In the third sentence alter the percentage to 15%.	in point d. after "trust" insert ",parish council" In point g. add to the end of the second sentence "appointed by the City Council." In the third sentence alter the percentage to 15%.
Policy HD3	780212	Church Commissioners for England		5338	Objecting	Object to Policy HD3. Consider that this policy is inconsistent with the NPPF (para 54) which accepts that market housing can facilitate the delivery of affordable housing. The policy does not recognise the importance of viability in delivering needed housing and should be amended accordingly. As mentioned previously, viability is a key aspect of planning and needs to be referred to in this policy.	Amend policy to recognise the importance of viability in delivering needed housing and to referred viability.
Policy HD3	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5559	Objecting	More analysis is obviously required of the affordability issue in rural areas and more proactive strategies and definite proposals framed to meet the shortfalls in ways that don't overwhelm local communities.	
Policy HD3	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5671	Supporting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:€€ Rural Exception Sites for affordable housing	
Policy HD3	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5953	Objecting	This Policy is supported and is consistent with NPPF Para 54. But, 30% upon the proportion of market housing provided within a scheme is arbitrary and not supported by evidence. The Policy needs greater flexibility to deal with individual circumstances that affect the viability of a scheme - particularly where abnormal cost elements exist. The ceiling of 30% should be qualified by the wording 'unless a higher percentage is needed to make the delivery of the scheme viable'.	The ceiling of 30% should be qualified by the wording 'unless a higher percentage is needed to make the delivery of the scheme viable'.
Policy HD3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6203	Objecting	Please confirm that this covers Sturry - a RURAL service centre and the RURAL VILLAGES of Hersden and Broad Oak.	
Policy HD3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6204	Objecting	Policy HD3 - All seems very reasonable if it is to meet local need, but see Response note page 25. (c) - available in perpetuity. This has particular support.	
Policy HD3	785163	Canterbury Christ Church University		6971	Objecting	Whilst it is appreciated that new housing development on land outside of the urban area boundary needs to be controlled it is considered that the Policy could be appropriately re-worded to take into account where residential development fulfils the function of 'enabling development'. It is suggested that the wording of Policy HD3 at item g could be amended to reflect this.	It is suggested that the wording of Policy HD3 at item g could be amended as follows: Delete as a minor element of the scheme and change the to an affordable housing. After local market need ADD and/or to enable development that will have an identified community benefit . Penultimate sentence ADD Where enabling development does not apply
2.56	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3866	Objecting	In the last sentence delete "generally" and substitute "sometimes"	In the last sentence delete "generally" and substitute "sometimes"

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.56	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6205	Supporting	Seems reasonable .	
2.57	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3867	Objecting	Add to the end of the para "Such information may be assessed by an independent assessor appointed by the City Council, the fees of whom will be payable by the applicant."	Add to the end of the para "Such information may be assessed by an independent assessor appointed by the City Council, the fees of whom will be payable by the applicant."
Policy HD4	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1765	Supporting	This policy supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance.	
Policy HD4	778333	Mr Ian Gregory		2596	Objecting	This policy is unduly oppressive since its purpose is to restrict development outside defined built up areas, despite the fact that the boundaries of many settlements are not defined. Furthermore, it denies the opportunity for development within otherwise built-up frontages to take place even where the impact of this would be minimal. The land at Stodmarsh Road comprises a good example of where this could reasonably be allowed to take place.	The Council needs to think clearly about what constitutes open countryside (where development could and should be restricted) and largely built-up frontages and other areas where limited amounts of development could reasonably take place. The first step in this respect would be to insert the word "open" in the first sentence of this policy and for a new policy to accept the principle of development in otherwise built-up frontages. It is hoped that these objections and comments are helpful. Should the Council wish to discuss them in more detail, or would like further information to be provided, then I would be pleased to work with them in that respect.
Policy HD4	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3868	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but remove the word 'normally' from the final paragraph	Remove the word 'normally' from the final paragraph
Policy HD4	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5679	Supporting	More specific positives:€€ Policies HD4 relating to buildings in the countryside	
Policy HD4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6206	Supporting	Support	
2.58	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6207	Supporting	2.58 to 2.64 Support all paragraphs	
2.62	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3054	Supporting	We welcome the protection afforded to bats and owl species.	
Policy HD5	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		438	Objecting	This Policy is to prescriptive and restricts housing choice and is contrary to guidance set out in the NPPF. This Plan should be amended to conform to the objectives of the NPPF on the conversion of Rural Buildings in the Countryside. This policy is not positively prepared, justified or effective.	
Policy HD5	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1766	Supporting	This policy supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance..	
Policy HD5	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2009	Objecting	Object - to the wording of this policy	Revisions in line with representation comments

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD5	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3602	Objecting	Policy HD5 should contain wording to discourage the conversion of stables and other equestrian facilities to residential use, given the difficulty there can be in replacing such facilities either in the open countryside or in towns.	Change the wording of Policy HD5 and the supporting text to discourage the conversion of stables and other equestrian facilities to residential use.
Policy HD5	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3869	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but it needs to be clarified whether all of the criteria need to be satisfied ('and' at the end) or just individual ones ('or' at the end).	
Policy HD5	780212	Church Commissioners for England		5340	Objecting	Object to Policy HD5. This policy is both inconsistent with NPPF (para 55) and Policy HD4, which confirms that new isolated homes in the countryside are acceptable if they would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to enhancement to the setting. The policy should be amended or deleted to be consistent with Policy HD4 and the NPPF.	The policy should be amended or deleted to be consistent with Policy HD4 and the NPPF.
Policy HD5	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5680	Supporting	More specific positives: · Policies HD5 relating to buildings in the countryside	
Policy HD5	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5929	Objecting	Canterbury City Council should take note of the Kent Farmsteads Guidance mentioned with reference to policy SP4 above.	Canterbury City Council should take note of the Kent Farmsteads Guidance mentioned with reference to policy SP4 above.
Policy HD5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6208	Supporting	Support	
2.63	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3871	Objecting	Alter the last sentence after "paragraphs" to read "5.58 - 5.66 and satisfy policies DBE1, DBE3, DBE4, DBE5, DBE10, DBE11 and DBE13".	Alter the last sentence after "paragraphs" to read "5.58 - 5.66 and satisfy policies DBE1, DBE3, DBE4, DBE5, DBE10, DBE11 and DBE13".
2.64	777570	Mr J K Rishworth		1070	Supporting	I have lived and worked in Canterbury since 1992, and would like to add my comments on this plan in response to the consultation. In that time I have seen particular problems developing, which need to be addressed in the new plan:- Over-crowding of new development within the city. Four- and five-storey blocks of flats are packed in cheek-by-jowl with little view of the sky, or sun, or air.	
2.64	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	2110	Supporting	At last but ten years too late.	
2.64	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2810	Objecting	What will the density be for the proposed developments?	
2.64	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5681	Supporting	More specific positives:€€ Provisions in 2.64 re-density and design of new housing	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.64	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6214	Objecting	Higher housing densities must not be at the expense of good design -Good to see this statement. . . . the housing density on developments will be lower than in recent years - Excellent news, but what is the target?	
2.64	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6215	Objecting	Chapter 8 talks about "highest standards" for construction but here "minimum standards" are acceptable for the people living inside.	Why not something more than minimum? This is building for the future, sustainability and quality of life. Please reconsider a greater proportion of 'lifetime home standard' at the same time. What about anticipating the needs of home-based businesses?
2.65	665473	Dr Richard Norman		534	Supporting	Agree with the need for balanced housing provision.	
2.65	481630	Dr R B Mallion		699	Objecting	The continued conversion into 'Houses of Multiple Occupation' of properties that, when built, were originally intended for normal family use does need severely to be curtailed, especially in the area near the University of Kent.	
2.65	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1211	Supporting	We agree strongly on the need for balanced communities and balanced housing provision, and on the need to counter the tendency for existing family houses to be converted into HMOs.	
2.65	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1468	Supporting	Act quickly to maintain the St Stephens area as an area of family housing	
2.65	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1743	Objecting	The proposed mix would average at, say, 3 people per household. The Plan is proposing that Herne Bay has 2,990 new homes on five housing estates. Herne Bay's normal share of smaller developments every year would be another 1,610 new homes, making 4,600 homes. Herne Bay has a population of about 38,000. The 2,990 new homes equals 9,000 people - about a quarter of the population. With the extra 1,160 homes this rises to 13,800 - over a third. This is too much - it will shatter our community.	The proposed level of development in and around Herne Bay must be reduced to a level that the town can absorb.
2.65	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2199	Supporting	We agree strongly on the need for balanced communities and balanced housing provision, and on the need to counter the tendency for existing family houses to be converted into HMOs.	
2.65	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4652	Supporting	Agrees with need for balanced communities and housing provision and the need to counter conversion of family houses to HMO's. Concentrations of HMO's add up to significant negative impacts for residents. There has been little meaningful engagement by CCC to deal with the problems caused by HMO's. CCC needs to take seriously the impact that HMO's have on permanent residents. CCC mishandled the Article 4 direction with respect to HMO's.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.65	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	6003	Supporting	We agree strongly on the need for balanced communities and balanced housing provision, and on the need to counter the tendency for existing family houses to be converted into HMOs.	
2.65	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6217	Supporting	Effects of HMOS. Recognition of the blight which can result is appreciated.	
2.66	665473	Dr Richard Norman		535	Supporting	Agree with policy of retaining existing family housing and combating the continued tendency for family housing to be converted to HMOs.	
2.66	775856	Mr Michael McDonnell		647	Supporting	Definitely agree that there is a strongcase for seeking to retain existing family housing, in the context of the wider housing and economic strategy.	
2.66	481630	Dr R B Mallion		700	Objecting	The continued conversion into 'Houses of Multiple Occupation' of properties that, when built, were originally intended for normal family use does need severely to be curtailed, especially in the area near the University of Kent.	
2.66	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1212	Supporting	We agree strongly on the need for balanced communities and balanced housing provision, and on the need to counter the tendency for existing family houses to be converted into HMOs.	
2.66	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1286	Supporting	We welcome all and any action which will retain houses as family homes or apartments for single people, as opposed to the sub division of houses for student occupation	
2.66	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1472	Supporting	Act quickly to maintain the St Stephens area as an area of family housing	
2.66	779262	Mr John Bailey		1958	Supporting	Too many family homes are being converted to HMOs so agree you must protect family homes from conversion.	
2.66	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4655	Supporting	Agrees with need for balanced communities and housing provision and the need to counter conversion of family houses to HMO's. Concentrations of HMO's add up to significant negative impacts for residents. There has been little meaningful engagement by CCC to deal with the problems caused by HMO's. CCC needs to take seriously the impact that HMO's have on permanent residents. CCC mishandled the Article 4 direction with respect to HMO's.	
2.67	665473	Dr Richard Norman		536	Supporting	Agree strongly that concentrations of HMOs change the character of an area and have a harmful effect on the local community.	
2.67	775856	Mr Michael McDonnell		639	Supporting	I agree there needs to be sufficient accommodation for students but believe that both Universities should be encourage to limit the number of students in accordance with the accommodation available. Kent University should be prepared to build more accommodation on campus.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.67	481630	Dr R B Mallion		701	Objecting	The continued conversion into 'Houses of Multiple Occupation' of properties that, when built, were originally intended for normal family use does need severely to be curtailed, especially in the area near the University of Kent.	
2.67	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1213	Supporting	We agree strongly on the need for balanced communities and balanced housing provision, and on the need to counter the tendency for existing family houses to be converted into HMOs.	
2.67	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1473	Supporting	No need for additional HMOs which are largely for private gain at the expense of the community	
2.67	779262	Mr John Bailey		1959	Supporting	Agree as the area south of UKC is blighted.	
2.67	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4656	Supporting	Agrees with need for balanced communities and housing provision and the need to counter conversion of family houses to HMO's. Concentrations of HMO's add up to significant negative impacts for residents. There has been little meaningful engagement by CCC to deal with the problems caused by HMO's. CCC needs to take seriously the impact that HMO's have on permanent residents. CCC mishandled the Article 4 direction with respect to HMO's.	
2.67	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6354	Supporting	I support these paragraphs with provisos. Comment: I strongly agree on the need to halt the conversion of family houses into HMOs in areas in which the proportion of HMOs is greater than 10%, and I would urge a rapid implementation of the Article 4 Direction. My proviso concerns the second half of policy HD6 as this looks like a get-out clause. This needs to be reformulated.	
2.68	771779	Mrs Patricia Kane		396	Supporting	I welcome this attempt to deal with the problems associated with HMOs and the impact they have had in my area on communities such as Hales Place, Wincheap and St Michael's Road. If a cap were to be placed on the number of HMOs in these areas, the pressure on affordable rented and private accommodation for families would be reduced and the current tensions which exist between students and other residents would be eased.	
2.68	665473	Dr Richard Norman		537	Supporting	Good to see this recognition that concentrations of HMOs increase levels of late-night disturbance, untidy gardens, litter, and refuse disposal.	
2.68	481630	Dr R B Mallion		702	Objecting	The continued conversion into 'Houses of Multiple Occupation' of properties that, when built, were originally intended for normal family use does need severely to be curtailed, especially in the area near the University of Kent.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.68	776051	Mr Rick Strange		863	Objecting	No retired person will want to live in or near all the thousands of badly behaved students who attend the Universities in the City.Beautiful residential areas are being turned into pure hell by so students who are continually drunk: or high and make as much noise as is possible. It would be nice if elected representatives and police upheld the Noise Act 1996, because without that no discerning retiree will move into any part of the City in which there are student lets.Indeed many are moving away	
2.68	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1214	Supporting	We agree strongly on the need for balanced communities and balanced housing provision, and on the need to counter the tendency for existing family houses to be converted into HMOs.	
2.68	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1474	Supporting	This is entirely our experience living here	
2.68	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4657	Supporting	Agrees with need for balanced communities and housing provision and the need to counter conversion of family houses to HMO's. Concentrations of HMO's add up to significant negative impacts for residents. There has been little meaningful engagement by CCC to deal with the problems caused by HMO's. CCC needs to take seriously the impact that HMO's have on permanent residents. CCC mishandled the Article 4 direction with respect to HMO's.	
2.68	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6356	Supporting	I support these paragraphs with provisos. Comment: I strongly agree on the need to halt the conversion of family houses into HMOs in areas in which the proportion of HMOs is greater than 10%, and I would urge a rapid implementation of the Article 4 Direction. My proviso concerns the second half of policy HD6 as this looks like a get-out clause. This needs to be reformulated.	
2.69	665473	Dr Richard Norman		538	Supporting	Agree strongly with the policy that the proportion of HMOs in an area should not exceed 10%.	
2.69	775856	Mr Michael McDonnell		640	Supporting	I definitely agree with all the comments mentioned in 2.69 but more importantly for the urban area of Canterbury.	
2.69	481630	Dr R B Mallion		703	Objecting	The continued conversion into 'Houses of Multiple Occupation' of properties that, when built, were originally intended for normal family use does need severely to be curtailed, especially in the area near the University of Kent.	
2.69	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1215	Supporting	We strongly support the proposed policy prohibiting further conversions to HMOs in areas where the proportion of HMOs already exceeds 10%.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.69	772683	Mr Bruce Woodcock		1310	Supporting	The St. Stephen's area is already at saturation point with properties occupied by students and is reaching a tipping point where it is becoming a student ghetto. Some roads in Canterbury now have up to 90% student occupation and this is destroying the local communities in our city and leaving permanent residents socially isolated. This occupation is bringing ever increasing problems of late night noise, refuse, poorly maintained gardens, litter and anti-social behaviour.	We completely SUPPORT policy HD6 to prevent further conversions of houses to HMOs if the proportion of HMOs is already 10% or more.
2.69	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1469	Supporting	Act to rigorously enforce the 10% limit to reawaken interest in purchase from families	
2.69	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1927	Supporting	Support the proposed policy prohibiting further conversions to HMOs in areas where the proportion of HMOs already exceeds 10%. It is also urged that the Article 4 Direction should be put into place at the earliest possible opportunity.	
2.69	779262	Mr John Bailey		1961	Supporting	Within a 100metre radius is excellent.	
2.69	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4658	Supporting	Supports the prohibition of further conversions to HMO's where the proportion will exceed 10%.	
2.69	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5884	Objecting	Why, given the general stance against this, is there a reference to allowing some extra conversions to HMOs?	
2.69	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6357	Supporting	I support these paragraphs with provisos. Comment: I strongly agree on the need to halt the conversion of family houses into HMOs in areas in which the proportion of HMOs is greater than 10%, and I would urge a rapid implementation of the Article 4 Direction. My proviso concerns the second half of policy HD6 as this looks like a get-out clause. This needs to be reformulated.	
2.70	775862	Mr Clive Flisher		336	Objecting	Not strong enough - this does not address areas where HMOs predominate, or provide any incentive for student accommodation to be built to release homes back to the market.	Keep, but add policies- see 2.72
2.70	665473	Dr Richard Norman		539	Supporting	Agree strongly with the need for an Article 4 Direction to implement the policy of limiting concentrations of HMOs.	
2.70	775856	Mr Michael McDonnell		648	Supporting	An Article 4 Direction definitely needs to be put in place as soon as possible.	
2.70	776445	Dr Grainne Evans		650	Supporting	Implementation of the Article 4 Direction to free up family houses used as HMO's to help solve the housing shortage.	Implement the Article 4 Direction
2.70	481630	Dr R B Mallion		704	Objecting	The continued conversion into 'Houses of Multiple Occupation' of properties that, when built, were originally intended for normal family use does need severely to be curtailed, especially in the area near the University of Kent.	
2.70	171665	Mr John Burden		1153	Objecting	In support of the St Michael's Road Area Residents Association. I support for the proposal to bring in an Article 4 Direction throughout the Canterbury district. We have witnessed the sale of dozens of homes which, having been put up for sale are snapped up by student landlords. Friends and neighbours have been driven from the district. I support the bringing in of the Article 4 Direction 'AS A MATTER OF SOME URGENCY' and I sincerely hope it is approved and implemented as soon as possible.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.70	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1216	Supporting	We strongly support the proposed policy prohibiting further conversions to HMOs in areas where the proportion of HMOs already exceeds 10%.	
2.70	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1928	Supporting	Support the proposed policy prohibiting further conversions to HMOs in areas where the proportion of HMOs already exceeds 10%. It is also urged that the Article 4 Direction should be put into place at the earliest possible opportunity.	
2.70	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4661	Objecting	Supports the prohibition of further conversions to HMO's where the proportion will exceed 10%. An Article 4 direction should be put in place ASAP and take immediate effect. No need for further consultation or notice as it has been done. The previous Article 4 direction was poorly handled.	An Article 4 direction should be put in place ASAP and take immediate effect. Develop a robust procedure for identifying existing HMOs. Implement an Additional License (as in Oxford) to counter the poor quality and maintenance of many HMOs.
2.70	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6218	Objecting	Addressing the three issues - housing need;community cohesion and residential amenity Proportion of HMOs in any given area should be no more than 10% of the number of properties. 10% looks too high, particularly as more student accommodation is built and the student population overall is not expected to increase.	
2.70	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6358	Supporting	I support these paragraphs with provisos. Comment: I strongly agree on the need to halt the conversion of family houses into HMOs in areas in which the proportion of HMOs is greater than 10%, and I would urge a rapid implementation of the Article 4 Direction. My proviso concerns the second half of policy HD6 as this looks like a get-out clause. This needs to be reformulated.	
Policy HD6	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		80	Objecting	I should like to see consideration for a NUL-street parking approach, thus making streets better places for all.	
Policy HD6	771779	Mrs Patricia Kane		394	Supporting	I think that 10% is a reasonable figure for HMOs in a given area. However I would like clarification about what this policy will mean for areas which already have a high concentration of HMOs and what allowing further conversions of blocks of properties will mean for existing owners and tenants of nearby houses.	
Policy HD6	665473	Dr Richard Norman		540	Supporting	Agree strongly with the need for this policy to limit concentrations of HMOs. The second half of the policy, that consideration will be given to permitting further conversions to HMOs in areas where there is already a high concentration, needs to be more carefully and tightly worded to prevent it from undermining the main thrust of the policy. Additional guidelines are needed to ensure that further conversions are permitted only in very rare and exceptional circ	
Policy HD6	776445	Dr Grainne Evans		628	Supporting	Support for HMO controls.	
Policy HD6	775856	Mr Michael McDonnell		638	Supporting	Article 4 Direction definitely needs to be implemented particularly in the Canterbury area so that young families have the opportunity to purchase new or existing properties and live in a community without the expansion of student lets. Consideration should also be given to factors a. b. and c. as mentioned in Policy HD6	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD6	481630	Dr R B Mallion		705	Objecting	The continued conversion into 'Houses of Multiple Occupation' of properties that, when built, were originally intended for normal family use does need severely to be curtailed, especially in the area near the University of Kent. Although largely supporting the Policy HD 6 I am alarmed at the flexibility implied in the second half of it - flexibility that could possibly fatally limit its effectiveness, overall.	I should like to see a modification of the '10%' policy, as follows: (a) If application is made to convert one half of a pair of semi-detached houses to Multiple Occupation whilst the other house of the pair is still lived in by a family or a couple or a single person, permission ought to be automatically denied, whatever proportion of the surrounding houses are multiply occupied, and (b) If, however, application is made to convert one half of a pair of semi-detached houses to Multiple Occupation whilst the other house in the pair is already in Multiple Occupation, then permission ought to be granted, no matter how many other near-by houses are multiply occupied. Although largely supporting the Policy HD 6 I am alarmed at the flexibility implied in the second half of it - flexibility that could possibly fatally limit its effectiveness, overall. I refer to the provision that in areas where there is an 'exceptionally high' proportion of multiply-occupied houses in any particular 'block' of properties, consideration will be given to further conversions. I think that this aspect needs very careful wording if it is not subsequently to be open to potential abuse.
Policy HD6	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		964	Supporting	NEW POUY HD6 -I welcome this new and long overdue policy on HMOs.	
Policy HD6	776710	N & R.J Smith		1113	Supporting	The need for more family and first-time buyer housing in the District could be better met by more efficient use of the existing housing stock, notably through a review of the substantial number of properties occupied by students.	
Policy HD6	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1174	Supporting	We strongly support Policy HD6 to limit the concentration of HMOs. As residents of Salisbury Road we deplore the impact of the conversion of homes to HMOs. This impact includes the increasingly run-down appearance of the area, the loss of front gardens to use as car parking spaces, the loss of garage space converted as extra bedrooms, the poor maintenance and appearance of some properties, and increasing noise and disturbance. There is also loss of social mix and fragmentation of community.	
Policy HD6	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1175	Objecting	We and our local Residents' Association are concerned to ensure that our area will be protected by this policy and not be abandoned to unlimited further conversions as envisaged in paragraph 2 of Policy HD6. There is a need to clarify what is meant by a 'block of properties', and what would constitute an 'exceptionally high proportion of HMOs'.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD6	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1217	Supporting	We strongly support the proposed policy prohibiting further conversions to HMOs in areas where the proportion of HMOs already exceeds 10%.	
Policy HD6	778563	Mrs Susan Langdown		1312	Supporting	St Stephens has become an area of high density HMOs. Unless urgent action is taken, the sensitive balance of students/core residents will be irrevocably damaged.	
Policy HD6	778387	Mr David Smith		1333	Supporting	Fully support the need to control the density of HMO's. Unfortunately this policy is many years overdue and in St.Stephen's area the damage to the local community has already been done.The Article 4 Directive should be put in place as soon as possible. The City Council should impliment a policy to return HMO's back into family homes in conjunction with Policy HD7 and work with the Universities to build more self contained student accomodation.	
Policy HD6	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1475	Supporting	Strongly support the 10% limit - see above - but do not support any opportunity to exceed it.	
Policy HD6	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1929	Supporting	Support the proposed policy prohibiting further conversions to HMOs in areas where the proportion of HMOs already exceeds 10%. It is also urged that the Article 4 Direction should be put into place at the earliest possible opportunity.	
Policy HD6	779262	Mr John Bailey		1962	Supporting	Excellent proposals. However, there needs to clarity over the proportion of an area where HMOs will still be allowed to be converted....is this 10 20,30? Or higher say 60,70.	
Policy HD6	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2010	Objecting	Need for Policy?	Query whether the policy is required
Policy HD6	778680	Mark & Dawn Walsh		2138	Supporting	support	
Policy HD6	778683	Ms Sarah Wood		2143	Supporting	Supports restrict concentrations of HMOs (usually student lets) in areas like St Stephen's, so supports policy HD6.	
Policy HD6	778716	Ms Sue Pratt		2164	Supporting	Support HD6 as they are dismayed at the number of family houses that are HMO's which is not good for a balanced community and landlords do not maintain their properties.	
Policy HD6	778712	Mr Robert Keen		2180	Objecting	I support Policy HD6 of the Draft Local Plan.	
Policy HD6	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2200	Supporting	Subject to some caveats regarding its operation, we strongly support the proposed policy prohibiting further conversions to HMOs in areas where the proportion of HMOs already exceeds 10%.	
Policy HD6	778801	A C Strange		2343	Supporting	I consider that we need action to restrict the concentration of HMOs in areas like St Stephens, to preserve the neighbourhood character for its residents and therefore support this policy.	
Policy HD6	778657	Prof J H Strange		2414	Supporting	Support policy HD6 : restrict the concentration of HMOs in areas like St Stephens, to preserve the neighbourhood character for its residents.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD6	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2423	Objecting	Spokes would like to see consideration for a NUL-street parking approach, thus making streets better places for all.	
Policy HD6	778686	Alan & Britta Pearlman		2436	Supporting	Support policy HD6 restricting HMOs in Canterbury. Past failures have created environmental and amenity problems. There are too many HMOs for the available resources, comfort and productive life of residents.	
Policy HD6	779270	Ms Pauline Walters		2460	Supporting	I support policy HD6	
Policy HD6	778956	Dr Michael Forrester		2469	Supporting	Supports policy HD6 restricting HMOs in Canterbury.	
Policy HD6	778868	Mr Tom Tomaszewski		2500	Supporting	I support POLICY HD6	
Policy HD6	778870	Leigh Derbyshire		2526	Supporting	I support HD6 restricting even more HMOs in Canterbury	
Policy HD6	778672	Ms Sheila Kesby		2527	Supporting	Support Policy HD6 in principle: student HMO's are not occupied all year; students are not residents so vulnerable residents are left isolated; Universities should build housing on campus, preserving housing for residents and reducing new builds; students should pay council tax, or landlords should pay business tax so residents don't pay twice; the affordable housing shortage is not caused by retired people living alone; Implement policy to restrict HMO's to 10%; support social policies	In conclusion to my comments above, I think the City Council should: 1. Implement the Plan's policy to restrict HMOs to 10% of residential housing in any one area or neighbourhood. 2. In the event that they really are legally except from community tax, student landlords should pay a business tax, or a specially designated tax, to contribute to the City's income and thus contribute to the services they (landlords and their student tenants) are benefitting from. 3. Accept and support the national social policies for a) keeping people in their own homes for as long as possible and b) avoiding clinically unnecessary attendance in A & E and emergency admissions to acute hospitals by NOT expecting (?forcing) older people to vacate their homes to provide 'affordable housing' for younger people and families. Instead, severely cut the numbers of HMOs as well building new or converting existing, housing stock suited for older people and those with long-term conditions.
Policy HD6	779320	Mr Peter Boys		2670	Supporting	I fully support policy HD6 for the reasons given in paragraphs 2.65 to 2.70. However, it is not clear what is meant by "an exceptionally high proportion" of HMOs or what is meant by "any particular block of properties". Unless an area has become almost saturated with HMOs then no further HMOs should be permitted. Once an area has become saturated there is the danger that an adjacent property, not currently an HMO, may be permitted to become one, unless boundaries are clearly set.	
Policy HD6	779572	Ms Margaret Derbyshire		2766	Supporting	I support policy HD6 restricting even more HMOs in Canterbury	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD6	775862	Mr Clive Flisher		2775	Objecting	I am concerned at the lack of commitment to solving the student housing problem in the city. The policy proposals to restrict HMO's to 10% of the stock in any area are too late; 2.72 refers to the need to avoid worsening the situation; Policy HD7 is restrictive of student accommodation.	These comments and proposals do not go far enough; there should be positive proposals to increase purpose built high density student accommodation to enable the existing stock of housing used as HMO's to be released back to single/family occupation over the plan period.
Policy HD6	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2784	Supporting	I support policy HD6 and think it is most important to restrict the concentrations of Houses in Multiple Occupation.	
Policy HD6	769596	Miss Megan Wells	Vice-President (Welfare) Kent Union	2976	Objecting	Object to the introduction of an Article 4 Direction on the grounds that insufficient evidence has been provided to support its introduction, or to limit the proportion of HMOs as proposed in the Local Plan.	Given the Council has estimated implementing an Article 4 Direction would cost at least £50,000 per year of public money, Why not use this money to tackle the issues felt by members of the local community instead of a wasteful and nonsensical policy implementation. Kent Union commends the work that Canterbury City Council has done in this area already, particularly in relation to new waste management systems but believe more can be done. Kent Union believes that putting money and support into proactive work around waste, problem reporting and noise enforcement is what will achieve results and is a much better use of Local Authority money, than implementing quotas limiting HMOs in a given area.
Policy HD6	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3064	Supporting	HD6: Support the aspiration to prevent further conversions to HMOs if the proportion of HMOs is already 10% or more.	
Policy HD6	499539	Mr Jeremy Barton		3210	Objecting	Would like to see action to restrict the concentration of HMO's in areas such as ours. The four houses behind us are now all student lets causing varying degrees of disruption throughout the year.	
Policy HD6	780293	John & Kate Hills		3212	Supporting	We support policy HD6 restricting even more HMOs in Canterbury.	
Policy HD6	780314	Ms Helen Gardiner		3224	Supporting	Concentrations of HMOs must be restricted in areas where there are already a significant number of these, e.g. St Stephen's area, and therefore I support policy HD6	
Policy HD6	405809	Mrs Denise Horswell	Clerk Hackington Parish Council	3296	Supporting	Houses of Multiple Occupation If the HMO proposed restrictions are accepted it will provide a good level of protection against an increase in the number of student houses in the village.	
Policy HD6	479400	Dr Doreen Rosman		3384	Supporting	Welcomes Policy HD6 preventing further HMO's when there are 10% or more, this needs to be calculated on a road by road basis if they are grouped it will change the proportions.	
Policy HD6	779697	B J & J M J Carpenter		3397	Objecting	Object to policy HD6. Although the first part is a step in the right direction the second part is worrying. Ringwood CI is 75% HMO's how will policy HD6 protect their neighbourhood. Once properties are converted they won't revert back to family housing. The shortage of family housing is entirely because of HMO's. If this in not stopped Canterbury will lose its balanced community. They feel let down. The article 4 should have been implemented earlier.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD6	780207	Pru Cherry	The Whitstable Road Residents Association	3400	Supporting	Support policy HD6 and welcome the plan to control the numbers of HMOs in Canterbury. How the Council will accurately assess the proportion of houses already converted to HMOs in any neighbourhood. Our own research revealed that the Council's figures on existing HMOs were underestimated.	
Policy HD6	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3410	Supporting	I support policy HD6 restricting even more HMOs in Canterbury	
Policy HD6	479719	Dr Robert Jupe		3497	Supporting	I support policy HD6 to limit the number of HMOs in the area on environmental grounds.	
Policy HD6	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3872	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent generally supports this Policy but: i,- Add to the start of the second para: "In order to encourage the return of HMO property to private (as opposed to student) residential use, the City Council may in suitable cases permit the conversion of HMOs into more than one residential unit."; Delete "consideration will be given to permitting" and add to end "will not be permitted"	Add to the start of the second para: "In order to encourage the return of HMO property to private (as opposed to student) residential use, the City Council may in suitable cases permit the conversion of HMOs into more than one residential unit." Delete "consideration will be given to permitting" and add to end "will not be permitted"
Policy HD6	780731	Mr T J Patten		4201	Supporting	I support the proposal to restrict the concentration of student HMOs and cannot understand why extreme examples such as Downs Road have ever been allowed.	
Policy HD6	780980	Ms Cecilia Duggan		4229	Supporting	I agree with HD6 and 2.71 regarding HMOs. Requiring universities to provide accommodation to cater for any future expansion in numbers is essential.	
Policy HD6	780983	Mr Martin Ward		4266	Supporting	The number of HMOs must be restricted both in overall numbers and concentration. I live very near to the University of Kent and we are surrounded by HMOs, mostly let to students. The presence of both such a large number of these types of properties and their high concentration distorts the social fabric of the locality, it adds to greater amounts of litter and general disturbance. These are houses designed for families and that is who should be living in them. I support Policy HD6	
Policy HD6	780985	Ms Jennifer Keaveney		4278	Objecting	I support policy HD6 which aims to restrict the proportion of HMOs to no more than 10% of the total number of dwellings and not to permit changes of use to HMOs, or extensions to existing HMOs, where that proportion is exceeded. However, I would argue that "in areas where there is an exceptionally high proportion of HMOs in any particular block of properties", any further conversions should be equally restricted and that no increase in the current overall proportion of HMOs should be permitted.	Amend policy
Policy HD6	781064	Mr Richard Grayson		4347	Supporting	Policy HD6 - I support this policy that seeks to restrict concentrations of Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs). Presently, significant swathes of Canterbury's suburban area are being changed as stable family housing gives way to student lets with their transitory tenants.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD6	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4662	Objecting	Strongly supports the prohibition of further conversions to HMO's where the proportion will exceed 10%. BUT; part 2 allowing increased in proportions needs to be more carefully and tightly worded to avoid a free for all; an Article 4 direction should be put in place ASAP and take immediate effect. No need for further consultation or notice as it has been done; An additional licensing scheme be put in place to ensure good maintenance of HMO's	An Article 4 direction should be put in place ASAP and take immediate effect. Develop a robust procedure for identifying existing HMOs. Implement an Additional License (as in Oxford) to counter the poor quality and maintenance of many HMOs.
Policy HD6	781637	Mr Brendan Power		4791	Supporting	We need action to restrict concentrations of HMOs (usually student lets) in areas like ours, so I support policy HD6.	
Policy HD6	781595	Ms Laura Jowers		4792	Supporting	We need action to restrict concentrations of HMOs (usually student lets) in areas like ours, so I support policy HD6.	
Policy HD6	782449	Ms Jayne Ward		5137	Supporting	The number of HMOs must be restricted both in overall numbers and concentration. I live very near to the University of Kent and we are surrounded by HMOs, mostly let to students. The presence of both such a large number of these types of properties and their high concentration distorts the social fabric of the locality, it adds to greater amounts of litter and general disturbance. These are houses designed for families and that is who should be living in them. I support Policy HD6	
Policy HD6	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5228	Supporting	I also welcome the new policy HD6 on Houses of Multiple Occupancy.	
Policy HD6	127115	B.J. Gore		5268	Objecting	Concerned that planning permission has been granted on prime housing sites for student accommodation plus encouragement of HMOs. Canterbury has lost 1000s of homes for locals to students. There is little in draft plan to suggest this has changed. Unconvinced that students contribute all that much financially as they are only here for 8 months and ave limited income. Jobs they indirectly provide in city would still be there with less students. City may be more attractive to employers and visitors	
Policy HD6	421400	Mr Ben Knox		5295	Supporting	I support policy HD6 restricting even more houses in multiple occupancy in Canterbury. The Council should go further to actively seek to reduce number of HMOs by working with the universities to provide on-campus accommodation for students. This should release a significant number of houses for single occupancy.	
Policy HD6	781622	Mr T Whiting		5395	Supporting	With regard to HMO"s any plan must have some regard to the ultimate affect on a particular area, I feel for every area there should be a percentage limit on HMOs to keep everything in proportion. I therefore support policy HD6	
Policy HD6	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5539	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'On Housing'. This includes the concern over HMO's.	
Policy HD6	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5672	Objecting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:€€ HMO policy HD6	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD6	784813	Ms Julie Sargeanty		5842	Supporting	Living in an area where the amount of HMO's is fast overtaking the amount of residential properties, where most nights are disturbed; where parking for residents is almost impossible; where the poor condition and appearance of many of the properties is a blight on the area; where wheelie bins and rubbish constantly litter pathways and gardens; where the value of properties is affected.It is with the above in mind I support Policy HD6.	
Policy HD6	784807	Mr John Pike		5939	Supporting	I support policy HD6 restricting even more HMOs in Canterbury.	
Policy HD6	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	6004	Supporting	We strongly support the proposed policy prohibiting further conversions to HMOs in areas where the proportion of HMOs already exceeds 10%.We urge that the proposed Article 4 Direction should be put into place at the earliest possible opportunity.We would also like to emphasise that in order to implement this policy, Canterbury City Council must develop a robust procedure for identifying existing HMOs.	
Policy HD6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6220	Objecting	Needs to be implemented at the earliest opportunity, but with a much lower target. 10% looks too high, particularly as more student accommodation is built and the student population overall is not expected to increase.	Suggest: If an area has an exceptionally high proportion of HMOs, only in exceptional circumstances will consideration be given to permitting further conversions, and then only with the positive support of all non-HMO dwellings within a 100m radius. This assumes regard of the following factors a), b) and c) ... As an addition, could there also be strong reference regarding the consideration of non-student neighbour
Policy HD6	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6359	Supporting	I support these paragraphs with provisos. Comment: I strongly agree on the need to halt the conversion of family houses into HMOs in areas in which the proportion of HMOs is greater than 10%, and I would urge a rapid implementation of the Article 4 Direction. My proviso concerns the second half of policy HD6 as this looks like a get-out clause. This needs to be reformulated.	
Policy HD6	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6861	Objecting	The plan will broadly encourage on-campus student housing, and discourage further intensification of HMOs (ref policies HD6, HD7). However, there is inadequate clarity and force in the policies. There should be a policy that specifically requires the universities to build so as to house increasing numbers of students on university land. Numbers cannot be arbitrarily set, but CCC should work actively with the institutions to enhance the master plans with significant increases in student accomm.	
Policy HD6	785163	Canterbury Christ Church University		6960	Objecting	Whilst an ideal solution is for purpose built student accommodation, CCCU finds that many students,esp 2nd and 3rd years, prefer to live independently often in HMOs. Recognise that a proliferation of HMOs in certain areas can cause social and amenity issues, it is considered that the restrictions in HD6 & Art 4 is prohibitive restrictive. Objects to 10% within 100m suggests 25% more appropriate. CCCU assumes CCC will set up & maintain a publicly accessible record of HMOs across Art 4 Dir area.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.71	408452	Mr & Mrs Raymond and Marion Bell		202	Supporting	There are currently over 400 homes for sale in CT1 and CT4 (Rightmove.com) and if the Council were to insist on the UKC building more student accommodation on campus (but not on Chaucer Fields) this would free up many more homes currently rented out to students.	
2.71	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		503	Supporting	The encouragement of more student accommodation may release houses back into the general market. An estimate of the numbers should be included in the overall numbers of houses required.	Include in the overall picture a number for the houses released back into the housing market
2.71	665473	Dr Richard Norman		541	Supporting	Agree strongly with the need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family housing for occupation by families.	
2.71	775856	Mr Michael McDonnell		641	Supporting	Definitely support the Council's aim to encourage purpose built student accommodation and am pleased to see that the City Council will work with the universities and colleges to ensure that it is their intention to build either on campus and on areas available in the surrounding area.	
2.71	776445	Dr Grainne Evans		645	Supporting	Support for universities to construct their own purpose built student housing to accommodate student numbers.	
2.71	777424	Mrs & Mrs Edmed		858	Supporting	Support for more purpose built student accommodation to release family housing in Canterbury	
2.71	777570	Mr J K Rishworth		1068	Supporting	In some streets nearly every house is let to students, and many residential areas have become blighted for normal family life due to student life-styles. The document at present lacks: Measures to recover residential housing from student lettings, with more students housed in purpose-built accommodation. This could supply a significant number of family homes towards the number desired.	
2.71	776710	N & R.J Smith		1119	Supporting	The Council should work with higher education institutions to provide increased residential places for students; returning a higher proportion of housing to permanent occupants.	
2.71	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1218	Supporting	We agree that there is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family-sized homes for occupation by families. We support all the proposed conditions listed in HD7 for granting permission for purpose-built student accommodation.	
2.71	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1446	Supporting	Student demand for private rented accommodation reduces the availability of family homes and alters character of neighbourhoods. Inflationary pressure on rents and house prices. UKC is increasing campus units and CCCU are expanding halls of residence. Has this been taken into account in forecasts? How many more houses could be released by aggressive programmes on the part of universities?	
2.71	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1476	Supporting	Any further student accommodation should be centrally at UKC and not on the Southern Slopes - which would change the character of the City irreversibly	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.71	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1930	Supporting	There is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family-sized homes for occupation by families. Support all the proposed conditions listed in HD7 for granting permission for purpose-built student accommodation.	
2.71	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2284	Objecting	Recently, both universities have expanded their building of student accommodation, and growth of student numbers has declined. Currently, UKC is building a further 900 student rooms and CCCU is working with an organization which has had planning permission granted for over 400 student rooms	We recommend strongly that the Council as part of its planning proposals adopts the practice and system of Oxford City Council and acts to get the universities to reduce still further the pressure that student numbers put on the city's housing stock, either by building or by limiting student numbers. On this basis we believe it is possible for the Council to adopt a level of house building at the lower end of the range of 600 or 700 a year that NLP proposes.
2.71	407886	Mr J and P Booth		3523	Objecting	There is reference to having housing and employment opportunities available for graduates from the local universities, this is not normally recognised as being an aspiration appropriate for the local authority so why does it appear here?	
2.71	780731	Mr T J Patten		4202	Supporting	The University of Kent should provide more on-campus student accommodation, thus freeing up housing for normal occupancy when we are told that there is a considerable shortage of such housing. A side issue affecting the University is, of course, student numbers and the extent to which they will be affected by fee increases, if , indeed, they are at all.	
2.71	780980	Ms Cecilia Duggan		4230	Supporting	I agree with HD6 and 2.71 regarding HMOs. Requiring universities to provide accommodation to cater for any future expansion in numbers is essential.	
2.71	780982	Mr John Hedington		4265	Supporting	Another suggestion that came out of a recent meeting of parishioners was that students should be rehoused on the Kent University site, thus freeing up housing for others within the City.	
2.71	781255	Robert & Sandra Shine		4504	Supporting	One focus should be building more campus student accommodation.	
2.71	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4663	Supporting	Agrees there is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family homes. Support conditions in HD7. Agree that student housing should not be built on housing allocations. Accommodation should be built on campus. University should focus on building well designed attractive student accommodation not high end conference facilities.	
2.71	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6221	Objecting	There seems to be a varying approach to the District's student population statistics in the various papers, reports etc. It is not always clear what difference/influence this has on the argument. It would be helpful if there is a clear constant for all future calculations, with the student situation shown separately from the non-student residential one, making it clear how the total has been reached.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.71	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6360	Supporting	I support these paragraphs and this policy. Comment: While I support these paragraphs and this policy, I would strongly oppose the building of student accommodation on the southern slopes of the campus of the University of Kent as these form a very important green buffer between the university and the neighbouring residential area.	
2.72	665473	Dr Richard Norman		542	Supporting	Agree that any increase in student numbers should be matched by an equivalent increase in student accommodation. But in view of the need to release family housing for occupation by families, and the limited space for more purpose-built student accommodation, this should in practice mean no further increases in student numbers by the universities.	
2.72	775856	Mr Michael McDonnell		642	Supporting	Fully support this paragraph but again would encourage Kent University to build more accommodation on campus and Christchurch University to continue their building on various sites in Canterbury.	
2.72	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1219	Supporting	We agree that there is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family-sized homes for occupation by families. We support all the proposed conditions listed in HD7 for granting permission for purpose-built student accommodation.	
2.72	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1477	Supporting	UKC can build centrally, but not on the Southern Slopes	
2.72	779262	Mr John Bailey		1963	Supporting	But with the rider that the open space gaps in existence are not eroded and UKC builds on land that does not affect local residents... i.e. keeping the campus style UKC.	
2.72	479400	Dr Doreen Rosman		3383	Supporting	The problem in Canterbury is a shortage of affordable houses. Many of the affordable houses available 35 years ago are now taken up by students, on campus accommodation provision would free up houses for residents.	
2.72	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4667	Supporting	Agrees there is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family homes. Support conditions in HD7. Agree that student housing should not be built on housing allocations. Accommodation should be built on campus. University should focus on building well designed attractive student accommodation not high end conference facilities.	
2.72	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6361	Supporting	I support these paragraphs and this policy. Comment: While I support these paragraphs and this policy, I would strongly oppose the building of student accommodation on the southern slopes of the campus of the University of Kent as these form a very important green buffer between the university and the neighbouring residential area.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.73	767055	Ms Julie Mecoli		93	Supporting	The proposed plan to build 4000 new homes at the end of Old and New Dover Road is of great concern and should not happen. Where is the convincing evidence new houses are actually needed in this location? At what point does the council actually take a stand and put forward a sustainable future for Canterbury, not one of constant expansion? Not only are many houses in Canterbury empty, the universities continue to build more student accommodation leaving more housing for residents.	
2.73	772987	Mrs Doreen Louren		309	Supporting	Students could be more appropriately accommodated by the Universities, resulting in property being freed up within the conurbation.	Encourage the universities to expand their student housing offer by further developing their existing resources to free up property in the the conurbation.
2.73	775856	Mr Michael McDonnell		649	Supporting	Support this paragraph providing it is for purpose-built managed student accommodation that does not interfere with the local residents of Canterbury district.	
2.73	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1220	Supporting	We agree that there is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family-sized homes for occupation by families. We support all the proposed conditions listed in HD7 for granting permission for purpose-built student accommodation, including in particular the conditions that it should not be in a location allocated for general housing.	
2.73	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2467	Objecting	Other Transport Policies that need inclusion in the Draft Local Plan Spokes would like to see a district wide 20 mph policy applied to all residential areas. Spokes would like to see a 40mph speed limit (at least) applied to country lanes in line with DfT circular 01/2013 and in Traffic Advisory Leaflets 1/04 and 3/04.	
2.73	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4668	Supporting	Agrees there is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family homes. Support conditions in HD7. Agree that student housing should not be built on housing allocations. Accommodation should be built on campus. University should focus on building well designed attractive student accommodation not high end conference facilities.	
2.73	406381	Ms Julia Gavriel		5214	Supporting	We need more purpose built student accommodation in city centre sites unsuitable for families, with warden controlled, cutting down on antisocial behaviour. Do not need gardens or parking, so do not affect traffic volumes. HMO's would be released for affordable housing for families and would result in a better living environment for those families. It seems a huge omission not to address this in a city with 3 Universities.	
2.73	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6022	Supporting	Supportive of proposals for the main universities to make greater provision for their student accommodation needs.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.73	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6362	Supporting	I support these paragraphs and this policy. Comment: While I support these paragraphs and this policy, I would strongly oppose the building of student accommodation on the southern slopes of the campus of the University of Kent as these form a very important green buffer between the university and the neighbouring residential area.	
2.74	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1221	Supporting	We agree that there is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family-sized homes for occupation by families. We support all the proposed conditions listed in HD7 for granting permission for purpose-built student accommodation, including in particular the conditions that it should not be in a location allocated for general housing.	
2.74	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1931	Supporting	There is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family-sized homes for occupation by families. Support all the proposed conditions listed in HD7 for granting permission for purpose-built student accommodation.	
2.74	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3873	Objecting	Add a new para as follows: "2.75 The City Council will encourage the building of such accommodation in and around the District where there are good transport links to the places of education and subject to policy HD6."	Add a new para as follows: "2.75 The City Council will encourage the building of such accommodation in and around the District where there are good transport links to the places of education and subject to policy HD6."
2.74	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4669	Supporting	Agrees there is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family homes. Support conditions in HD7. Agree that student housing should not be built on housing allocations. Accommodation should be built on campus. University should focus on building well designed attractive student accommodation not high end conference facilities.	
2.74	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6363	Supporting	I support these paragraphs and this policy. Comment: While I support these paragraphs and this policy, I would strongly oppose the building of student accommodation on the southern slopes of the campus of the University of Kent as these form a very important green buffer between the university and the neighbouring residential area.	
Policy HD7	775862	Mr Clive Flisher		339	Objecting	5000 existing homes let to students. Land to be identified close to the universities for student "halls", designed so as to enable existing/ new private investors to buy on the back of assured rents. Thus releasing homes back to family occupation - many will be of "affordable" value to rent or buy. This should also bring ex-council type housing values in Canterbury back to par with those in Whitstable/Herne Bay over the period.	Complete change to student accommodation strategy. NOTE - I have been valuing these properties in Canterbury Whitstable and Herne Bay for lenders for the last 30 years.

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD7	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		350	Supporting	Sites must also be well served for pedestrians and cyclists. High quality cycle storage provision must be provided.	I fully support this policy and would make the following additions: In addition to the site being well served by public transport the site must be well served for pedestrians and cyclists. This could be achieved by the provision of new pedestrian / cycle paths as part of the development, in which case these paths must be completed prior to the initial occupancy of the student accommodation to ensure that they can be used from the outset. These paths must also be adoptable to be able to benefit the wider community; The cycle storage provision must be covered, or high quality that will properly support the frame of bicycles (e.g. Sheffield stands and not €œwheelbenders"), easy to find, located conveniently close to building entrances, well surveilled and lit, properly spaced so as to ensure that all of the cycle parking can be effectively used (as defined in the Kent Vehicle Parking Standards), and must meet or exceed the minimum quantity of cycle parking set out in the Kent Vehicle Parking Standards for dedicated student accommodation (1 bicycle per 5 students).
Policy HD7	665473	Dr Richard Norman		543	Supporting	Agree with these conditions to be placed on building of more purpose-built student accommodation. In the case of the University of Kent this means that any additional student accommodation on the campus should be in the central area of the campus, and there should be no student accommodation on the southern slopes, which would be adjacent to a residential area where there is already a high concentration of HMOs.	
Policy HD7	366511	Mr Tony Couperthwaite		810	Supporting	Object to development at South Canterbury. There are other alternatives. Steering Universities to build 'student accommodation' on their existing land, of which they have plenty, instead of buying up land that could be used for local housing.	
Policy HD7	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1222	Supporting	We agree that there is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family-sized homes for occupation by families. We support all the proposed conditions listed in HD7 for granting permission for purpose-built student accommodation.	
Policy HD7	778387	Mr David Smith		1334	Supporting	Additionally The City Council should ensure that The University of Kent does not try again to propose development of The Southern Slopes of the campus which is designated as an AHLV, and in the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal (area 28 Stour Valley Slopes) it is recommended that action should be taken to "encourage its conservation and restoration".	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD7	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1932	Supporting	There is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family-sized homes for occupation by families. Support all the proposed conditions listed in HD7 for granting permission for purpose-built student accommodation.	
Policy HD7	779262	Mr John Bailey		1964	Supporting	Very good proposals.	
Policy HD7	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2203	Supporting	We agree that there is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family-sized homes for occupation by families. We support all the proposed conditions listed in HD7 for granting permission for purpose-built student accommodation.	
Policy HD7	778868	Mr Tom Tomaszewski		2501	Objecting	The idea of further building of student lets appalls me.	
Policy HD7	779320	Mr Peter Boys		2673	Supporting	I support policy HD7 for the reasons given in paragraphs 2.71-2.74. However in order to re-balance the housing stock it may be advisable to re-designate some sites already designated for general housing for student accommodation.	
Policy HD7	780209	B O'Byrne		3008	Supporting	Limit to student housing: To minimise loss of family housing closer to the city centre; provide areas of dedicated student housing, e.g. on the old prison and army sites, need to be included in the local plan.	Limit student housing, include student housing at barracks and prison.
Policy HD7	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3619	Objecting	Insufficient attention is paid to the impact of Student Housing. We propose an increase in custom-built Student Housing, especially but not only at the Prison and at Howe Barracks with its existing facilities. This could greatly reduce the number of HMOs.	
Policy HD7	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3874	Objecting	Generally supports this Policy but: Amend point a: "It is the acceptable redevelopment of an existing non-residential site where there is no longer a proven need for the existing use and the site is unsuitable for private housing." Delete point e as it conflicts with point g. Add to point g: "with occupiers contracting not to bring their cars to the town or city where the development is situated" Point h after "policies" alter to "DBE2, DBE3, DBE4, DBE5 and DBE6"	Amend point a: "It is the acceptable redevelopment of an existing non-residential site where there is no longer a proven need for the existing use and the site is unsuitable for private housing." Delete point e as it conflicts with point g. Add to point g: "with occupiers contracting not to bring their cars to the town or city where the development is situated" Point h after "policies" alter to "DBE2, DBE3, DBE4, DBE5 and DBE6"
Policy HD7	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4670	Supporting	Agrees there is a need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family homes. Support conditions in HD7. Agree that student housing should not be built on housing allocations. Accommodation should be built on campus. University should focus on building well designed attractive student accommodation not high end conference facilities.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD7	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4684	Objecting	This is a major concern amongst residents in the City and one which the Local Plan does little to ameliorate.	We recommend that the Council look sympathetically on any proposal to build additional student accommodation, respecting the need for good design and protection of green spaces, in order to reduce pressure on traditional residential housing. In doing so, the Council could meet its target for units of housebuilding without the need for mass construction in south Canterbury and other areas. The Council should also examine how other university cities (e.g. Oxford) have addressed problems of student overspill into residential areas, and draw lessons relevant to Canterbury.
Policy HD7	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4955	Objecting	The exceptionally large number of students in Canterbury has a significant adverse impact on the housing market in the District. We feel that the City universities should be required and encouraged to provide sufficient housing for their students, preferably on campus and in locations that are suitable in planning and environmental terms. This would free up large numbers of houses for local people to occupy.	We feel that the City universities should be required and encouraged to provide sufficient housing for their students, preferably on campus and in locations that are suitable in planning and environmental terms. We would recommend that the universities be required to submit their projections for student numbers and their proposals for student accommodation together with a land use Masterplan which can be rolled forward contemporaneously with the Local Plan. We also recommend that The Council consult and adopt a Policy in the Local Plan, similar to Policy CS25 (Student Accommodation) in the Oxford City Council Core Strategy 2026 as follows: "Planning permission will only be granted for additional academic/administrative accommodation for the University of Oxford and for Oxford Brookes University where the university can demonstrate in the first place that the number of full time students at that university, who live in Oxford but outside of university provided accommodation, will before the particular development is completed be below the 3,000 level and once that figure is reached, thereafter will not exceed that level. All future increases in student numbers at the two universities as a result of increases in academic/administrative floor space must be matched by a corresponding increase in purpose built student accommodation. Student accommodation will be restricted in occupation to students in full time education on courses of an academic year or more. Appropriate management controls will be secured, including an undertaking that students do not
Policy HD7	127115	B.J. Gore		5269	Objecting	City is full to overflowing with people and traffic, there needs to be strict adhesion to current City boundaries, and a redress of the housing balance in favour of locals. One way of doing this would be to tell the Universities and Colleges that they must: Build on-campus student accommodation, or in urban areas away from the City with good transport links. Limit amount of students to a level City can cope with. Work towards getting HMOs back for private housing.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD7	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5543	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'On Housing'. This includes the concern over HMO's.	
Policy HD7	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5673	Supporting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:€€ Support for purpose-built student accommodation with provisos €€ Policy HD7	
Policy HD7	380265	Pavilion Property group	Pavillion Property	5787	Objecting	Land North of Stour Promenade, Glenside Avenue - proposal for Protected Open Space and Student Accommodation. There is no reason why the site will come forward for open space purposes - no financial justification without enabling development .Compulsory purchase action is improbable. Our proposals are sound and financially viable. They would facilitate the delivery of high quality open space, including equipped play space. The need to student accommodation is recognised.	Propose this site is amended to show the site part as Open Space and part for student purpose-built student accommodation.
Policy HD7	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	6005	Objecting	We agree that there is some need for more purpose-built student accommodation to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family-sized homes for occupation by families, but question that this may be met by the new developments currently taking place 800plus bedrooms on University of Kent central campus, and more bedrooms on old Peugeot site in liaison with Christchurch.We strongly oppose the building of student accommodation on the southern slopes of the campus.	
Policy HD7	781581	UNITE Group PLC		6194	Objecting	Policy HD7 need further flexibility through the recognition that off-campus purpose built student accommodation contributes to housing land supply. Consideration of purpose built student accommodation as a component of conventional housing supply would ensure impact of students can be mitigated As a result the reference within Policy HD7 to comply with restrictive criteria in HMO Policy HD6 is unjustified and therefore unsound, as defined by NPPF Para182 and should be removed. Remove part a)	Delete from part a) "where there is no longer a proven need for the existing use;" Amend part b) by deleting "is not already allocated for general" and replace with "would not compromise overall capacity to meet general housing need;" Delete from part c) "and therefore conflict with HMO policy H5"
Policy HD7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6222	Objecting	Perhaps the Council Offices could be converted to student accommodation? As Sturry is such a good transport hub, the relocation of the Council Offices here could be a serious possibility. Council Staff could, also be travelling in the opposite direction to rush hour traffic, easing congestion - an added bonus.	
Policy HD7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6223	Objecting	As an additional consideration, could there be inclusion of a factor to limit the 'nuisance to neighbours'?	
Policy HD7	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6364	Supporting	I support these paragraphs and this policy. Comment: While I support these paragraphs and this policy, I would strongly oppose the building of student accommodation on the southern slopes of the campus of the University of Kent as these form a very important green buffer between the university and the neighbouring residential area.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD7	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6862	Objecting	The plan will broadly encourage on-campus student housing, and discourage further intensification of HMOs (ref policies HD6, HD7). However, there is inadequate clarity and force in the policies. There should be a policy that specifically requires the universities to build so as to house increasing numbers of students on university land. Numbers cannot be arbitrarily set, but CCC should work actively with the institutions to enhance the master plans with significant increases in student accomm.	
Policy HD7	784489	Dr Robert Mayer		6956	Objecting	Completely against your un-researched, yesterday's thinking plan for purpose-built, managed, student accommodation on appropriate sites, plus Article 4 Direction. Having experience in student housing I assure you that this accommodation is far more expensive for students and tide of student opinion has changed against this. Support local economy by retaining student private lets. Purpose built accomm is often ugly, expensive and designed to make money, alienate students, future liability.	
Policy HD7	785163	Canterbury Christ Church University		6961	Objecting	Welcomes support for purpose built student accommodation but students shouldn't be forced into this as 2nd 3rd years prefer HMOs. Final sentence of para 2.74 should be deleted as considers this and HMOs together when different use classes, thereby putting purpose built accomm under Article 4. Sentence is contradictory and should be deleted. Criteria c should be deleted from HD7	It is requested that the final sentence of supporting paragraph 2.74 and criteria c of Policy HD7 be deleted accordingly. The reference to 'HMO policy H5' in criteria c is confusing and it is assumed that this should in fact read 'HMO policy HD6'.
2.75	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		966	Supporting	Retention of Housing Accommodation, paragraph 2.75: There has been a trend for smaller shops in secondary shopping areas to be converted to residential use. This should not be discouraged for reasons given above on retail trends.	
2.75	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6224	Objecting	... to achieve a balanced mix across the District. Hopefully this aim for balance will be seen at sub-district level as well.	
Policy HD8	777305	Mr Jason Hobbs	Area Manager Homes and Communities Agency	1604	Supporting	The HCA support Policy HD8 that seeks to retain housing accommodation.	
Policy HD8	779262	Mr John Bailey		1965	Supporting	Very good proposals.	
Policy HD8	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5685	Supporting	More specific positives:- Retention of housing policy HD8 and 2.77-2.79	
Policy HD8	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6226	Supporting	Seems sound	
2.76	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5674	Supporting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:€ Desire to bring empty houses back into use; aspiration in 2.76 good (but needs more focus and specific action)	
2.76	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6225	Objecting	Bringing back empty property into use. With 600-700 empty properties in the District this is an excellent aim. What priority will this be given? Is it deliverable? If so, is the scale of new build justified?	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.77	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5682	Supporting	More specific positives:€€ Retention of housing policy HD8 and 2.77-2.79	
2.77	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6228	Supporting	Seem straight forward	
2.78	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5683	Supporting	More specific positives:· Retention of housing policy HD8 and 2.77-2.79	
2.79	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5684	Supporting	More specific positives:· Retention of housing policy HD8 and 2.77-2.79	
Policy HD9	777305	Mr Jason Hobbs	Area Manager Homes and Communities Agency	1605	Supporting	The HCA supports the policy that seeks to bring empty residential property back into residential use including vacant residential properties and spaces above shops.	
Policy HD9	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2013	Objecting	Object €" to the inclusion of paragraph (b	Suggest deletion of this clause.
Policy HD9	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3411	Supporting	I also support policy HD9 which aims to ensure that empty residential property is occupied.	
Policy HD9	781238	Mr R N Warnick		4340	Supporting	For the past 11 weeks I have been waiting for planning permission for what I believe to be a routine renovation and enlargement of living space. This seems to be a priority under HD9 of the development plan and yet the Planning Dept is unable to process the application due to the pressure of other matters. Bringing empty property back into proper residential use should have a higher priority than promoting the building of new property - but this does not seem to be the case at the moment.	
Policy HD9	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5546	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'On Housing'. This includes the desire to increase over the shop accommodation.	
Policy HD9	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5675	Supporting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:· Desire to bring empty houses back into use; aspiration in HD9 good (but needs more focus and specific action)	
Policy HD9	784807	Mr John Pike		5940	Supporting	I also support policy HD9 which aims to ensure that empty residential property is occupied.	
Policy HD9	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6083	Supporting	The Council should maintain and update annually its register of empty property in the area and publish strategies for its use. People without homes should be proactively consulted on policies for housing provision. Thereafter, advice and help should be given to such groups to make proposals about the use of empty property, and to put those proposals into effect.	
2.80	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6227	Objecting	Has there been sufficient provision in the Plan? The Plan's provision for supported living accommodation similar to Sturry's Franklyn House and Sturry Court Mews is inadequate.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.81	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	756	Objecting	The Council needs to be careful that it is planning for enough new housing to cater for the needs of elderly people as well as the knowledge workers it hopes to attract, otherwise there is the potential that elderly but more asset rich households will compete against knowledge workers for access to the limited housing stock. Such a situation could militate against the employment objectives of the plan.	This is why we consider that scenarios I and J provide a more reliable and objective basis for the assessment of need.
2.81	788181	Mr Gary Day	McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	4969	Objecting	The Council's use of 'self-containment' as a means of determining whether and Extra Care Development is C2 or C3 Use Class and consequently exempt from affordable housing contributions appears to arbitrary and contrary to recent case precedent (see 'Gladman'). Clearly self-containment is not a valid means of determining whether a development is C2 or C3. Further Extra Care Development have a tight viability threshold and unjustified burdens will be counter-productive.	The Council's proposed requirement for seeking Affordable Housing Contributions from self-contained residential institution is a radical departure from the accepted stance on seeking affordable housing contributions from C2 developments and as such needs to be robustly justified.
2.81	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5853	Supporting	KCC supports the recognition of the need for accommodation to meet the needs of older people. The provision of attractive and suitable housing for older people within the District will be of key importance. KCC would like to see a reduction in the use of some types of residential care provision for all social client groups and a greater focus on housing options, to create better independence. KCC would welcome provision of extra care housing to cater for growing care needs for older people.	
2.81	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5930	Objecting	Add "of all new" after 20% in first sentence. Please refer to Better Homes: housing for the third age - A framework for delivering older people's accommodation across Kent and Medway by Kent Housing Group and Joint Policy and Planning Board. http://www.kenthousinggroup.org.uk/uploads/OPFrameworkFINAL.pdf This document provides the recommended Use Class Order for accommodation for older people	Add "of all new" after 20% in first sentence. Please refer to Better Homes: housing for the third age - A framework for delivering older people's accommodation across Kent and Medway by Kent Housing Group and Joint Policy and Planning Board. http://www.kenthousinggroup.org.uk/uploads/OPFrameworkFINAL.pdf This document provides the recommended Use Class Order for accommodation for older people
2.81	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6161	Objecting	Needs of different groups (para 2.32)...Lifetime standard homes would take this into account and would not be too costly. It would create a more sustainable community. The Council's target of 20% [see para 2.80] is too low.. The Adams Integra Economic Viability Assessment stated "if the council chose to have all new housing built to Lifetime Homes [standard] then it would not have a significant negative effect on scheme viability".	
2.81	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6229	Objecting	Please reconsider a greater proportion of 'lifetime home standard' at the same time. Note: This is also covered in paras 8.46 and 8.47. Cross reference?	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
2.82	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5962	Objecting	The text in bold should be added to the following paragraph: 2The location of these types of development is important, as the use should be compatible with surrounding uses and not impact on wider residential amenity, the character of the area and should be accessible to local shops, services, public transport and other public facilities".	The text in bold should be added to the following paragraph: 2The location of these types of development is important, as the use should be compatible with surrounding uses and not impact on wider residential amenity, the character of the area and should be accessible to local shops, services, public transport and other public facilities".
2.83	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4022	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent find it disappointing that the City Council will not be seeking to address the issue of gypsy and traveller sites in the Local Plan, and that the identification of sites is being deferred to a future DPD	
2.83	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6230	Supporting	2.83 to 2.85 - seems reasonable	
2.84	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3875	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent find it disappointing that the City Council will not be seeking to address the issue of gypsy and traveller sites in the Local Plan, and that the identification of sites is being deferred to a future DPD	
2.85	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		968	Objecting	Gypsy and Traveller Sites, paragraph 2.85: As stated in the draft plan, there is only one permanent gypsy site in the District and this is almost full. It is vital that one or more additional sites are identified in the plan to prevent travellers buying land and setting up their own sites at unsuitable locations.	
2.85	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4023	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent find it disappointing that the City Council will not be seeking to address the issue of gypsy and traveller sites in the Local Plan, and that the identification of sites is being deferred to a future DPD	
Policy HD10	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		970	Supporting	POLICY HD10: Gypsy and Traveller Sites. I welcome the proposed criteria to be used when considering applications for Gypsy and Traveller sites.	
Policy HD10	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1769	Supporting	This policy supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance. All caravan sites/mobile home sites are considered inappropriate development within the AONB unless strict criteria are met that conserve and enhance the KDAONB.	
Policy HD10	779286	Mr Mark Aplin	Planning Policy Team Leader Shepway District Council	2068	Supporting	Shepway partners Canterbury in the Needs Assessment work researching Gypsy and Traveller requirements. Canterbury's stated approach should be kept under review given gov. preference for single Plans and the likelihood that the evidence will be available in time to be incorporated in the Local Plan; a clear timetable to tackle the issues should be set. The duty to cooperate will apply but it cannot be assumed sustainable, or feasible, for Shepway to help meet Canterbury's needs in this respect.	
Policy HD10	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3055	Supporting	Welcome the protection of the designated sites and natural habitat.	

Summary Chapter 2 - Housing Development

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HD10	758936	Mr Mike Walling	Chair Ethnic Minority Independant Council	5054	Objecting	EMIC notes that the Council is working with Thanet, Dover and Shepway on a review of the GTAA (2007).Swale Borough's Local Plan suggests that they might also have valuable experience and expertise in this sensitive matter. EMIC welcomes Swale's general approach including their relevant policies for Affordable Housing provision and commends it to Canterbury Council when they undertake their GTAA review and development plan document.	EMIC welcomes Swale's general approach including their relevant policies for Affordable Housing provision and commends it to Canterbury Council when they undertake their GTAA review and development plan document.
Policy HD10	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5376	Objecting	Gypsy and traveller sites must be provided with essential services, such as wastewater disposal. The amenity of residents must be protected. Sites for gypsies and travellers adjacent to wastewater treatment works and other wastewater facilities should only be permitted if the distance to the works is allows adequate odour and noise dispersion. This should be recognised in the criteria for unallocated sites. Amend as outlined.	Add the following criteria to policy HD10: h. The site is capable of being provided with on-site services for water supply and sewage disposal. i. The site is not adversely affected by pollution, including noise and odour, so that the amenity and well-being of occupants is protected. Proposals adjacent to wastewater treatment facilities will only be permitted if the distance between the facility and the development is sufficient to allow adequate odour dispersion.
Policy HD10	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5687	Objecting	More specific positives:€€ HD10 re-Gypsy and Traveller Sites	
Policy HD10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6231	Supporting	Seems reasonable	

Canterbury District Local Plan

Preferred Option Consultation Draft 2013

Schedule of Consultation Responses

Part 2



December 2013

Comments Summary:

Chapter 3: Economic Development and Employment

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.1	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1447	Objecting	From an economist viewpoint, the CDLP draft is not 'properly joined-up', over-optimistic on the local economic outlook and, if implemented, more likely to benefit incomers rather than existing residents.	
3.1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5656	Supporting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:· Concern to ensure economic well-being and success of the District and desire to harness its advantages (as expressed in general in chapter 3)	
3.1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6084	Supporting	Canterbury & District Green Party welcomes the focus of much of this chapter on sustainability, encouraging small business and home-working, supporting start-ups and re-use of buildings.	
3.2	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		981	Objecting	Paragraph 3.2: The District, and particularly Canterbury, has a remarkably diverse economic base. The Council should attract an 'economic driver' to Herne Bay, e.g. a higher education campus, a major sports venue, a marina or even a casino. The Council has a considerable land holding in Herne Bay, and these could be 'offered' to attract businesses. There is also no mention of the important contributions agriculture and the associated food processing and packi	
3.2	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3621	Objecting	Concerned that culture will be sacrificed to economic and demographic growth. Safeguarding of world class heritage should be given priority. This could be destroyed in the short term. See Oxford example. It is the mixture of residential, commercial, educational and above all cultural property, which makes Canterbury so attractive to citizens and visitors alike.	
3.2	780975	Mr Frederic Stansfield		4221	Supporting	Canterbury is the City in England most dependent on higher education. The City needs to diversify its economy away from higher education, for instance by "spinning off" knowledge-based businesses from current institutions. The development of knowledge-based employment needs to be proportionate to the number of graduates emerging from higher education in Canterbury: at present provision of facilities for graduate level employment is inadequate.	
3.2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4629	Supporting	We are particularly pleased with the recommendations for the local economy, with the emphasis on developing high-value sectors and stemming the graduate brain drain out the city.	
3.2	781925	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd		4920	Objecting	Sainsbury's would like to take this opportunity to remind the Council of the employment potential of retail development, and the valuable contribution that it can play in the District. New supermarket developments often create in excess of 100 Full Time Equivalent jobs available to the local population and Sainsbury's offers excellent training and career progression.	
3.2	782028	Terrace Hill		4931	Objecting	The NPPF includes 'main town centre uses' in definition of economic development and does not differentiate between the value of jobs in different sectors or the economic benefits of retail compared to B uses.	The Plan should acknowledge the very significant economic role and value of retailing in the District. It should confirm that the Council supports the economic employment opportunities provided by retail development.

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.2	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5528	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'Economic Growth'. This includes a commitment to a more prosperous society in line with local strengths and current trends.	
3.2	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6086	Objecting	There needs to be a greater focus on the green economy and natural capital. The New Economics Foundation (Nef) states that "the natural environment is the basis of our socio-economic system. It provides us with basic goods and services and increases our resilience to climate change and resource scarcity shocks. There is no economic stability without ecological stability."	
3.2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6232	Objecting	All very worthy but there is so much ambition. Is it all deliverable? Is the understanding of business need 'clear'? 20 years is a VERY long time. Planning ahead is one thing, but could the Plan not be broken down into more manageable timescale chunks with declared targets? This would build in the flexibility to react to unforeseen change mentioned in para 3.5 and it would not be so overwhelming for residents to take on board, but still give business encouragement to move into the District.	
3.4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6233	Objecting	All very worthy but there is so much ambition. Is it all deliverable? Is the understanding of business need 'clear'? 20 years is a VERY long time. Planning ahead is one thing, but could the Plan not be broken down into more manageable timescale chunks with declared targets? This would build in the flexibility to react to unforeseen change mentioned in para 3.5 and it would not be so overwhelming for residents to take on board, but still give business encouragement to move into the District.	
3.5	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1834	Objecting	There is no economic plan in the Local Plan that sets out how the Council will attract enough employers to Herne Bay to soak up thousands more job-seekers. We already have above average unemployment in Heron ward. The explosion in housing planned for Herne Bay can only make it worse.	The Council is presenting this Plan without a matching economic strategy. Merely putting up buildings is not sufficient - the Council has no valid plans for what happens next, no plans for attracting and retaining high quality sustainable jobs.
3.5	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6089	Objecting	"Sustainable economic growth" should be replaced with 'sustainable development' and the plan should refer to 'steady state economy' rather than "economic growth" which is, by definition, socially, economically and environmentally unsustainable. It is paramount that the City Council outlines specifically how it will encourage ^ and promote investment in ^ the green economy, including low/zero carbon enterprises.	"Sustainable economic growth" should be replaced with 'sustainable development' and the plan should refer to 'steady state economy' rather than "economic growth".
3.5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6234	Objecting	facilitate flexible working practices such as the integration of residential and commercial use within the same unit'. What exactly does this mean? The empty units at Lakeside Business Park can be converted to offices with living accommodation over?	
3.6	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6092	Supporting	Encouraged by reference in the plan to sustainable new development and re-use of buildings and the support of sustainable rural tourism.	
3.6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6235	Objecting	How will the phasing of business work with housing 2.22 and 2.23?	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6236	Objecting	Avoid long term protection.How long is 'long-term? How does this sit with the need to be flexible, respond to economic change yet be able to support business expansion? This is asking the impossible! Would this resolve the eyesore of the old Slatters Hotel ?	
3.8	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6237	Objecting	Futures Study 2006: Investment in new high quality office accommodation is still awaited. Should the 'open to commuters' scenario been so readily dismissed? Between the Study and the Review there was a 71% increase in travellers from Canterbury West thanks to the High Sped Train. This should have been anticipated. Review 2001: It is 'certain' that Canterbury will be disproportionately affected by cuts and effect changes in full and part time employment have been overlooked.	Has the review/react flexibility expected in the NPPF been demonstrated to date?
3.8	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6239	Objecting	NLP's Development Requirements Study 2012 Is sufficient mention made here of the 'Commuter economy'? Why has the Council chosen to place so much confidence in this report over others?	
3.10	779295	Mr Alan Porter		1994	Objecting	I am worried about employment prospects in the future. I can see that land is being allocated in the hope it will attract businesses and jobs but I can not see relevant market research or evidence that jobs will be created.	
3.12	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		984	Objecting	Paragraph 3.12: The reference to a 36% increase since 2008 in 'managerial, scientific and technical activities' is I suspect a misinterpretation of the statistics. Many of these people will have been made redundant and have since set up their own companies to work as sub-contractors (as required by HMRC). Most of them will be working from their homes.	
3.14	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		987	Objecting	Paragraph 3.14: I believe that the comment about private sector and key growth sectors being under-represented is too narrowly focussed. There are many highly paid individuals who live but do not work in the District, and their number is increasing. With the improved transport links to London and elsewhere, Canterbury and Whitstable are very attractive locations for highly paid professionals to commute from. It should be recognised that these people spend much of their incomes in the District.	
3.14	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6241	Objecting	Lack of diversity in the economy. Why was the Experian Study 2006 point about the need for high quality office space not pursued 7 years ago?	
3.15	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		962	Objecting	I could find no coherent economic plan in the plan that sets out how the Council will attract employers to HB to soak up the 12,000+ newcomers.	An economic strategy for Herne Bay that sets out what kind of employer the Council hopes to attract here and how.
3.15	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4365	Objecting	According to CCC figures, Sturry North ward is third in the District's deprivation list. It is hard to see what is in the plan that will change the deprivation here. It is likely to worsen, raising quality of life issues, which would be shared with Sturry South.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.15	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6242	Objecting	.. it is felt ...the local economy can be stewarded towards recovery ...able to exploit any growth potential ... address structural economic weaknesses... Will this be robust enough to sustain 15,000 new homes? Will the new road infrastructures, and community amenities and facilities be funded? Will they actually be delivered?	
3.16	665473	Dr Richard Norman		544	Supporting	Agree that the district's greatest asset for promoting the economy and employment is that it is a greatly attractive place to live and work. Therefore the first priority, from the point of view of the economy and employment, should be not to undermine this asset by adding to traffic and congestion, or excessive further development. This is strong reason for opposing the current housing targets in the Plan.	
3.17	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6093	Objecting	With reference to Herne Bay, understanding is that there has been shrinkage of the independent retail sector. Proposals to develop any new out-of-town supermarkets are not locally supported and would work against the reinvigoration of the town centre.	
3.17	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6244	Objecting	Few vacant shops ..An understatement. Current actual figures challenge this statement.	
3.18	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		10	Supporting	I am encouraged that the Canterbury Innovation Centre has made some progress.	
3.18	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6163	Objecting	More could be done to support and encourage small independent businesses in the district. Such measures could include developing policies that prevent corporate businesses developing in certain areas, as well as policies that encourage and/or facilitate independent SMEs into those areas.	
3.18	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6245	Objecting	IPSOS MORI (2012) '..residents overwhelmingly'. Residents' support was conditional.	
3.19	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		439	Supporting	We fully support the Councils approach in helping to provide the underlying conditions required and preparing the ground to enable the local economy to prosper and flourish adding to the number of people in work and this is supported by the NPPF. The NLP report found that in order to increase the labour supply and to support new jobs creation in the District a significant level of new housing was required (i.e. 15600 to support the creation of 6500 new jobs)	
3.19	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6246	Objecting	.. encouragement to residents currently disengaged from the local economy to become economically active'. Very commendable, but according to this Plan, para 3.26, 15,000 new houses are only going to provide some 6,500 jobs. Even if only 1 person lives in each dwelling, what are the remaining 8,500 people going to do? That is considerably more people 'disengaged. from the local economy'.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.19	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6878	Objecting	The assumption that local economy is only to be served by full time economically active workers is inaccurate, the 'inactive' population is likely to have a significant proportion of part-time workers, as the retirement age increases, and considerable disposable income even if only derived from pension sources - a driver for local service industries, but is not discussed in the plan. The assumption that all local workers should be housed locally is questionable is desirable but unenforceable.	
3.20	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6094	Objecting	The Council must promote investment in the 'Green Economy' as a matter of urgency. The 'Green Economy' should provide the baseline for all development, be it in housing, education, transport, leisure or any other sector. A focus on green jobs and sustainable development can ensure high levels of employment whilst at the same time reducing our ecological footprint.	
3.20	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6247	Objecting	Knowledge economy still achievable '.. although there will be challenges'. Somewhat of an understatement.	
3.20	476233	Mrs Catherine Cantwell		6724	Objecting	When local people indicated that they supported the expansion of the knowledge economy and the creation of new jobs, they did not intend to support increasing the local population and providing new residents with housing, their vision was for residents to take up new employment opportunities. Council's draft plan is different - their concern is, "to increase labour supply" which is used to justify large new housing developments.	
3.22	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6248	Objecting	*Important enough for main points to be an appendix to the Plan ?	
3.24	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6164	Supporting	The Canterbury District would benefit from its own local currency, which could work alongside local spending reward card schemes, where they already exist. Keeping money circulating locally is widely agreed to be a key way to ensure a vibrant and thriving local economy. It is also important to consider social and natural capital as well as any reduction in dependence on social and health services, such as occurs when there is a thriving informal economy.	
3.24	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6251	Objecting	NO MENTION OF 'NEW HOMES BONUS' If, as reported, this means the Council loses out on some £400,000 per year under the Government's New Homes Bonus Scheme, then this fact should be put to the electorate. It would mean less than £4.00 per head for everyone in Canterbury to make up this sum, but large scale, unwanted development with so many uncertainties would be avoided. The Council and the people of Canterbury should not be held to ransom by either the Government of the day, or developers.	
3.25	772987	Mrs Doreen Louren		313	Objecting	The Canterbury District is not flooded with people looking for homes because they are employed here in lucrative work; the local economy is also unlikely to provide thousands of new jobs in the future. The proposals will make Canterbury a far less attractive place for visitors who are the main source of our income.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.25	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3876	Objecting	Generally support this Policy, but: i. In point a. after "existing" insert "private or council site"; i. Point c. is unachievable €" by definition any site on the outskirts of a built-up area will mean encroachment in the open countryside; and i. In point c. delete "designated in the development plan" and replace with "identified in the Landscape and Biodiversity Appraisal"	In point a. after "existing" insert "private or council site"; Point c. is unachievable - by definition any site on the outskirts of a built-up area will mean encroachment in the open countryside; and In point c. delete "designated in the development plan" and replace with "identified in the Landscape and Biodiversity Appraisal"
3.25	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3877	Objecting	This paragraph needs to reflect the fact that following the exit of Pfizer the site has been reborn as the Discovery Park which has been designated as a new Enterprise Zone and that it has major plans for significant job growth over the coming years.	
3.25	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6252	Objecting	Canterbury Knowledge City'. Good for Canterbury, and 3,000 jobs it may create there, but what about the other towns? The promotion of this is understandable, but a bit divisive. Our towns need a similar tag, otherwise this is not creating an inclusive feel for the district - it almost implies there is no knowledge elsewhere! Suggestion; Creation/promotion of coastal knowledge centres relating to marine knowledge/skills?	
3.26	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	216	Objecting	Negative aspects. he emphasis on building thousands of homes to meet essentially hypothetical need posited on the premise that new homes create new jobs (this has all the appearances of an unsupported assertion). With the much-vaunted HS1 link, parts of the Canterbury area could take on the aspect of a dormitory town as people can commute with relative ease to London. The Economic Plan should also focus on the potential of persuading larger companies to relocate to the area.	
3.26	665473	Dr Richard Norman		545	Objecting	There is no evidence for the claim that a higher level of new housing is needed to support job creation.	
3.26	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		967	Objecting	We have unemployed labour already. This plan (12,000-15,000 people for Herne Bay and 1440 jobs) will make that worse. If housing estates attracted employers to an area, then, in the short to medium term, employment would be created to mop up the unemployed residents. The world does not work like that which is why, all over the UK, there are pockets of long-term unemployment. We have unused employment land in Herne Bay at Altira Business Park. We have unemployed people. However, Altira does not at	A proper employment strategy for Herne Bay rather than importing way more people than new jobs.
3.26	109652	CLlr Michael Dixey		993	Objecting	The statement in paragraph 3.26 that the NLP study found 'that, in order to increase the labour supply and to support new job creation in the District, a significant level of new housing was required' is a very selective use of their conclusions. It states that 'The ageing population means that the number of 'workers' per household in the District will decline, meaning that, compared with the past, more homes will be required to support the same number of jobs in the District'. It then go	
3.26	778048	Mr Stuart Read		1083	Objecting	Additional housing is stated as being required to benefit local employment. However will people still choose to stay or move to Canterbury if the city get over developed?	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.26	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1432	Objecting	Many economists believe the economy will never return to the unsustainable trajectory of the 1998-2008 period. Future growth will be different in character. Canterbury uniquely benefitted by the pre-recession boom permitting an economic over-performance and it may have 'to struggle to stay still' in the future. The digital economy threatens the retail centre and the universities face severe threats. The Council have probably over-estimated the potential employment growth and need for dwellings.	
3.26	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1824	Objecting	The Council is assuming that if it builds lots of houses, employers will move to be near them and the new population. If employers really did move to be near pools of unemployed people, there would be no areas struggling with high and long-term unemployment. 15,600 new multi-bedroomed homes, having more than one person; and just 6,500 wishful new jobs; that's just four jobs for every ten homes. On that basis, what we would be creating here with this housing explosion is massive unemployment.	The idea that underpins this strategy is fundamentally flawed, and the evidence for this is plain to see across the country and the county. Inhabited houses do not automatically attract employers and generate jobs. The Local Plan must describe a multi-stranded policy of structural and targeted incentives to attract and retain employers that generate high quality, sustainable employment.
3.26	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3092	Objecting	Under Scenario E an increase in employment of 6,500 requires 15,600 new houses. The relationship between these two figures is not clear. With rising life expectancy, the rate of retirement will likely be greater than the death rate, creating an increased demand for housing with no rise in job opportunities, but will be offset to an unknown extent by any delay in the retirement age. Also, there is no estimate of double income households, and how this would reduce the number of houses required.	
3.26	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3656	Objecting	Too great a reliance is placed on the assertion in the Devt Requirements Study that 15,600 homes are required to support the creation of 6,500 jobs. This should be subject to rigorous scrutiny. What kind of jobs? short term work in construction industry will not solve long term problems. Government's financial inducement to local councils to build houses at any cost is unlikely to survive the next election. The Council runs risk of being led into ill-conceived action with baleful consequences.	
3.26	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4367	Objecting	It is hard to see what is in the plan that will change deprivation and quality of life issues in Sturry North. At Hersden the lack of new business in Lakesview does not bode well for local employment prospects for school leavers. The Plan implies only 6,500 jobs are expected to be created from 15,000 houses. Disadvantage is likely to increase.	
3.26	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5776	Objecting	The role of the DLP is to increase labour supply and to support job creation via new housing and new business floor space and by aiding Universities. There is reference to helping a knowledge city/economy to emerge but why as the professional, scientific and technical sector has apparently survived the recession. There is no definition of a knowledge city. In fact, the stress on the knowledge economy seems to conflict with what paragraphs 3.13-14.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.26	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6098	Objecting	Unsure as to the need to create 6,500 new jobs (and therefore having to build more houses) when Canterbury District's unemployment rate is lower than the national average and labour is imported because of an insufficient pool of local skills. Job creation and development should be supported in the surrounding districts where unemployment is much higher and where regeneration is a priority.	
3.26	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6254	Objecting	NLP Study. The great unknown factors of how does the economy support the balance of the increased population €“ at least 9,100 people and where do they come from are major concerns for many people. Can the services and utilities support this increase? Water supply, waste water treatment, etc.	Reassurance/answers about these points need to appear here, or be cross referenced. There is no mention of supporting evidence to show that the proposal is supportable.
3.26	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6255	Objecting	An additional 96,775 sqm of employment space required. Without knowing what the businesses might be, how is this calculated? Is there a difference for 'high value worth' sectors and the lower paid job market.?	
3.27	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6256	Objecting	IPSOS MORI €“ 71 % supported housing ..IF it meant houses and jobs for LOCAL people. 'Local' also has the meaning of neighbourhood. Did IPOS MORI differentiate between this and 'local' as in the district sense?	
3.28	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		969	Objecting	Residents said that they wanted jobs. What they are being given is housing.	A proper, proactive, economic and employment strategy before building large housing estates
3.28	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		988	Objecting	Paragraphs 3.24 to 3.28: There is an inherent contradiction in this section. The majority of local people (69%) consider that there are insufficient employment opportunities in the area (paragraph 3.28), i.e. that there are not enough jobs for the people already living in the District. Building more houses will only make this worse, as building houses does NOT create jobs in the longer term.	
3.29	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5809	Objecting	The link between growth and housing is unexplored. Although the suggestion is that more houses are needed to provide for new graduate level jobs, this justification does not occur with all the stress being placed on housing demand from the existing population. The case for housing as a driver in the DLP appears to be passed over. Equally the Economic Land Review does not mention housing as an economic driver, concentrating on business space requirements.	
3.30	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2812	Objecting	Why have some sites identified in the previous local plan now been considered unsuitable and where are they? Not all the sites allocated have yet been used. Is there a list of sites that have been rejected, available for scrutiny?.	
3.31	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		998	Objecting	New Employment land Allocations, paragraphs 3.33 and 3.34: The conclusions of the Development Requirements Study carried out by NLP are, I believe, optimistic. They are based on extrapolating historical data, and do not take fully into account changing working patterns, particularly with home-based businesses (see paragraphs 3.47-3.50).	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.33	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		996	Objecting	New Employment land Allocations, paragraphs 3.33 and 3.34: The conclusions of the Development Requirements Study carried out by NLP are, I believe, optimistic. They are based on extrapolating historical data, and do not take fully into account changing working patterns, particularly with home-based businesses (see paragraphs 3.47-3.50).	
3.33	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5216	Objecting	Object to Policy EMP1. Policy EMP2 doesn't apply to allocated sites except as per Policy EMP3 (para 3.38) which would not apply to Wraik Hill. Mix use proposals for Wraik Hill are advanced and accepted in principle for retail, healthcare, social care, residential and businesses uses. Either apply more flexible wording to Wraik Hill to cover uses or new policy. Seeking to restrict use to B1/B8 other than a 10% allowance would be harmful to securing a range of employment opportunities at Whitstabl	Either amend policy wording of EMP1, or add new site specific policy, covering employment allocation at Wraik Hill, to broaden range of acceptable uses to include: Health care, Social care/residential care home, Residential use, Retail use
3.34	776051	Mr Rick Strange		849	Objecting	The NLP report emphasises the large number of hectares that will need to be developed for factory, industrial, light industrial, business and quality offices for all the extra people to work in. Nowhere on the CCC plan is there any mention of this other than a few token areas (in purple on the plans and Little Barton Farm) to support such a large increase in population. You simply cannot site large office blocks, or light industry in the middle of housing estates.	
3.34	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		972	Objecting	Altira Business Park has not been successful in attracting employers, despite trying to do so for years. It is evident from that that the Council cannot rely on Altira producing jobs to support the massive influx of new residents associated with over 4000 new homes.	A proper economic and employment strategy rather than wishful thinking about an already failed site.
3.34	778805	Mr Richard Marsh		1465	Objecting	Existing land on Roper Road should be retained and redeveloped into a north side access to the rail station with more not less car parking for comnuters. There is enough developments for student flats going on within Canterbury to satisfy demand.	Dont sell of the land. Redevelop as north access to the west station. Extra car park spaces.
3.34	778304	O W Presland		2602	Objecting	The plan as currently proposed at the spatial level between the centres within the hierarchy is not sound. It is particularly unsound in relation to the lack of land at Whitstable for employment and mixed uses.	
3.34	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2813	Objecting	Altira Park is under used and another 33,000m2 has been allocated? The site should be completed before any further development is allowed to take place	
3.34	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2924	Objecting	However, the wording of paragraph 3.34 is confusing, and it is not entirely clear to the reader how the un-titled table immediately below the text relates to the table embedded in Policy EMP1. It would be helpful to redraft this text to clarify where Policy EMP1 relates to the protection of existing sites. It is also unclear to the reader why one table presents allocations in square metres and the other in hectares.	It would be helpful to redraft this text to clarify where Policy EMP1 relates to the protection of existing sites.

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.34	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3878	Objecting	Notwithstanding our objections to the strategic sites in Part 1 of the response, the table following this paragraph needs to include the proposed employment elements to the Sturry and Strode Farm Strategic Sites.	
3.34	781255	Robert & Sandra Shine		4506	Objecting	A business park and 4000 houses in South Canterbury would greatly exacerbate existing levels of traffic congestion, especially at peak times, resulting in gridlock. Proposed junction improvements to the A2 would be insufficient to cope with the volume of traffic trying to access the city centre, the UKC which is the district's largest employer and the high speed train network. A business park in this area would not be attractive to companies who will look for excellent road transport access.	
3.34	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5217	Objecting	Object to Policy EMP1. Policy EMP2 doesn't apply to allocated sites except as per Policy EMP3 (para 3.38) which would not apply to Wraik Hill. Mix use proposals for Wraik Hill are advanced and accepted in principle for retail, healthcare, social care, residential and businesses uses. Either apply more flexible wording to Wraik Hill to cover uses or new policy. Seeking to restrict use to B1/B8 other than a 10% allowance would be harmful to securing a range of employment opportunities at Whitstabl	Either amend policy wording of EMP1, or add new site specific policy, covering employment allocation at Wraik Hill, to broaden range of acceptable uses to include: Health care, Social care/residential care home, Residential use, Retail use
3.34	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5392	Objecting	Office development Barton Farm We share Dr Sloman's doubt that it is '...an appropriate site for 70,000 sq m B1 (office/light industry) or B8 (storage/distribution) uses' and are similarly concerned 'that it maybe a low density 'business park' development. this would generate substantial additional traffic. Agree with Dr Slowman and would prefer this to be located at Wincheap with its excellent public transport and park and ride links.	
3.34	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5743	Supporting	Welcome the provision of significant business space in South Canterbury. It will support economic growth, jobs and inward investment. Need to ensure businesses don't relocate from city centre. City centre need to retain is primacy and mix of commercial uses.	
3.34	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5965	Objecting	Development of these proposed sites has the potential to impact upon heritage assets such as direct impact resulting from construction activities and indirect impacts on the setting and character of neighbouring assets and places. The exceptional richness of historic environment + scale of the sites proposed would indicate a good potential for these allocation sites to impact upon presently unknown assets. Advice from CCC archaeological advisor should be sought with specific site analysis.	
3.34	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6769	Supporting	Support allocation of 18-20ha of land for employment use at South Canterbury. Will give 70000m2 of new employment floor space. Although they do suggest some alternative ratios than those referred to in the employment land review.	
Policy EMP1	766797	Miss L Dowle		113	Objecting	Employment opportunities, at present it is very difficult for all age categories to find appropriate employment in the area, the draft plan shows no provision for employment to cater for the new housing.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP1	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		608	Objecting	Land at Canterbury West station needs to be carefully used, with the priority given to making provision for a new road crossing to relieve the level crossings, and, if this is not feasible, the provision of additional parking since some of the new housing will inevitably be used by people wanting to commute to London.	Removal of "Land at Canterbury West" from the list of land allocated for industrial use.
Policy EMP1	776051	Mr Rick Strange		853	Objecting	The purple areas for 'Business' on the CCCplans would only be able to support supermarkets, or shops like PC World etc, you could not have even light industry so close to housing developments. Nowhere else on the plans is there any indication of a proper area for new business that would be large enough to provide employment for the new enlarged population of the Canterbury area.	
Policy EMP1	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1782	Supporting	Wraik Hill - We support the rejection of the houing SHLAA and amendment from Office node to employment land which keeps business use on this easily accessible, highly sustainable site.	
Policy EMP1	779262	Mr John Bailey		1966	Supporting	With the caveat that business at the innovation centre could include an hotel and conference centre.	
Policy EMP1	121447	K P Poole		2218	Objecting	Abandon the policy. Increase in use of Canterbury West Station makes necessary increased parking space off-road for (1) long stay train travellers, (2) for cars awaiting or dropping off travellers; for tickets to be bought and enquiries to be made, and (3) for taxis to wait. Fortunately the public car park adjacent to the station could be turned to these uses.	It is difficult to estimate just how many spaces are required for (1) but I suggest that at least 12 marked spaces are necessary for each of (2) and (3). I suspect that once these needs are met there will be little or no space available for continues use as a public car park, or forbusiness development. If further provision for a public car park is considered necessary then it should be provided by conversion and up-grading of the existing overflow car park, rather than using that for housing development.
Policy EMP1	778803	Mr Robert Atkins		2402	Objecting	Policy EMP1- The effect of this policy will be to reduce the availability of car parking space at Canterbury West Station's overflow car park and in Station Road West. I also object to any proposal to use the station's existing overflow car park for housing, at least until substantially increased alternative car parking facilities for the station have been provided.	I ask the City Council to add to the Draft Local Plan an additional policy to safeguard the two sites in Roper Road currently owned by Network rail for future use for car parking
Policy EMP1	778304	O W Presland		2612	Objecting	Employment - the balance of employment sites is not sound, does not reflect needs and opportunities. The table at Policy EMP1 should be revised to include additional employment land at Whitstable, in particular an extension to 'John Wilson Business Park on land south of the park in the form of a mixed use housing and employment site'.	The table at Policy EMP1 should be revised to include additional employment land at Whitstable, in particular an extension to 'John Wilson Business Park on land south of the park in the form of a mixed use housing and employment site'.
Policy EMP1	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2923	Supporting	Kitewood supports the additional employment allocation of 33,000 sqm through an extension to Altira Business Park, as part of the Strategic Allocation of Land at Hillborough.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP1	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3057	Objecting	There are a number of sites that are either adjacent to or within close proximity to LWSs and therefore are likely to have an impact that will need to be considered. Of greatest concern are the housing developments located adjacent to AS27 Great Stour, Ashford to Fordwich especially when viewed in combination with the mixed development sites and the transport strategies. Broad Oak Road/ Vauxhall Road, Wincheap retail area and the Sturry park and ride being situated within the LWS.	We welcome the safeguards within later policies however we would like to discuss the possibility of preparing a set of guidelines to ensure protection of the LWS from in Combination impacts from the above developments. Such guidance could then be incorporated into the relevant Policies. We would recommend that guidelines include:- No development within the boundaries of the LWS A buffer of at least 15m from the boundary of the LWS free from development. Management and monitoring of the river system.
Policy EMP1	121820	Mrs IVD Baker		3443	Objecting	Objects to business development of Stn Rd West car park, because: it is vital for local businesses and rail travellers; should not be developed unless replacement parking and the additional 120 spaces is provided; forecourt refurbishments will reduce parking; the approved brief required parking be provided on this site (6.1); no reference made in EMP1 or supporting text to parking provision. Policy unsound, include text from brief.	Please modify Policy EMP1 by including the text from the Development Brief: 'In order to retain the existing public car parking and provide adequate operational parking the car park will have to be decked with one or two additional floors. This decking should provide additional parking above the existing provision to allow for a possible increase in rail user demand.'
Policy EMP1	121830	Mr MJR Baker		3445	Objecting	Objects to business development of Stn Rd West car park, because: it is vital for local businesses and rail travellers; should not be developed unless replacement parking and the additional 120 spaces is provided; forecourt refurbishments will reduce parking; the approved brief required parking be provided on this site (6.1); no reference made in EMP1 or supporting text to parking provision. Policy unsound, include text from brief.	Please modify Policy EMP1 by including the text from the Development Brief: 'In order to retain the existing public car parking and provide adequate operational parking the car park will have to be decked with one or two additional floors. This decking should provide additional parking above the existing provision to allow for a possible increase in rail user demand.'
Policy EMP1	780827	Mr M P J Baker		3446	Objecting	Objects to business development of Stn Rd West car park, because: it is vital for local businesses and rail travellers; should not be developed unless replacement parking and the additional 120 spaces is provided; forecourt refurbishments will reduce parking; the approved brief required parking be provided on this site (6.1); no reference made in EMP1 or supporting text to parking provision. Policy unsound, include text from brief.	Please modify Policy EMP1 by including the text from the Development Brief: 'In order to retain the existing public car parking and provide adequate operational parking the car park will have to be decked with one or two additional floors. This decking should provide additional parking above the existing provision to allow for a possible increase in rail user demand.'
Policy EMP1	780828	Mr Jeremy D I Baker		3447	Objecting	Objects to business development of Stn Rd West car park, because: it is vital for local businesses and rail travellers; should not be developed unless replacement parking and the additional 120 spaces is provided; forecourt refurbishments will reduce parking; the approved brief required parking be provided on this site (6.1); no reference made in EMP1 or supporting text to parking provision. Policy unsound, include text from brief.	Please modify Policy EMP1 by including the text from the Development Brief: 'In order to retain the existing public car parking and provide adequate operational parking the car park will have to be decked with one or two additional floors. This decking should provide additional parking above the existing provision to allow for a possible increase in rail user demand.'

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP1	781063	Mr B J Head	Director Crown Products	4361	Objecting	There is an opportunity to deliver developments which address the need for increase in both residential and employment supply within one building. Such a construction could deliver not only a simplified route for either business start-up or follow-on but a genuine reduction in travel requirements and a financial boost for the small businesses operated from these premises by way of reduced ancillary costs, these being shared between both the residential and business spaces.	
Policy EMP1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4415	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. comments on the sites proposed for inclusion in the Plan, in policies SP3a - h, HD1, EMP1, TCL7 and TCL10. As a general point, though, we find that the policy guidance on the proposed sites is lacking. In particular we consider that more supporting text is required to explain what is actually proposed for each site and how they will actually be developed. This should then be reflected in the individual policies themselves.	
Policy EMP1	777500	Mr & Mrs A R Pierce		4480	Objecting	Seek an allocation for development for industrial, commercial and/or retail development, including non use B class employment development on land north-west of Sturry Road, Canterbury, Kent.	Seek an allocation for development for industrial, commercial and/or retail development, including non use B class employment development on land north-west of Sturry Road, Canterbury, Kent.
Policy EMP1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4490	Supporting	Accept employment allocations at: Innovation Centre, University of Kent Broad Oak Road/Vauxhall Road Office Connection site, St Andrew's Cl Eddington Lane (various) Altira Herne Bay Metric Site Herne Bay Land at Wraik Hill Canterbury Business Park (Highland Court)	
Policy EMP1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4491	Objecting	Canterbury West Station (Policy EMP1): CPRE Protect Kent objects to the allocation of this site for development. In the absence of replacement provision being made we find it regrettable that car parking at the station will be lost. We also consider that the development of the site will add to the congestion already experienced in this location.	
Policy EMP1	121858	Ms A Knight		4548	Objecting	I urge the council to abandon plans to build houses on the council car park by Canterbury West station and to get Railtrak to use its land on Roper Road for car parking spaces and allow access to the station from Roper Road.	I urge the council to abandon plans to build houses on the council car park by Canterbury West station and to get Railtrak to use its land on Roper Road for car parking spaces and allow access to the station from Roper Road.
Policy EMP1	781396	Mr Christopher Heady		4554	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for Canterbury West Station's overflow car park because an unreliable provision of parking spaces (esp for off-peak passengers) would discourage people from taking the train and therefore result in an increase in the use of cars. There is already a lack of short-term parking which causes problems whenever a train arrives discouraging tourists and other visitors coming to Canterbury, with a resulting loss to the local economy.	The Local Plan should ensure that there is adequate parking space at the West Station. This should include car parking and station access on Roper Road - this will reduce the congestion at the present station entrance as well as reduce queuing traffic at the level crossing.
Policy EMP1	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4764	Objecting	Many of the sites are embedded in urban areas or are associated with the strategic housing sites. The Canterbury Business Park (Highland Court) is within the designated landscape and the AONB Unit may wish to comment.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP1	781921	National Grid		4911	Objecting	The Broad Oak Road / Vauxhall Road site is crossed by an existing National Grid high voltage electricity line. NG wishes to retain lines in situ. National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly under overhead lines and statutory clearances must not be infringed. NG encourages high quality development and land beneath the overhead line should be used to make a positive contribution to the development - nature conservation, open space etc. See 'A sense of Place' design guidelines .	
Policy EMP1	782028	Terrace Hill		4933	Objecting	The NPPF includes 'main town centre uses' in definition of economic development and does not differentiate between the value of jobs in different sectors or the economic benefits of retail. EMP1 states that retail uses which could compromise the primary business use of allocated employment sites will not be permitted. This is unhelpful and confusing. There is no evidence that retail uses would compromise the business use of an allocated employmt site seeking to generate employment and wealth etc	Retailing is economic development and should be acceptable on employment sites, subject Page 3 of 7 to the NPPF retail tests. Policy EMP1 should simply protect the identified sites for 'economic development'. There is no further text needed to clarify the policy. Proposals for retail development will be subject to the retail policies in the NPPF and Local Plan.
Policy EMP1	782028	Terrace Hill		4934	Objecting	There is a critical need to ensure that the Local Plan provides a positive development framework and one that is capable of flexibility, particularly given the length of the plan period within which economic fluctuations are bound to occur. Policy EMP1 could lead to the sterilisation of large areas of developable land for no real planning benefit.	Policy EMP1 should simply protect the identified sites for 'economic development'. There is no further text needed to clarify the policy. Proposals for retail development will be subject to the retail policies in the NPPF and Local Plan.
Policy EMP1	781734	Mr Chris Lowe		5087	Objecting	Object to the development proposals at Canterbury West Station as this would reduce the availability of car parking spaces and potentially affect the overall use of rail. Bus services & cycle routes to the Canterbury West are limited; hence there is no easy alternative to the car.	Remove Canterbury West Station from Policy EMP1 or alternatively the undeveloped land only could be used for housing, but would be better from noise aspect to be for business.
Policy EMP1	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5149	Objecting	The need for additional employment floorspace at Whitstable is widely recognised. We hope the Council will support these important proposals by a successful developer which will create new employment, visual enhancement and biodiversity. We ask the Council to include the extension of the Joseph Wilson Industrial Estate within Policy EMP1 as an employment allocation.	We ask the Council to include the extension of the Joseph Wilson Industrial Estate within Policy EMP1 as an employment allocation.
Policy EMP1	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5215	Objecting	Object to Policy EMP1. Policy EMP2 doesn't apply to allocated sites except as per Policy EMP3 (para 3.38) which would not apply to Wraik Hill. Mix use proposals for Wraik Hill are advanced and accepted in principle for retail, healthcare, social care, residential and businesses uses. Either apply more flexible wording to Wraik Hill to cover uses or new policy. Seeking to restrict use to B1/B8 other than a 10% allowance would be harmful to securing a range of employment opportunities at Whitstabl	Either amend policy wording of EMP1, or add new site specific policy, covering employment allocation at Wraik Hill, to broaden range of acceptable uses to include: Health care, Social care/residential care home, Residential use, Retail use
Policy EMP1	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5237	Objecting	On parking, I am concerned that the Station Road West car park has been allocated for business development (as identified under EMP1). This car park is important for customers of existing local businesses, and for rail commuters. It is often close to capacity during weekdays, and any loss of parking space will be detrimental to the local business community.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP1	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5264	Objecting	We write to request that this land be allocated for mixed use, including protected open space, church, sport and employment facilities. The proposals have much to commend them and involve sustainable development, performing the social and economic roles very strongly. The site is in the urban area and its development in the way proposed would take pressure away from outlying areas.	We request the council to remove the Protected Open Space designation covering the entire site, limiting it to the roadside landscape buffer. We ask that the site be designated as a mixed use site.
Policy EMP1	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5350	Objecting	We are unable to carry out capacity checks for the non-domestic sites and sites without a number of dwellings as the anticipated flows to such sites are unknown. Where sites are mixed use the capacity assessment relates to the domestic aspect of the site only.	
Policy EMP1	781600	Ms Avril Leonard		5390	Objecting	Objects to the Business Development on the Council's car Park next to the Canterbury West station. These proposals are inappropriate given the already limited parking spaces and facilities to drop off and pick up commuters and accommodate taxis. Additionally the city council claims to promote environmentally friendly travel, trains are key to this, thus parking here is essential to this.	
Policy EMP1	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5646	Supporting	Agree/endorse with ELR it seeks to protect the best employment sites and release weak/poor sites, as well as identifying where future need. There is no new provision for business proposed at Whitstable so Council needs to ensure that the investment potential of Herne Bay is strongly promoted.	
Policy EMP1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5688	Supporting	More specific positives:. Desire to have adequate and suitable employment land available/ protection of such sites	
Policy EMP1	784458	Mr Jim Pace	Amos Dawton Finn	5789	Objecting	Hall PLace, Harbledown. We propose land at Hall PLace as a Business Innovation Centre. Several professional firms in Canterbury have identified the need for expansion and have considered the possibility of moving outside the city. The intention would be to build structures of attractive and innovative design. It is well located in relation to the city. The development would help grow the 'knowledge economy, delivering additional employment floorspace and widening the City's economic base.	We request that the site be identified as a Business Innovation Centre and included within and subject to policy EMP1 on the Local PPlan Porposals Map.
Policy EMP1	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5810	Objecting	KCC support the approach for strengthening and diversifying the local economy. KCC suggest that the Local Plan should state the number of jobs that could reasonably be accommodated on the allocated sites to illustrate the broad compatibility of the employment and residential allocations.	
Policy EMP1	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5966	Objecting	Development of these proposed sites has the potential to impact upon heritage assets such as direct impact resulting from construction activities and indirect impacts on the setting and character of neighbouring assets and places. The exceptional richness of historic environment + scale of the sites proposed would indicate a good potential for these allocation sites to impact upon presently unknown assets. Advice from CCC archaeological advisor should be sought with specific site analysis.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6157	Objecting	Advocate that every effort to encourage more development/regeneration of the Wincheap Industrial Estate for employment. It is ideal in the sense that it is well served by public transport. It would be preferable that development here should be small-scale, high-tech businesses.	
Policy EMP1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6240	Objecting	The 'professional, scientific and technical activities' prosperity. This Plan locates these in 'clusters' to the south and west of the Canterbury. The outlook for the Parish of Sturry to the north and east is bleak. More of the same industrial units, cheap retail outlets, high density housing with travel to work costs to be met out of low paid, probably part-time, employment. Is this building sustainable communities?	
Policy EMP1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6253	Objecting	Suggestion; Creation/promotion of coastal knowledge centres relating to marine knowledge/skills? Eg small boat building, something to do with off shore wind farming, sea safety?	
Policy EMP1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6257	Objecting	Disappointingly, nothing mentioned for Sturry, Broad Oak or Hersden. Where will its residents work? Considering Sturry is seen as having excellent transport links, close to both train and bus routes, could not more business land have been located here for high end office provision? This would have improved the local job/housing mix, avoided traffic congestion and improved air quality. This would also have balanced the deprivation in the Parish and made the area more sustainable.	
Policy EMP1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6259	Objecting	Will all new employment land allocations include a requirement to fund future infrastructure needs? Is this included somewhere?	
Policy EMP1	784458	Mr Jim Pace	Amos Dawton Finn	6486	Objecting	Object to HD1 as land east of Lakesview has not been allocated for mixed use development. See site representation and attached file.	
Policy EMP1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6888	Objecting	The district already has empty houses and business units. Building even more premises will not put actual, economically sound businesses into those that are currently standing surplus to requirement	
3.35	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5218	Objecting	Object to Policy EMP1. Policy EMP2 doesn't apply to allocated sites except as per Policy EMP3 (para 3.38) which would not apply to Wraik Hill. Mix use proposals for Wraik Hill are advanced and accepted in principle for retail, healthcare, social care, residential and businesses uses. Either apply more flexible wording to Wraik Hill to cover uses or new policy. Seeking to restrict use to B1/B8 other than a 10% allowance would be harmful to securing a range of employment opportunities at Whitstabl	Either amend policy wording of EMP1, or add new site specific policy, covering employment allocation at Wraik Hill, to broaden range of acceptable uses to include: Health care, Social care/residential care home, Residential use, Retail use
3.36	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1000	Objecting	Whitstable Harbour, paragraphs 3.66-3.68: There is no reference made to Whitstable Harbour's Strategic Plan in this section (although it is covered in Policy TV5f). This should be a background document to the local Plan.I agree that there is a need for a marina on the North Kent coast. However, Whitstable is not a viable option. Herne Bay's economy would, however, benefit greatly from a marina which would contribute to the regeneration agenda for the town.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.36	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5219	Objecting	Object to Policy EMP1. Policy EMP2 doesn't apply to allocated sites except as per Policy EMP3 (para 3.38) which would not apply to Wraik Hill. Mix use proposals for Wraik Hill are advanced and accepted in principle for retail, healthcare, social care, residential and businesses uses. Either apply more flexible wording to Wraik Hill to cover uses or new policy. Seeking to restrict use to B1/B8 other than a 10% allowance would be harmful to securing a range of employment opportunities at Whitstabl	Either amend policy wording of EMP1, or add new site specific policy, covering employment allocation at Wraik Hill, to broaden range of acceptable uses to include: Health care, Social care/residential care home, Residential use, Retail use
3.36	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5967	Supporting	KCC is keen to work with CCC to ensure adequate provision of school places across the District	
3.36	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6160	Objecting	On average, each house in the Canterbury District has 1.16 workers. At this rate 15,600 additional houses will require about 17,000 more jobs. Although the present demographic trends probably serve to exaggerate this number, it is clear that the District will be nowhere near creating what is required; Canterbury will rapidly become a dormitory town for London commuters. We consider that mass commuting is an unsustainable way of providing for livelihoods.	
3.36	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6261	Objecting	Please, could there be an appendix giving the classification in the Plan.	
3.37	779285	Mr Matthew Hedges		2023	Objecting	Our client has a specific site as shown on the attached plan which is suitable for sui-generis uses and as such should be allocated as part of the Local Plan to provide a basic provision for this type of use class in addition to the proposed flexible policy framework.	Addition of allocated sites for sui-generis use class to provide a basic provision in addition to the flexible policy framework proposed by the Local Plan
3.37	780450	Mr Brian Buggins		3348	Objecting	The plans for Station Road West are of concern as there is no guarantee that the existing numbers of spaces in the public car park will be retained only that there is an "intention" to retain them. In addition the plans for the West Station forecourt will also reduce parking, taxi ranks and the drop off / pick up provision thus putting pressure on Station Road Wes, eg congestion caused by people stopping in the road.	
3.37	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5220	Objecting	Object to Policy EMP1. Policy EMP2 doesn't apply to allocated sites except as per Policy EMP3 (para 3.38) which would not apply to Wraik Hill. Mix use proposals for Wraik Hill are advanced and accepted in principle for retail, healthcare, social care, residential and businesses uses. Either apply more flexible wording to Wraik Hill to cover uses or new policy. Seeking to restrict use to B1/B8 other than a 10% allowance would be harmful to securing a range of employment opportunities at Whitstabl	Either amend policy wording of EMP1, or add new site specific policy, covering employment allocation at Wraik Hill, to broaden range of acceptable uses to include: Health care, Social care/residential care home, Residential use, Retail use
3.37	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6107	Objecting	Any flexibility around sites for disparate needs should be based very clearly on proven community need for those businesses or developments.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.38	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		975	Objecting	The Council MUST make adequate provision for school places for the current population and for the future, much bigger, population that will be living in Herne Bay if 4000 new homes are built.	The Council MUST make adequate provision for school places for the current population and for the future, much bigger, population that will be living in Herne Bay if 4000 new homes are built.
3.38	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5221	Objecting	Object to Policy EMP1. Policy EMP2 doesn't apply to allocated sites except as per Policy EMP3 (para 3.38) which would not apply to Wraik Hill. Mix use proposals for Wraik Hill are advanced and accepted in principle for retail, healthcare, social care, residential and businesses uses. Either apply more flexible wording to Wraik Hill to cover uses or new policy. Seeking to restrict use to B1/B8 other than a 10% allowance would be harmful to securing a range of employment opportunities at Whitstabl	Either amend policy wording of EMP1, or add new site specific policy, covering employment allocation at Wraik Hill, to broaden range of acceptable uses to include: Health care, Social care/residential care home, Residential use, Retail use
Policy EMP2	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3879	Objecting	Generally support this Policy, but: i. In the second paragraph it is unclear what is meant by "subject to the provisions of Policy EMP1" when that Policy simply identifies sites for business purposes € it has no provisions! i. In points 2. and 3. replace "significant" with "unacceptable".	In points 2. and 3. replace "significant" with "unacceptable".
Policy EMP2	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4429	Supporting	DIO supports this policy and believes that the whole of the barracks coming forward for comprehensive development allows for greater flexibility on an enlarged site. The possibility of a hotel is further explored in the Tourism and Visitor Economy Chapter.	
Policy EMP2	782028	Terrace Hill		4935	Objecting	Policy EMP2 states that the Council will support non-class B uses and other uses, where they are significant in terms of the local economy, including on allocated business sites, in the event that a series of criteria are met. Given the suggested amendments to Policy EMP1 which would include retail in the definition of economic development, Policy EMP2 is not required and can be deleted.	However, if Policy is to be retained it should be amended to read: "The Council will support the development of premises for economic development on sites not identified in Policy EMP1, where they are significant in terms of the local economy and not addressed through other policies in the plan".
Policy EMP2	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5222	Objecting	Object to Policy EMP1. Policy EMP2 doesn't apply to allocated sites except as per Policy EMP3 (para 3.38) which would not apply to Wraik Hill. Mix use proposals for Wraik Hill are advanced and accepted in principle for retail, healthcare, social care, residential and businesses uses. Either apply more flexible wording to Wraik Hill to cover uses or new policy. Seeking to restrict use to B1/B8 other than a 10% allowance would be harmful to securing a range of employment opportunities at Whitstabl	Either amend policy wording of EMP1, or add new site specific policy, covering employment allocation at Wraik Hill, to broaden range of acceptable uses to include: Health care, Social care/residential care home, Residential use, Retail use
Policy EMP2	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6158	Supporting	Advocate using the old Serco site (corner of Kingsmead and Sturry Roads) for economic regeneration. This site would be particularly suited for a mix of leisure facilities.	
Policy EMP2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6262	Objecting	Confusing. In locations where there is minimal business allocation, is there provision to meet an unforeseen need? How will this be achieved if all the housing land has also been allocated/developed ?	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP2	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6770	Objecting	Need to adopt a flexible approach to the identification of employment generating uses. There are a number of class C2, D1 and D2 uses which also generate significant numbers of jobs and these uses should be identified as being suitable uses to be accommodated on employment land. This should be identified both in the Employment Land Assessment and the policies of the Local Plan.	
3.39	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5662	Objecting	Agree/endorse with ELR it seeks to protect the best employment sites and release weak/poor sites, as well as identifying where future need. Identifies a need for start-up and small businesses, particularly at Herne Bay, which is a priority. There is a lack of employment space for small businesses along the Whitstable-Herne Bay coastal corridor, particularly at Herne Bay.	
3.39	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6121	Supporting	Supportive of the Canterbury Start Up Programme (Start My Biz) and its development across the whole District.	
3.39	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6263	Supporting	Start my Biz' has the future of the District riding on it.	
3.40	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6122	Supporting	Supportive of the re-use of upper floors above retail and other commercial premises for start-ups. A light-touch approach to these businesses should depend on proven environmental and financial sustainability.	
3.40	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6125	Objecting	There should be more incentives and support for green, environmentally sustainable and low carbon businesses, including those proposing the use of renewable energy.	
Policy EMP3	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		351	Supporting	This will help to support local businesses and encourage sustainable travel patterns. It must be ensured that demand on town / city centre cycle parking is adversely pressured by ensuring extra provision of town / city centre cycle parking is paid for via a planning development contribution.	A planning development contribution should be required to support extra cycle parking.
Policy EMP3	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2015	Objecting	Repetition of the provisions and aims of Policy HD9.	suggest deletion
Policy EMP3	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3880	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support the Policy as far as it goes, but surely opportunities elsewhere for business 'start-ups' should also be encouraged.	
Policy EMP3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6264	Objecting	A policy for Planners and developers, not so easily understood by residents who do not know the classifications	
Policy EMP3	785163	Canterbury Christ Church University		6965	Objecting	Policy EMP3 refers to policy HD7 which is purpose built student accommodation. This is incorrect and should be HD9.	Policy EMP3 refers to policy HD7 which is purpose built student accommodation. This is incorrect and should be HD9.

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.41	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4366	Objecting	Deprivation has been a problem for Hersden for some time and considerable efforts have been made to remedy the situation, but statistics revealing the current extent of this are not available. However, significant investment in one of the lowest ranked schools in Kent has led to slow improvement. But the lack of new businesses in Lakesview (currently over 7,000sq. feet available to rent or buy) does not bode well for local employment prospects for school leavers.	
3.41	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6265	Objecting	The NLP study ..97,000sqm business floorspace. Is this the only study which quantifies business space requirement?	
3.42	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1783	Objecting	It should be noted that although older units are good for start ups as they are usually lower cost to rent. The Council policies should strongly encourage and prioritise the development/refurbishment of existing units, over greenfield sites, in order to stop units becoming derelict and falling into disrepair and decay because they are the wrong size/shape/colour for what is needed at the present time.	Include policy for older units that bring them back into use.
3.42	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6269	Objecting	.. the Council's research over the past few years ..'. What, when and where can this be found?	
3.43	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6270	Objecting	.. only protect sites ..in the long term ..reasonable prospect'. Vague enough to cover all eventualities?	
3.44	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2016	Objecting	Object - to the inclusion of paragraph 3.44	Delete
3.44	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6271	Objecting	'..Conversion of office space to retail ...'. What about retail space to residential?	
3.45	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6273	Supporting	Necessary	
3.46	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		976	Objecting	It is unclear from this plan whether the Council means to object to the proposal to add a large supermarket to Altira Business park because the land will be allocated to different business uses. Given the failure of Altira as a provider of local employment, it would be a mistake to resist the development suggested in this area by Sainsbury.	Make clear what use the Council is envisaging for all the land around Altira Business park.
3.46	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6274	Objecting	This highlights the poor provision of 'job opportunities in close proximity to housing' in the Parish of Sturry for what could be approaching a population of 10,000 by 2031. For Sturry Parish villages does this meet the Council's aims for sustainable communities? Should smaller business sites premises in the other large villages eg Chartham also be mentioned and protected ?	
Policy EMP4	405613	Mr Adam Roake		502	Objecting	The policy is unclear regarding existing sites.	The policy needs to be amended to clarify that "existing sites" are those identified in paragraph 3.46.

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP4	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1772	Supporting	We support this policy but would comment on (c) protection of office space. What is the current planning position ? It is understood that change of use to residential from offices in town centres without requiring planning permission is currently supported by the Government. However no doubt this will change again....?	
Policy EMP4	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2018	Objecting	Object €“ to the wording of part (c).	Re-wording in line with representation
Policy EMP4	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3831	Objecting	If, and this seems doubtful, there is a need for more commercial premises why are not the two plots of land between Eddington Lane and A2990 Old Thanet Way included in the Golf Club proposal - they certainly could do with tidying up.	
Policy EMP4	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3881	Objecting	Generally supports this Policy, but: i. In point 1 delete all after "economic strategy". i. In point 2 add at the end "provided evidence is provided that the existing use is not viable"	In point 1 delete all after "economic strategy". In point 2 add at the end "provided evidence is provided that the existing use is not viable"
Policy EMP4	782028	Terrace Hill		4936	Objecting	As currently worded Policy EMP4 is too rigid and does not provide a flexible framework for the District over the full plan period. Paragraph 22 of the NPPF requires that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Terrace Hill is concerned that this requirement fails to be reflected in current draft policy.	The Policy should refer to: "the loss of existing or allocated sites for economic development...."
Policy EMP4	380675	Mr D Bryant and Mrs.M.Robinson		5144	Objecting	Whilst we acknowledge that the site (Hillborough Business Park) currently meets the needs of those local businesses seeking small, low cost and practical workspace, at some point during this Plan period, the existing buildings will have deteriorated to such an extent and demand for services would be such that the business park would no longer be viable. We, therefore, seek exclusion of the site from Policy EMP4, Paragraph 3.46 and the Proposals Map.	We seek exclusion of the site from Policy EMP4, Paragraph 3.46 and the Proposals Map.
Policy EMP4	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5151	Objecting	The site is identified in the Canterbury District Local Plan Preferred Option Consultation Draft (June 2013) as a Protected Employment Site subject to Policy EMP4. In our view, the Protected Employment designation should be removed in order to allow for the more effective and proper planning of the area. The site could be used for residential development or a mixture of residential and employment uses.	In conclusion we request that the Council removes the site from the list of Protected Employment Sites subject to Policy EMP4.
Policy EMP4	780212	Church Commissioners for England		5339	Objecting	Policy EMP4 relates to office development. Part (c) seeks to protect the existing office accommodation from change of use. However, with the recent changes to Permitted Development Rights, we are of the opinion that this policy is no longer necessary.	Delete policy
Policy EMP4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6238	Objecting	The Lakeside Business Park could be/ have been ideal location for high quality office accommodation investment. The wonderful views across the Stour valley are enjoyed by industrial type buildings instead	
Policy EMP4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6275	Objecting	Policy EMP4 - (b) there is no mention of even considering the effect on neighbours. Please could this be included? At the moment it gives the impression that residents objections will not be heard or considered with an open mind, or is the omission deliberate?	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.47	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5829	Objecting	The DLP's support for home working is not linked to the development proposal at Barton. Is the idea that the jobs of people living there will be based at home? The question is not explored.	
3.47	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6276	Objecting	.. domestic offices .. The type and size of houses to be built will need to reflect this with the number of rooms, design and space available. Will 2.64 'minimum standard' provide this?	
3.48	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6277	Supporting	Acceptable	
3.49	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6279	Objecting	If the business involves any of the following..planning permission is likely..	Please change 'likely' to 'must'
3.50	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6126	Supporting	Supportive of the aim to encourage and support more home working and home-based businesses. This needs to be matched with more investment into means of sustainable transport and disincentives for developers to build any more out of town retail or business parks.	
3.50	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6132	Objecting	A larger number of business units should be incorporated into housing developments i.e. to reduce traffic congestion and to ensure vibrant working communities.	
Policy EMP5	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		9	Supporting	I am glad CCC will support home-working with appropriate safeguards.	
Policy EMP5	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2019	Objecting	Object €" to clause (3) being over-prescriptive and unnecessary	delete
Policy EMP5	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3882	Supporting	Generally supports this Policy, but in point 3 after "small" insert "unlit"	Point 3 after "small" insert "unlit"
Policy EMP5	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4430	Supporting	DIO supports this policy. It is proposed that some of the housing on the Barracks development will be suitable for home based working.	
Policy EMP5	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5689	Supporting	More specific positives:. Encouragement of home-based businesses to reduce commuting with provisos of EMP5	
Policy EMP5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6280	Objecting	What powers of control will the Council have?	
Policy EMP5	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6898	Supporting	The policy acknowledging the increasing number of people who will wish to work from home is both supported and welcome. The inclusion of the clause protecting neighbours from significant level of deliveries, visits etc. is appropriate.	
3.51	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5585	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'sustainable infrastructure'. This includes the support for new digital infrastructures	
3.52	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1125	Objecting	The copper telephone land-line connections of many homes the Parish of Waltham cover significant distances to the nearest telephone exchange that reduces the speed of broadband communication. The enhanced facilities offered by super-fast broadband via fibre-optic cables are not currently available to Waltham residents. Also the hilly nature of the Parish gives areas of radio shadow interferes with mobile phone signals. These two factors can discourage residents from working at home.	WPC would like to see a stronger commitment by CCC to the comments in Section 3.52 thatthe Council will support improvements in communications technology in areas that are not as accessible to new digital services.

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP6	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		352	Supporting	- Enables home working; - Provides lower overall traffic levels; - Supports the growth of a knowledge-based economy.	
Policy EMP6	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1100	Supporting	WPC welcomes the commitment given in Policy EMP6 that Canterbury City Council ("CCC") will give particular support to improving digital infrastructure in areas such as the Parish of Waltham in which mobile phone signals and broadband speeds are limited. This limitation restricts the ability of Waltham parishioners for working from home, and action to enable more home-working could benefit economic development in the rural areas of the District.	
Policy EMP6	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1128	Objecting	Policy EMP6 is particularly relevant to the Parish of Waltham, and WPC would like to see more specific details as to how the right balance can be struck between retro-fitting villages and rural areas with improved digital infrastructure, without giving rise to detrimental impacts on listed buildings, and the character and appearance of conservation areas and sensitive landscape areas.	
Policy EMP6	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1775	Objecting	Add mention of designated landscape (i.e. KDAONB)	Add mention of designated KDAONB as follows in bold : '.....and appearance of conservation areas and sensitive and/or designated landscape areas.'
Policy EMP6	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5591	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'sustainable infrastructure'. This includes the support for new digital infrastructures	
Policy EMP6	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5886	Objecting	There is also a shortage of information on what is proposed to improve digital coverage.	
Policy EMP6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6282	Objecting	Again, lacking any mention of consideration for neighbours	
3.53	776445	Dr Grainne Evans		637	Objecting	Canterbury has a large student population. UK student numbers are falling and foreign students will not remain as suggested in the Draft Local Plan. Cap student numbers. Higher student fees have been introduced to discourage young people from pursuing non vocational subjects; apprenticeships are the new higher education.	
3.53	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5761	Objecting	HE's have the potential to have a greater economic impact, in 'spin out' companies and knowledge exchange, which will bring prosperity in the future . Their development is not included in the Local Plan and yet will be a significant element of providing employment/growth in the District. Need an integrated approach and support expansion of provision in all HE providers in capacity, exploitation of research, IP and conferences.	We would like to see an integrated approach and would support expansion of provision in all of our HE providers in the development of additional capacity to meet future education needs, and in accommodating spin out businesses, the exploitation of research and other valuable IP developed by them, and conferences that can have a positive impact across the wider city and District.
3.53	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6283	Supporting	3.53 to 3.60. Seem sensible	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.59	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3413	Objecting	I note that there is no mention of developments relating to the University of Creative Arts and Canterbury College. These institutions occupy a shared site which is now fully utilised. If these institutions wish to grow in future there needs to be some provision in the plan for this to be enabled.	Make provision in Plan for the University of Creative Arts and Canterbury College to grow.
3.60	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5690	Supporting	More specific positives:. Encouragement of business initiatives resulting from innovative university research	
Policy EMP7	405570	Ms Julie Martin		122	Objecting	Imperative to increase consideration of existing local residents who chose to live in semi/rural areas, villages etc - creeping development without proper 'margins' produce parking issues, light and noise pollution and change the character of communities. People should be at the heart of any development - NOT merely economic benefits for the few at the expense of many.	Absolute confirmation of appropriate restrictions and commitment to local residents, backed up with support from the City Council. Canterbury is a Cathedral city not a giant University - the character of existing communities should be preserved and protected. This should involve maintaining an appropriate, physical margin to keep the areas distinct. This enables everyone to exist without blurring the boundaries. Residents pay the Council Tax and vote for the councillors and their needs should be given priority.
Policy EMP7	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		353	Supporting	I fully support this. Additionally I believe that it would be prudent to point out that the university's Travel Plan must clearly further the sustainable transport objectives of this Local Plan in order to demonstrate that it will have a beneficial impact on the wider district.	
Policy EMP7	771779	Mrs Patricia Kane		397	Supporting	I welcome this policy which emphasises that the campus character of the university should be preserved and that the setting of the site in the wider countryside should be respected. I assume this means that the southern slopes of the university, including the Chaucer Fields site will be retained as a natural buffer zone between the campus and the residential areas adjacent to it.	
Policy EMP7	665473	Dr Richard Norman		546	Supporting	Strongly support the requirement for the University of Kent to produce a Masterplan for the campus, and that this should maintain the campus character of the University, respect the setting of the site in the wider countryside, and set out a landscape strategy for the whole site.	
Policy EMP7	775856	Mr Michael McDonnell		643	Supporting	Definitely support Policy EMP7 and in particular the second paragraph stating that "the Council will expect a masterplan to be prepared for the whole identified campus site prior to any significant development within the site." I would hope that the Council would support the efforts of the local residents in the area of Kent University to protect Chaucer Field and the wonderful view of the Canterbury and the Cathedral from University Road.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP7	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	904	Objecting	The growth of the University over recent decades has been exponential. I concur with this policy but it does not go far enough. I fear that with unchecked development the University could be seen as a cuckoo in Canterbury's nest and this would be counter productive to both the City and the University. Economic contribution made by the University is recognised but it sits in an AHLV that can affect the setting of the cathedral, preservation of Blean Woods and amenity value of open space.	Accordingly I would seek to insert. "There should be particular regard to the wider setting of the Cathedral and its visual amenity and the amenity value to the residents of Canterbury and students from open space on the campus".
Policy EMP7	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	1051	Supporting	The new Local Plan has a requirement for the University of Kent (UKC) to have a Master Plan. CCAC supports this initiative.	
Policy EMP7	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1176	Supporting	We strongly support the requirement for a masterplan for the campus of the University of Kent. We welcome the requirement for any development of the campus to respect the setting of the site in the wider countryside and to have regard to a landscape strategy for the whole campus. The proposed 'Chaucer Fields' development is contrary to these aims, disregarding the need to maintain a green buffer zone to the nearby residential area and representing a loss of visual and recreational amenity.	
Policy EMP7	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1223	Supporting	We strongly support the policy that the University of Kent should be expected to prepare a Masterplan for the whole campus site. We particularly welcome and emphasise the requirements that such a Masterplan should: maintain the campus character of the university; respect the setting of the site in the wider countryside; set out a landscape strategy for the whole site.	
Policy EMP7	778563	Mrs Susan Langdown		1313	Supporting	This action is long overdue, and should have been put in place many years ago, when it first became obvious that the University was not keeping pace with student numbers in providing accommodation on site. Such action should not wait for the Local Plan to be approved, but could and should be put in place immediately.	
Policy EMP7	778387	Mr David Smith		1335	Supporting	This policy should also rule out any development of the Southern Slopes of the campus. Because at present the University is unable to house the current number of students requiring on campus accommodation, no further increase in student numbers should be allowed until the Masterplan has been prepared and approved and the University can clearly demonstrate that they are able to accommodate any desired increase in student numbers.	
Policy EMP7	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1478	Supporting	Strongly support. UKC should produce a master plan before any further development is permitted. They should explain clearly why any further growth in student numbers is required (and thus more pressure on local and city needs).	
Policy EMP7	777305	Mr Jason Hobbs	Area Manager Homes and Communities Agency	1607	Supporting	HCA considers that policy guidance to develop the campus at the University of Kent, which, supports the retention/development of educational buildings, should be supported as it supports and encourages economic growth.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP7	779262	Mr John Bailey		1967	Supporting	Fully agree that the Master Plan must be produced and that the campus setting must be maintained. The encroachment on local residents would not be acceptable and change the very nature of the campus setting. Excellent proposal.	
Policy EMP7	778680	Mark & Dawn Walsh		2139	Supporting	support	
Policy EMP7	778683	Ms Sarah Wood		2144	Supporting	The University of Kent should produce a masterplan for its campus, that maintains character, respects the setting, and includes a landscape strategy, so supports policy EMP7.	
Policy EMP7	778716	Ms Sue Pratt		2169	Supporting	We support EMP7 and would welcome a proper landscape strategy.	
Policy EMP7	778712	Mr Robert Keen		2181	Supporting	I support Policy EMP7 of the Draft Local Plan	
Policy EMP7	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2206	Supporting	We strongly support the policy that the University of Kent should be expected to prepare a Masterplan for the whole campus site. We particularly welcome and emphasise the requirements that such a Masterplan should: maintain the campus character of the university; respect the setting of the site in the wider countryside; set out a landscape strategy for the whole site.	
Policy EMP7	778801	A C Strange		2344	Supporting	the University of Kent should certainly be required to produce a masterplan for its campus, which maintains its campus character, respects the setting of the site in the wider countryside, and includes a landscape strategy. I support this policy.	
Policy EMP7	778657	Prof J H Strange		2416	Supporting	support policy EMP7 : the University of Kent should produce a masterplan for its campus, which maintains its campus character, respects the setting and includes a landscape strategy.	
Policy EMP7	778686	Alan & Britta Pearlman		2432	Supporting	Support policy EMP7. It is essential for Canterbury that the University of Kent produce a plan which respects its setting in the context of this city and restricts its potential to impinge negatively upon it.	
Policy EMP7	779270	Ms Pauline Walters		2461	Supporting	I support policy EMP7	
Policy EMP7	778956	Dr Michael Forrester		2470	Supporting	Supports policy EMP7 which proposes that UKC should provide a master plan for its campus.	
Policy EMP7	778868	Mr Tom Tomaszewski		2502	Supporting	I support Policy EMP7	
Policy EMP7	778870	Leigh Derbyshire		2528	Supporting	I support Policy EMP7 which proposes that UKC should provide a masterplan for its campus.	
Policy EMP7	779099	Ms Jennifer Lennard		2640	Supporting	I would like to support policy EMP7.	
Policy EMP7	779320	Mr Peter Boys		2675	Supporting	I support policy EMP7.	
Policy EMP7	779572	Ms Margaret Derbyshire		2767	Supporting	I support policy EMP7 which proposes that UKC should provide a master plan for its campus.	
Policy EMP7	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2801	Supporting	I also support policy EMP7 protecting views across the city, etc.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP7	780332	Ms Lucinda Malster		2896	Supporting	I agree with the proposal that the University of Kent should be required to produce a master plan for its campus respecting the setting of the site in the wider countryside. I support Policy EMP7	
Policy EMP7	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3056	Objecting	It will be important that any residential development proposed within the University of Kent or Canterbury Christ Church University is assessed for its individual and in-combination impacts on the Natura 2000 and Ramsar network.	
Policy EMP7	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3065	Supporting	EMP7: Support the aspiration that would require the University of Kent to produce a Masterplan for its whole campus.	
Policy EMP7	499539	Mr Jeremy Barton		3211	Supporting	Agrees that the University of Kent be required to produce a masterplan for its campus, maintaining campus character, respecting the setting of the site, and including a landscape strategy. The University should be required to protect open spaces within the campus.	Require the University to protect open spaces within the campus
Policy EMP7	780293	John & Kate Hills		3213	Supporting	We support policy EMP7 which proposes that UKC should provide a master plan for its campus.	
Policy EMP7	780292	Mrs Marianne Fearnside		3219	Supporting	I believe that the University of Kent should be required to produce a Masterplan for its campus, which maintains its campus character, respects the setting of the site in the wider countryside, and includes a landscape strategy. For this reason I support policy EMP7.	
Policy EMP7	780314	Ms Helen Gardiner		3225	Supporting	The University of Kent should be required to produce a master plan for its campus which maintains its campus character, respects the setting of the site in the wider countryside and includes a landscape strategy. As such I support policy EMP7	
Policy EMP7	780449	Daniel & Elizabeth Rikh		3318	Supporting	We support policy EMP7 for a masterplan for campus planning in the context of the wider environment.	
Policy EMP7	779545	Mr Keith Bothwell		3363	Supporting	I am writing to respond to the consultation regarding the Local Draft Plan. Please note the following: I wholeheartedly support policy EMP7 which proposes that UKC should provide a master plan for its campus. I believe that this is essential in order to ensure that future developments on the campus are coherent, well-designed and sensitive to the existing surroundings, buildings and landscape.	
Policy EMP7	479400	Dr Doreen Rosman		3385	Supporting	Welcomes the requirement that the University produce a masterplan and that it be encouraged to provide purpose-built campus accommodation. The impact of buildings should be considered in the wider landscape.	
Policy EMP7	780207	Pru Cherry	The Whitstable Road Residents Association	3401	Supporting	We support policy EMP7 requiring the University of Kent to prepare a masterplan for future development on the campus. EMP7 should be more specific about a review of the University's travel plan. The huge number of buses has meant increases in pollution, vibration and congestion. Consider electric buses, a monorail, borris bikes.	
Policy EMP7	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3412	Supporting	I support policy EMP7 which proposes that UKC should provide a master plan for its campus.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP7	481630	Dr R B Mallion		3477	Supporting	I agree that UKC should be required to produce a Master-Plan that (a) maintains the original character of the Campus; (b) respects the setting of the site in the context of the wider countryside, and (c) includes a comprehensive and self-consistent landscape strategy. I very much hope that the Council will not grant permission for grubbing up centuries-old hedgerows, fields and meadows, for which the present generation are merely the custodians.	
Policy EMP7	479719	Dr Robert Jupe		3498	Supporting	I support policy EMP7 on the need for a plan from the University.	
Policy EMP7	780690	Ms Rosemary Cane		3513	Supporting	I support the policy EMP7 relating to the requirement for the University of Kent to produce a Masterplan for its campus which should demonstrate respect for its setting, in view of its historical importance and rural nature, and include a landscape strategy.	
Policy EMP7	780505	Dr Jeremy Kendall		3729	Supporting	Support the proposal that the University of Kent should be required to produce a Masterplan for its campus, which maintains its campus character, respects the setting of the site in the wider countryside, and includes a landscape strategy.	
Policy EMP7	780518	Mr Ken Fox & Family		3801	Supporting	Support Policy EMP7, which proposes that UKC should provide a master plan for its campus.	
Policy EMP7	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3883	Objecting	Objects to policy EMP7 because: need long term strategies, need to show a developed and available site/s, the policy sanctions development anywhere within the whole campus, which could cause a blot on the landscape. Delete business innovation centre, include biodiversity, discourage parking on campus, delete 4th para.	In the introduction delete "business accommodation.....business innovation". This is entirely inappropriate and certainly would not the best use of land at the University, especially when such accommodation for this purpose is available in the centre of Canterbury. In the last sentence of the second para insert "and biodiversity" after "landscape". In the third para add to end "The City Council will discourage or refuse further areas of parking on the campus to lessen reliance on car travel, and to lessen air, light and noise pollution" Delete the fourth para.
Policy EMP7	780988	Ms Laura Leahy		3955	Supporting	I agree with the proposal that the University of Kent should be required to produce a Masterplan for its campus, which maintains its campus character, respects the setting of the site in the wider countryside, and includes a landscape strategy, write to say that you support policy EMP7.	
Policy EMP7	780731	Mr T J Patten		4203	Supporting	I support the view that the University of Kent should produce a master plan for its campus to maintain character, to maintain respect for the site and setting in the wider countryside, and to include a landscape strategy. I believe the University should never have countenanced its proposed development on Chaucer Fields.	
Policy EMP7	780732	Mr Jonathan A Cane		4207	Supporting	I support the policy EMP7 relating to the requirement for the University of Kent to produce a Masterplan for its campus which should demonstrate respect for its setting, in view of its historical importance and rural nature, and include a landscape strategy.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP7	780983	Mr Martin Ward		4267	Supporting	The University of Kent must be compelled to produce a master-plan for its campus which ensures the character of the campus is maintained and respects the setting of the site in the wider countryside. This should include a clear plan for protecting areas from development and a landscape strategy. The university must be prevented from developing the campus at will with no regard for either the local environment or the position in which it sits overlooking the city. I support Policy EMP7	
Policy EMP7	780985	Ms Jennifer Keaveney		4282	Supporting	I support the call for the University to produce a masterplan but would argue that 'design, siting and access considerations' should be given the highest importance when such a plan, or any element of it, is being considered.	
Policy EMP7	781064	Mr Richard Grayson		4325	Supporting	Policy EMP7 - I agree with the proposal that the University of Kent be required to produce a Masterplan for its Canterbury campus. T	
Policy EMP7	780971	Mr Tom Cane		4357	Supporting	I support the policy EMP7 relating to the requirement for the University of Kent to produce a Masterplan for its campus which should demonstrate respect for its setting, in view of its historical importance and rural nature, and include a landscape strategy.	
Policy EMP7	781413	Dr Adam Bartley		4585	Supporting	Support for Policy EMP7 in relation to Chaucer Fields.	
Policy EMP7	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4672	Supporting	Support the preparation of a master plan, especially maintaining character, setting and landscape strategy. It should be adhered to and no development allowed until it is completed. Include provision for student accommodation and include caps on student number accommodated in the City. Encourage online learning.	
Policy EMP7	781637	Mr Brendan Power		4793	Supporting	I agree with the proposal that the University of Kent should be required to produce a masterplan for its campus, which maintains its campus character, respects the setting of the site in the wider countryside, and includes a landscape strategy, so support policy EMP7.	
Policy EMP7	781595	Ms Laura Jowers		4794	Supporting	I agree with the proposal that the University of Kent should be required to produce a masterplan for its campus, which maintains its campus character, respects the setting of the site in the wider countryside, and includes a landscape strategy, so support policy EMP7.	
Policy EMP7	782070	Julie Rowe		5038	Supporting	I agree with the proposal that the University of Kent should be required to produce a Masterplan for its campus, which maintains its campus character, respects the setting of the site in the wider countryside, and includes a landscape strategy. I support policy EMP7.	
Policy EMP7	781734	Mr Chris Lowe		5089	Objecting	Clarify what represents the university 'campus' on the proposals map. The campus should be defined with a northern boundary starting at the path on the northern edge of Blean Primary school going east to join the northern boundary of the Wolff College site.	Change the wording to read: "The 'campus' is that area owned by the University with a northern boundary starting at the path on the northern edge of Blean Primary school going east to join the northern boundary of the Wolff College site.

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP7	782449	Ms Jayne Ward		5138	Supporting	The University of Kent must be compelled to produce a master-plan for its campus which ensures the character of the campus is maintained and respects the setting of the site in the wider countryside. This should include a clear plan for protecting areas from development and a landscape strategy. The university must be prevented from developing the campus at will with no regard for either the local environment or the position in which it sits overlooking the city. I support Policy EMP7	
Policy EMP7	784481	Fabio Hedayioglu		5252	Supporting	i,§ I agree with the proposal that the University of Kent should be required to produce a Masterplan for its campus, which maintains its campus character, respects the setting of the site in the wider countryside, and includes a landscape strategy. I support policy EMP7.	
Policy EMP7	421400	Mr Ben Knox		5297	Supporting	I therefore support policy EMP7 which proposes that UKC should provide a master plan for its campus. Priority must be the creation of affordable housing (both to buy and to rent) so that our children's generation can actually afford to live in the Canterbury district.	
Policy EMP7	781622	Mr T Whiting		5396	Supporting	I consider the University of Kent brings an overall benefit to the city, but again a plan should consider the final proportions of the University compared to the size of the city and it should defiantly not be allowed to creep down to join the outskirts so loosing that green divide. I therefore support policy EMP7	
Policy EMP7	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5547	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'On Housing'. This includes the intention to work with universities on their plans.	
Policy EMP7	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5691	Supporting	More specific positives:. University-related policies EMP7 and 8	
Policy EMP7	784807	Mr John Pike		5941	Objecting	I support policy EMP7 which proposes that UKC should provide a master plan for its campus. However, I note that there is no mention of developments relating to the University of Creative Arts and Canterbury College . These institutions occupy a shared site which is now fully utilised. If these institutions wish to grow in future there needs to be some provision in the plan for this to be enabled.	I note that there is no mention of developments relating to the University of Creative Arts and Canterbury College . These institutions occupy a shared site which is now fully utilised. If these institutions wish to grow in future there needs to be some provision in the plan for this to be enabled.

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP7	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	6006	Objecting	We strongly support the ethos of a policy that the University of Kent should be expected to prepare a Masterplan for the whole campus site. However we believe the wording needs some further clarification. We particularly emphasise the requirements that such a Masterplan should: · maintain the campus character of the university; · respect the setting of the site in the wider countryside and impact to local residents and wildlife; · set out a landscape strategy for the whole site.	Make clear to the University that planning permission will not be given for any further developments until such a Masterplan is produced and the above requirements are fully met. The Masterplan should include provision for more student accommodation on the central campus to reduce the pressure on the housing market and release family-sized homes for occupation by families . There are possible sites on the campus for additional student accommodation, but the available space is limited. The University should therefore also be required to accompany the Masterplan with a commitment that there will be no further increase in student numbers . Without such a commitment, the Masterplan will be unworkable.
Policy EMP7	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6144	Supporting	Supportive of the need for a transport impact assessment and a review of the universities' travel plans to accompany any significant development proposal. This should relate to new developments, existing or new. All universities should be expected to mitigate any potential increase in traffic and to positively encourage a modal shift towards sustainable transport, including measures that dis-incentivise.	
Policy EMP7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6284	Supporting	Seem sensible	
Policy EMP7	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6365	Supporting	I support this policy. Comment: I support the policy that the University of Kent should develop a masterplan for the whole campus and believe that this should include a landscape strategy for the whole site. There should be no further increase in student numbers until the HMO issue has been resolved.	
Policy EMP7	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6901	Supporting	Agree with an increase in student housing, as indicated in General Statement. The plan will broadly encourage on-campus student housing, and discourage further intensification of HMOs (ref policies HD6, HD7). See PO6861, PO6862 CCC should work actively with the institutions to enhance the master plans with significant increases in student accomm.	
Policy EMP8	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		354	Supporting	I fully support this. Additionally I believe that it would be prudent to point out that the university's Travel Plan must clearly further the sustainable transport objectives of this Local Plan in order to demonstrate that it will have a beneficial impact on the wider district.	
Policy EMP8	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3058	Objecting	It will be important that any residential development proposed within the University of Kent or Canterbury Christ Church University is assessed for its individual and in-combination impacts on the Natura 2000 and Ramsar network.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP8	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3884	Objecting	Object to EMP8 because: support for student accommodation in the urban area is unacceptable. Delete second sentence, exclude students from first sentence. Add a para that requires a campus travel plan.	The second sentence should, be deleted. First sentence, delete "the intensification or re" and add to end "but not for student accommodation". Add at end of para: "together with a landscape and biodiversity strategy. The City Council will expect the transport plan to include provisions to prevent staff and students from bringing cars to Canterbury. The University of Kent has already adopted such a provision."
Policy EMP8	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5692	Supporting	More specific positives:. University-related policies EMP7 and 8	
Policy EMP8	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6145	Supporting	Supportive of the need for a transport impact assessment and a review of the universities' travel plans to accompany any significant development proposal. This should relate to new developments, existing or new. All universities should be expected to mitigate any potential increase in traffic and to positively encourage a modal shift towards sustainable transport, including measures that dis-incentivise.	
Policy EMP8	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6285	Supporting	Seem sensible	
Policy EMP8	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6903	Supporting	Agree with an increase in student housing, as indicated in General Statement. The plan will broadly encourage on-campus student housing, and discourage further intensification of HMOs (ref policies HD6, HD7). See PO6861, PO6862 CCC should work actively with the institutions to enhance the master plans with significant increases in student accomm.	
Policy EMP8	785163	Canterbury Christ Church University		6966	Supporting	Para 3.59 refers to CCC's recognition that the fiscal environment for further and tertiary education is changing rapidly, and that long-term planning may be complicated. It therefore seeks to continue to support the Universities and Colleges in the improvement, diversification and development of their educational offer, but also the development of business ideas stemming from innovative research and other University core business. This acknowledgement is welcomed by CCCU. Allocation is welcomed.	
3.61	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		977	Objecting	"Some" of the necessary provision is made. This is not good enough. The plan needs to provide for the educational needs of our residents.	"Some" of the necessary provision is made. This is not good enough. The plan needs to provide for the educational needs of our residents.
3.61	771556	Mr Phil Rose		2061	Objecting	This is shocking. The Local Plan only provides for "some" of the need for new or improved school provision in the district. Put simply, the Council is EXPLICITLY PLANNING TO UNDER-PROVIDE SCHOOLING. The Plan needs to contain more policies like EMP10, stating "Land is allocated at X, Herne Bay for a new school." And there needs to be explicit support from KCC, as education authority, for each allocation, and an explicit commitment to build within a specified timeframe.	The Plan needs to contain more policies like EMP10, stating "Land is allocated at X, Herne Bay for a new school." And there needs to be explicit support from KCC, as education authority, for each allocation, and an explicit commitment to build within a specified timeframe.

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.61	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5968	Supporting	KCC will consult with CCC on the possibility and suitability of any changes to provision in this area, in line with the Education Commissioning Plan.	
3.61	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6286	Objecting	School provision - An issue of great concern to residents of Sturry.	
3.62	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5969	Supporting	KCC will consult with CCC on the possibility and suitability of any changes to provision in this area, in line with the Education Commissioning Plan.	
3.63	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		355	Supporting	Funding should sought to improve the link between Canterbury East station and the Langton schools at their combined site. - Motor vehicle movements in the vicinity of the schools should be restricted in order to encourage sustainable travel patterns to the schools and so as to not adversely affect local residents.	Funding should sought to improve the link between Canterbury East station and the Langton schools at their combined site. - Motor vehicle movements in the vicinity of the schools should be restricted in order to encourage sustainable travel patterns to the schools and so as to not adversely affect local residents.
3.63	779262	Mr John Bailey		1968	Supporting	Very good idea as they work on so much together.	
3.63	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2814	Objecting	There are proposals for Simon Langton Girls School to be relocated but no indication as to whether it will take more pupils. This has been refuted by the school.	
3.63	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3172	Objecting	Langton girls school be removed from plan as there is no funding for it to move. There is no resident support and the plans have blighted properties. The site shown for the new school should be removed.	Remove Simon Langton Girls School new site from the DLP.
3.63	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3885	Objecting	Delete the paragraph	Delete the paragraph
3.63	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5970	Supporting	KCC will consult with CCC on the possibility and suitability of any changes to provision in this area, in line with the Education Commissioning Plan.	
3.63	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6147	Objecting	We understand that this is now not the case and that Simon Langton Girls' School will be staying on the current site.	
3.63	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6287	Objecting	Is the SLGS proposal deliverable?	
3.64	405570	Ms Julie Martin		123	Objecting	Waste of public money that could be better used elsewhere.	Withdraw this proposal

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.64	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		356	Supporting	There is strong demand for Grammar school provision in the coastal towns. Such provision will lead to more sustainable travel patterns and reduced traffic levels.	
3.64	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	915	Objecting	Given the parlous state of traffic congestion in the city and pointless journeys in terms of time and carbon footprint made by children from the coast this should be treated as an absolute priority.	I would wish to see a statement that " The Council will seek to identify an appropriate site at the earliest opportunity".
3.64	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		980	Objecting	Land needs to be allocated for this in the plan, otherwise this is just a pipe dream.	Land needs to be allocated for this in the plan, otherwise this is just a pipe dream.
3.64	771556	Mr Phil Rose		2062	Objecting	However, this Plan does not make that case and there is no land set aside anywhere to build a new secondary school. Nor is there any commitment from Kent Council to fund a new secondary school. This statement is pure pie in the sky.	If, and it's a big if, the Council really does "believe that there is a strong case to be made for grammar school provision at the coast" then this must be an explicit commitment within the Local Plan. It's not enough to allude to future discussions of possibilities with KCC - land must be identified and reserved for the purpose, and KCC must provide explicit support and commitment to build.
3.64	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	2161	Objecting	Advantage underplayed or not mentioned.	Fully describe advantages and describe others such as joint working with coast schools.
3.64	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2815	Objecting	KCC do not have the funding for a new school in the area. A large proportion of secondary school children from Herne Bay travel out of the area to school. Proposed development on the Golf Course and Strode Farm will reduce the catchment area for Herne Bay High, excluding youngsters who live in the parish.	
3.64	780271	Councillor Alison O'Dea	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3292	Supporting	The provision of a Coastal Grammar School (3.64) Given the current number of students who current have to travel into Canterbury from the coastal towns, must be treated as a priority.	
3.64	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3603	Supporting	I agree with paragraph 3.64, especially as I understand that the Queen Elizabeth School at Faversham no longer takes pupils from Herne & Broomfield.	
3.64	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5571	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'On Traffic'. This includes the idea of a grammar school on the coast.	
3.64	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5971	Supporting	KCC will consult with CCC on the possibility and suitability of any changes to provision in this area, in line with the Education Commissioning Plan.	
3.64	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6289	Supporting	Grammar school provision at the coast SUPPORTED and long overdue	
3.65	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3886	Objecting	Insert a new para as follows: "The Council will expect all schools and colleges in and around the City to exclude staff and students from bringing cars to Canterbury."	Insert a new para as follows: "The Council will expect all schools and colleges in and around the City to exclude staff and students from bringing cars to Canterbury."

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP9	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5032	Objecting	Policy EMP9 does not meet the tests in the NPPF (para 204) as it is not directly related to the new development nor is fairly related in scale and kind. The education needs arising from new development may not have an unacceptable impact so a contribution should not be required. Amend to only refer to unacceptable impacts and fair and reasonable payments/facility provision.	Amend policy as follows: insert a sentence at start 'Where new development will result in an unacceptable impact on primary and secondary school education facilities, ...'. At the end include 'The mechanisms secured, which could include the payment of contributions towards the provision of new or improved facilities will be of a scale and kind that is fairly and reasonably associated to the development.'
Policy EMP9	784575	Kent College		5293	Objecting	It is of particular concern to Kent College that the Draft Local Plan needs to recognise the presumption in favour of allowing Schools to expand and grow to meet its needs and needs of the Borough. We would ask that Kent College, in the independent sector, be noted for having potential for expansion both in pupil numbers and its facilities, and the potential for housing as enabling development to support the school's development.	Policies EMP 7 and EMP8 identify the potential education options relating to the University of Kent, land North Holmes Road, and Canterbury Christchurch. We would ask that Kent College, in the independent sector, be noted for having potential for expansion both in pupil numbers and its facilities wherein objecting to Policy OS5, we have provided a list of many of the developments the School is targeting. It is highlighted that such a list should not be viewed as a final and exclusive list. The school would welcome better and clearer designation within the Local Plan Preferred Option Draft Consultation as to the contribution that Kent College currently makes and will continue to make. There needs to be a balance between consideration of this School site in its setting and settlement context. There is a need to allow for its optimum viable use (see NPPF Paragraph 134) as an educational establishment and not to impose unnecessary constraints.
Policy EMP9	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5856	Supporting	CCC has worked with KCC in respect of the impact of proposed new development in the Plan on the need for new or improved school provision (para. 3.63). Policy EMP9 is for School provision and states "The city council will work with the education authority and other school providers to ensure that provision is made for educational needs arising from new development and that appropriate mechanisms are secured through legal agreements to deliver this provision". KCC welcomes EMP9.	
Policy EMP9	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6290	Supporting	Would not expect any less	
Policy EMP10	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	215	Objecting	The obviously massive cost of such elements as the remodelling of the A2 junction at Bridge, the construction of the so-called "Eastern Bypass" and the relocation of large and important girls' school is not acknowledged anywhere in the document. The idea that such schemes could simply be funded by development is, frankly, disingenuous. Indeed, it is perhaps significant that no even speculative costings are included.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP10	408444	Mr & Mrs Bill & Carol Hinchliffe		491	Objecting	Simon Langton Girls School is not being moved next to the Boys School which is good as it currently has good access and bus links.	Remove school from plan
Policy EMP10	778182	Gordon and Susan Manley		1603	Objecting	There is no justification or requirement for moving Simon Langton Girls School other than the demands of the plan. The cost factors involved in moving and re-establishing the school would be disproportionate to the gains in the value of land for development	
Policy EMP10	778077	Mr Paul Newton		2204	Objecting	The proposal to relocate Simon Langton Girls' School does not represent a sensible use of funds for development.	
Policy EMP10	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3173	Objecting	Langton girls school be removed from plan as there is no funding for it to move. There is no resident support and the plans have blighted properties. The site shown for the new school should be removed.	Remove Simon Langton Girls School new site from the DLP.
Policy EMP10	13751	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Lower Hardres Parish Council	3379	Objecting	The new proposed site for Simon Langton Girls School will greatly add to the traffic density on Nackington Road with over 1000 pupils, most in buses and cars adding further traffic congestion during school term time.	
Policy EMP10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3887	Objecting	Object to the allocation of the land at Langton Lane for a new secondary school, and this site should be deleted from the Policy and the Proposals Map.	Delete allocation of the land at Langton Lane for a new secondary school, and this site should be deleted from the Policy and the Proposals Map.
Policy EMP10	13752	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Petham Parish Council	3942	Objecting	The proposed new site for Simon Langton Girls School will add to the traffic density on Nackington Road, with over 1,000 pupils, most in buses and cars adding further traffic congestion.	
Policy EMP10	781614	Mr Malcolm Cumming		4774	Supporting	The proposal to move the Langton Girls Grammar School adjacent to the Simon Langton boys school is a good one, as the potential to share resources can only benefit the education of students at both schools. However, one suspects the ultimate decision on this will be taken by Kent County Council, and not the City Council	
Policy EMP10	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5972	Objecting	KCC is not now proposing the relocation of Simon Langton Grammar School for Girls onto land at Langton Lane. The exceptional richness of historic environment + scale of the sites proposed would indicate a good potential for these allocation sites to impact upon presently unknown assets. Advice from CCC archaeological advisor should be sought with specific site analysis.	KCC is not now proposing the relocation of Simon Langton Grammar School for Girls onto land at Langton Lane
Policy EMP10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6291	Objecting	Is it deliverable?	
3.67	784280	Whitstable Oyster Company Ltd		5122	Objecting	We seek deletion of the final words of Proposed Paragraph 3.67: "In particular, residential uses."We accept that amenity issues would form part of the assessment of the acceptability of proposed land uses within a marina development.These issues can be addressed through a number of means - siting, building design and orientation, buffer uses and insulation. We do not consider, therefore, that residential use should be discounted, at this stage.	We seek deletion of the final words of Proposed Paragraph 3.67: "In particular, residential uses."

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.68	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1035	Supporting	I agree that there is a need for a marina on the North Kent coast. However, Whitstable is not a viable option. Herne Bay's economy would, however, benefit greatly from a marina which would contribute to the regeneration agenda for the town.	
Policy EMP11	778047	Mr Michael Perkins		1242	Objecting	No reference to the provision or support for sea based leisure facilities, in particular at Whitstable. This is a serious omission as plans for the future of the Harbour and the surrounding area need to be included in any Plan for Whitstable. Whitstable Harbour needs to develop it's marine activities to be successful. If incorporated into a Marina development it would give it a major economic boost.	Make reference to sea based leisure and facilities in the Plan.
Policy EMP11	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3070	Objecting	Whitstable Harbour is immediately adjacent to the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar site. Consideration should be given to whether proposed expansion plans will cause increases in disturbances or loss of supporting habitat. Any plans should be assessed as part of the HRA process with mitigation being provided if impact is thought to occur.	
Policy EMP11	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3888	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but remove 'normally' from last sentence. See also our comments in Part 1 of our response in regard to Whitstable Harbour and our suggestion that the proposals for the Harbour included in Policy TCL10 should be incorporated into Policy EMP11.	Remove 'normally' from last sentence. Proposals for the Harbour in Policy TCL10 should be incorporated into Policy EMP11.
Policy EMP11	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3889	Objecting	Support this Policy, but remove 'normally' from last sentence. Accept that the range of uses indicated are suitable for Whitstable Harbour. But Policy EMP11 also relates to the Whitstable Harbour area. It would be better to deal with the Harbour in a one Policy to avoid confusion. We suggest that Policy EMP11 would be the appropriate. Therefore, the content of Policy TCL10 in relation to the Harbour should be incorporated into Policy EMP11, and the supporting text expanded.	Remove 'normally' from last sentence. The content of Policy TCL10 in relation to the Harbour should be incorporated into Policy EMP11, and the supporting text expanded.
Policy EMP11	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5630	Objecting	Whitstable A more considered discussion of the Harbour is required, including the relationship between the DLP and the Strategic Harbour Plan.	
Policy EMP11	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5693	Supporting	More specific positives: . Whitstable Harbour policy EMP11	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP11	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6034	Objecting	The summary of the Strategic Plan is over-compressed and simplified and is being used as a planning document without sufficient thought and protections.	The Local Plan policy should state each the objectives (set out below) of the Strategic Plan to getround the issues described above. 3.1 Key elements [a] To develop on the basis of interests that are harbour-dependent or harbour-beneficial. [b] To maintain the operating capability of the [c] To maintain a balance of operational and non-operational activities [d] To maintain a balance of community and tourist [e] To develop in keeping with the character and heritage of the town [f] To retain control over Harbour [g] To develop land areas suitable for Harbour related [h] To create an active frontage on the South Quay Active street frontage to Harbour Street, Tower Parade and to the quayside itself, providing direct public access and any necessary access for delivery vehicles, will be a key objective for any new development. [i] To support the fishing and shell-fishing activities and markets. [j] To balance the commercial interests of the Harbour with those of the town. [k] To contribute to the sustainability of the community Long Comment - see representation
Policy EMP11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6292	Objecting	What are the transport implications? Are the proposals acceptable to the residents of Whitstable?	
3.69	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3890	Objecting	This section should be split into two section, with sub-headings as follows: a) Agriculture - para 3.69 to 3.73 and policies EMP12 and EMP13; and b) Other rural businesses €" paras 3.74 to 3.75 and Policy EMP14	This section should be split into two section, with sub-headings as follows: a) Agriculture - para 3.69 to 3.73 and policies EMP12 and EMP13; and b) Other rural businesses - paras 3.74 to 3.75 and Policy EMP14
3.70	70139	Mr John Archer	Regional Environment & Land Use Adviser National Farmers Union	1441	Supporting	The NFU welcomes the Council's support of agriculture and horticulture businesses. Food production is strategically important in its own right and is likely to become more so as population increases and productive land area decreases. Naturally we wish to see agricultural land remain in production but we take a pragmatic view of the development of best and most versatile land, accepting that it will be necessary in some cases for the wider public good.	
3.70	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3604	Objecting	Lower grade land can still be valuable for growing food, it can hold more moisture in dry years, when higher graded land is less productive.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.70	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3892	Objecting	In the second sentence after "is" insert "also productive of food or". At end add a section on the proportion of food produced, and council refusing all applications on productive agricultural land and specifying allocations.	In the second sentence after "is" insert "also productive of food or". At the end of the para add: "To emphasise the importance of all agricultural land, the National Farmers Union has just stated that Britain now produces only 62% of the food that the country produces (75% in 1991). Putting this into context it means that we are currently importing well over one third of the food we consume, at ever increasing prices, with the transport required adding to the world's and Britain's environmental problems. Consequently, the Council will refuse all applications for development of productive agricultural land and will not specify housing allocations in respect of areas of such land, in order to protect food security for Kent and for Britain."
3.70	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6293	Objecting	The country needs this more than ever. The quality of Grade 2 and 3 land can be improved where there is a will. The rush to build on this is unseemly and perceived as prompted by greed and developer profit motives. Building on any Agricultural land for any reason should only be after the total supply of brownfield sites can be proven to be exhausted. RURAL areas includes Sturry Parish.	
Policy EMP12	634241	Mr Robert Douthwaite		889	Objecting	Food security and the need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land is recognised by the NPPF. This has been omitted from the SA of the local plan, protecting best quality agricultural land is omitted as a core policy and food security is omitted as a key sustainability issue. Relevant because: self sufficiency in UK food production has fallen; Grade 1 and 2 is scarce nationally, well represented in Canterbury and threatened by the LP. There is a duty to consult Natural England.	
Policy EMP12	70139	Mr John Archer	Regional Environment & Land Use Adviser National Farmers Union	1442	Supporting	The NFU supports this policy, which broadly reflects its own position on the matter. We accept that there will be instances where development, including agricultural development, may be permitted on best and most versatile land where no viable alternative exists.	
Policy EMP12	775862	Mr Clive Flisher		2774	Objecting	I have commented on the quality of the agricultural land under separate cover dealing with the Landscape and Biodiversity report, but reiterate the recommendations therein as to the desire to restore the landscape, and the Natural England guidance on the conservation of best agricultural land which is being ignored by the council; the loss of Grade 1 and 2 land is significant and is my first concern.	
Policy EMP12	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2817	Objecting	How is CCC going to prove that development of agricultural land is necessary? No development of agricultural land is acceptable. Strode Farm as grade 3; grade 3a is 'best & most versatile'. This loss is not acceptable.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP12	383359	Ms Judy Seymour - Ure		3310	Objecting	Green farmland (Grade 1) must be preserved. There are not enough green spaces at the moment, and those that remain should not be built on.	
Policy EMP12	780449	Daniel & Elizabeth Rikh		3328	Objecting	We think that the Grade 1 farmland in Canterbury must be preserved.	
Policy EMP12	13751	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Lower Hardres Parish Council	3424	Objecting	The value of high quality land for food production ranks alongside global warming, as something we have to protect to ensure food supplies for the next generation. Once houses have been built it will be lost forever. An urgent re-assessment of the use of this land as proposed in the plan is required.	
Policy EMP12	121820	Mrs IVD Baker		3462	Supporting	Although the Draft Plan contains Policies SP4(5) and EMP12, which I welcome, they are both expressly subject to the allocations made in the Draft Plan - which is a very significant weakness and limits their utility.	
Policy EMP12	121830	Mr MJR Baker		3465	Supporting	Although the Draft Plan contains Policies SP4(5) and EMP12, which I welcome, they are both expressly subject to the allocations made in the Draft Plan - which is a very significant weakness and limits their utility.	
Policy EMP12	780827	Mr M P J Baker		3468	Supporting	Although the Draft Plan contains Policies SP4(5) and EMP12, which I welcome, they are both expressly subject to the allocations made in the Draft Plan - which is a very significant weakness and limits their utility.	
Policy EMP12	780828	Mr Jeremy D I Baker		3470	Supporting	Although the Draft Plan contains Policies SP4(5) and EMP12, which I welcome, they are both expressly subject to the allocations made in the Draft Plan - which is a very significant weakness and limits their utility.	
Policy EMP12	407886	Mr J and P Booth		3527	Objecting	When there is concern at strategic level about the amount of food we have to import it is wrong to turn quality agricultural land over to housing.	
Policy EMP12	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3893	Objecting	Support this Policy, but the word 'normally' should be removed from the last sentence, and the following should be added at the end: ", including previously developed land"	remove 'normally' sfrom the last sentence, and add at the end: ", including previously developed land"
Policy EMP12	13752	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Petham Parish Council	3944	Objecting	Land off Nackington Road as part of the proposal for 4,000 dwellings, is probably the finest Grade 1 brickearth in the United Kingdom, capable of growing the very widest range of crops, and has one of the best micro climates in Kent. The value of high quality land for food production ranks alongside global warming, as something we have to protect and act on now to ensure food supplies for the next generation. Once this land is developed, it will be lost forever.	An urgent re-assessment of the use of the land off Nackington Road is required.
Policy EMP12	780837	Mrs Margaret Darby		4742	Objecting	The City Council should for the long term future be protecting all Grade 1 agricultural land. This applies to all grade 1 land in the District and not just South Canterbury. This type of land is irreplaceable.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy EMP12	127115	B.J. Gore		5267	Objecting	Agricultural land should not be developed at all for non-agricultural purposes. As our own and the world's population rises, not only will the costs of the food we import rise, but also there will everywhere be a scarcity of productive land for growing food. It is utter folly to take such land for built development. Canterbury should take a lead on this, especially as so much of the land is in designated Landscape Areas and contributes to public health and social well-being.	
Policy EMP12	780212	Church Commissioners for England		5341	Objecting	Object to policy EMP12, because: development in rural areas needs to be carefully considered; some sites maybe the most sustainable and suitable location for development; protecting the best/most versatile land may not allow for development; also some of the best/most versatile land may not accommodate modern farming practices or is in isolated locations. Flexibility needs to be integrated.	Integrate flexibility into policy.
Policy EMP12	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5596	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'sustainable environment'. This includes the protection of good agricultural land.	
Policy EMP12	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5694	Supporting	More specific positives:. Protection of agricultural land EMP12 [but development allocation esp. at South Canterbury infringes this!]	
Policy EMP12	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6148	Objecting	Would like specific designations of land favoured for small scale cooperative farming use e.g. community allotments and cooperative small-holdings.	
Policy EMP12	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6294	Objecting	This is a RURAL area. The inclusion of a strong statement to cover the protection of agricultural land and the support for steps to improve its quality would reflect this.	
3.71	70139	Mr John Archer	Regional Environment & Land Use Adviser National Farmers Union	1443	Supporting	The NFU supports this statement within reason. Functional agricultural buildings may not be financially feasible if "high quality contemporary architecture of an extremely high standard" is insisted upon as a condition of planning approval. There is no excuse for the use of garish colours and we would support reasonable and proportionate requirements regarding the colour and texture of roofing and cladding materials.	
3.71	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3894	Objecting	After "buildings" in the first line insert "and structures" and after "silos" insert "poly tunnels, solar farms, wind turbines and fracking developments". Delete "AONB" and replace with "in the countryside". Add a sentence relating to land being returned to its previous use once the developments lists have ceased.	After "buildings" in the first line insert "and structures" and after "silos" insert "poly tunnels, solar farms, wind turbines and fracking developments". Delete "Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)" and replace with "in the countryside". At the end of the para add "In the case of poly tunnels, solar farms, wind turbines and fracking developments, landscaping and tree screening will be required and when the sites' uses have ceased they will have to be returned to their previous use (including the restoration of land to a productive condition)."
3.71	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5695	Supporting	More specific positives:. Design of farm buildings 3.71 and policy EMP13	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.71	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6296	Objecting	The recognition of the need to protect the look of the countryside is appreciated. Note: Sturry Parish is 'Rural' and wants to stay that way	
3.72	70139	Mr John Archer	Regional Environment & Land Use Adviser National Farmers Union	1445	Supporting	The usual reason for the abandonment of old agricultural buildings is simply that they are incompatible with modern needs. The NFU supports the use of redundant buildings, including historic ones, for diversification projects, and the Government's new and proposed relaxations of permitted development regulations will make this easier.	
3.72	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5696	Supporting	More specific positives: · Design of farm buildings 3.72 and policy EMP13	
3.73	70139	Mr John Archer	Regional Environment & Land Use Adviser National Farmers Union	1444	Supporting	The NFU agrees with these suggestions provided that some consideration is also given to the needs and practicalities of agricultural operations in the siting of new buildings.	
3.73	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3895	Objecting	In the second point delete "recommended" and insert "to be used". In the last sentence delete "should" and "avoided" and insert "is not to" and "used" respectively.	In the second point delete "recommended" and insert "to be used". In the last sentence delete "should" and "avoided" and insert "is not to" and "used" respectively.
3.73	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5697	Supporting	More specific positives: · Design of farm buildings 3.73 and policy EMP13	
Policy EMP13	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1039	Objecting	POLICY EMP13: Agricultural Development -There is no reference to polytunnels. There is an urgent need for policy guidance, as the numbers are growing rapidly.	
Policy EMP13	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1777	Objecting	High quality design and careful siting in the KDAONB protected landscape should be particularly mentioned. The KDAONB has concerns over reuse of large new agricultural buildings for non agricultural purposes and would require conditions on planning permissions for large agricultural buildings to ensure their demolition and restoration of the land to its former condition after they are no longer needed for agricultural purposes.	We would welcome discussion around revision of this policy to address the points raised above and how this policy relates to LB1 and our comments on the changes we would like to see on LB1
Policy EMP13	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2020	Objecting	It is over-prescriptive for this particular form of development and does not serve to add anything to the objectives of Policy SP1.	
Policy EMP13	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3896	Objecting	Generally support this Policy, but: i. Insert ", including poly tunnels," after "agricultural buildings" in the first line; and ii. add the following as a new paragraph at the end: "for energy proposals Policy CC1 will additionally apply."	i. Insert ", including poly tunnels," after "agricultural buildings" in the first line; and ii. add the following as a new paragraph at the end: "for energy proposals Policy CC1 will additionally apply."
Policy EMP13	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5698	Supporting	More specific positives: · Design of farm buildings policy EMP13	
Policy EMP13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6297	Supporting	Seems Reasonable	
3.74	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2804	Supporting	We must not forget that two-thirds of the District are rural and we should be looking to expand the rural economy.	

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.74	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3891	Supporting	This section should be split into two section, with sub-headings as follows: a) Agriculture - para 3.69 to 3.73 and policies EMP12 and EMP13; and b) Other rural businesses - paras 3.74 to 3.75 and Policy EMP14	
3.74	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6298	Objecting	Need the actual definition of a 'rural' business here - It appears elsewhere.	
3.75	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6299	Objecting	Government has published plans. Where are these to be found?	
Policy EMP14	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1779	Supporting	This policy supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance. An minor text edit - last sentence - please note that it is the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, not the 'North Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty'.	An minor text edit - last sentence - please note that it is the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, not the ' North Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty'.
Policy EMP14	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2022	Objecting	Object €" to the over-prescriptive requirements of the policy	Revisions in line with representation
Policy EMP14	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3608	Objecting	Policy EMP14 should contain wording to discourage the conversion of stables and other equestrian facilities.	Change the wording of Policy EMP14 to discourage the conversion of stables and other equestrian facilities to residential use.
Policy EMP14	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3897	Objecting	Generally support this Policy, but: first point delete "Preferably"; second point delete ", including accommodation"; third point before "design" insert "positioning and" after "the north downs area of outstanding natural beauty" add "and areas of high landscape value"; Amend final sentence to ensuring that rural businesses and essential services are retained.	First point delete "Preferably"; Second point delete ", including accommodation"; Third point before "design" insert "positioning and". Also after "the north downs area of outstanding natural beauty" add "and areas of high landscape value"; Amend the final sentence to: "The Council will not support proposals that would result in the loss of existing business premises that provide essential services to the rural areas, unless it is demonstrated that the service is no longer needed or viable and/or a replacement premises is provided."
Policy EMP14	780212	Church Commissioners for England		5342	Objecting	Policy EMP14 sets out the conditions which need to be made in order to convert rural buildings into commercial premises. As with Policy EMP4, with the recent changes to Permitted Development Rights, we are of the opinion that this policy is no longer necessary.	Delete policy.
Policy EMP14	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5699	Supporting	More specific positives:. Policies re- rural businesses and horse-related development EMP14	
3.76	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3592	Supporting	Horse riding and associated activities is a popular recreational past-time and provides physical health, psychological and social benefits.	
3.77	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3609	Objecting	Recognises that preserving the landscape is important but states that it can take 3 hours for a person to erect and/or put away equestrian equipment. What constitutes 'frequent' use? The last sentence of paragraph 3.77 could be improved by being amended to read "In appropriate circumstances there may be a requirement to undertake removal or screening of associated equipment such as jumps, when not in regular use, to avoid visual clutter".	Change the wording of paragraph 3.77 to read "In appropriate circumstances there may be a requirement to undertake removal or screening of associated equipment such as jumps, when not in regular use, to avoid visual clutter".

Summary Chapter 3 - Economic Development and Employment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
3.78	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3613	Objecting	In view of the insufficiency and fragmented nature of equestrian rights of way paragraph 3.78 could usefully be amended to read "Where possible, the proposal should be well related to the existing rights of way network or an equestrian route in public open space, and accessible by public transport or a non-motorised access route. Facilities which provide new equestrian public rights of way or routes in public open space will be welcomed"	Change the wording of paragraph 3.78 to read "Where possible, the proposal should be well related to the existing rights of way network or an equestrian route in public open space, and accessible by public transport or a non-motorised access route. Facilities which provide new equestrian public rights of way or routes in public open space will be welcomed"
Policy EMP15	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1836	Supporting	This policy supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance. A minor text edit - last sentence - please note that it is the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, not the 'North Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty'.	This policy supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance. A minor text edit - last sentence - please note that it is the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, not the ' North Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty'.
Policy EMP15	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3076	Objecting	We welcome the safeguards for protected species and nature conservation sites and that boundary treatments include indigenous hedgerows.	
Policy EMP15	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3898	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent general support this Policy, but the supporting text and the Policy needs to recognise the cumulative effect of such development.	
Policy EMP15	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5700	Supporting	More specific positives:. Policies re- rural businesses and horse-related development EMP15	
Policy EMP15	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6150	Objecting	Would like stronger restrictions on horse ownership. Horses can occupy large areas of prime agricultural land, generate greenhouse gases, and be kept in fields that are too small and their health. This problem is exacerbated during a recession.	Would like to see stronger restrictions on horse ownership.

Comments Summary:

Chapter 4: Town Centre and Leisure

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.1	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3666	Supporting	Chapter 4: Town Centres: We welcome the assertions that town centres are "vitaly important to the District's economy" (4.1) and that "Canterbury City Centre acts as a sub-regional centre for retail.	
4.1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4696	Objecting	While there are some positive suggestions in this chapter, in general it is predicated on the needs of businesses (retails, offices, leisure) and the capability of Canterbury to attract shoppers, with no acknowledgement of the needs of residents (particularly those living within the walls). Even if the town centre were taken to mean just the high street, many people live just off the high street, on dispersal routes, and thus what goes on in the high street impacts on them as well.	
4.1	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5751	Objecting	Many town centres have been decimated by poor planning decisions, ie Thanet, Ashford and Dartford. Canterbury is too precious to erode. The city will always be a visitor and HE centre. Retail that serves residents and visitors, and a commercial/business sector located in the city centre that employs people, who add to the city's economic strength are vital. Letting business locate elsewhere would be a mistake.	
4.1	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6189	Objecting	Separating a visitor economy out in a separate chapter is wrong on all counts.	Merge Ch 4 and Ch 6 with bits transferred elsewhere so as to make division between chapters sensibly in logic, planning thinking, business, economics, transport and the environment.
4.5	780975	Mr Frederic Stansfield		4218	Objecting	1Whilst I appreciate the need to prepare for the future, I think that the aspiration to produce a Local Plan lasting until 2031 is unrealistic at the present time. In particular, it is clear that major changes to shopping are affecting Town Centres and that major review of many aspects of future plans will be required soon to take into account the business and technological revolution currently in progress in relation to the retail sector, the effects of which are currently unforeseeable.	
4.6	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		982	Objecting	Herne Bay already loses 70p in the retail pound to places like Canterbury. The plan's focus on enhancing Canterbury's attractiveness while doing nothing in Herne Bay will make this worse	A retail strategy for Herne Bay that deals with its under-performance now and that does not make the dsitrcet entirely dependent on Canterbury
4.6	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3669	Objecting	What we miss here is recognition of its incomparable value, not only to the district but also to the nation and indeed the whole world simply in its own right. Such recognition should be the basic premise of the whole plan. Retail, housing and the economy could then be planned in relation to that fundamental principle.	
4.6	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3899	Objecting	A Policy should be included which sets out this proposed hierarchy and how development will be considered in the context of it.	
4.6	13719	Mr Steve Moore	Thanet District Council	4119	Objecting	In the light of the content of the document we assume that the emphasis of the proposals is to retain and reinforce rather than elevate the City in the retail hierarchy. We would have concerns if the latter was the case.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6300	Objecting	..continued increase in demand as a retail destination. May be misplaced	
4.9	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		983	Objecting	The HBAAP has been in existence for some years and there has been no progress whatsoever on the retail aspects of the plan. Even now, the Council has no anchor store for the Central Development Area and is reportedly in talks with a discount supermarket to take this space. An Aldi or a Lidl will not serve as a magnet for other new retailers. The CDA plan is dead. We need a new retail plan for Herne Bay.	We need a new retail plan for Herne Bay.
4.9	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1868	Objecting	The HBAAP was written between 2007-2009. The CDA was proposed in 2009. In the 4 years since, there has been no progress. Despite this, the Council is still clinging to this plan as its only idea to regenerate Herne Bay. Our retail centre will continue to struggle whilst Canterbury's is expanded and improved. This will mean that Herne Bay will become a dormitory town, surrounded by housing estates, with no town centre to speak of, and all the consumer spending will be bled out into Canterbury.	The CDA should be recognised as past its use-by date. Instead of putting all the eggs in one basket, a broader based approach should be adopted. Smaller shops are always more employment-intensive than supermarkets, and independent shops are widely recognised as being far more attractive than the "clone town" look of the same chains you can find on any High Street. An obvious first step would be for the Council to offer the same incentives (or better) to independent start-ups as it does to charity shops. If the concern is retaining consumer spend within the town, then independent shops that are owned by people who live in the town are easily the best solution. Supermarkets, chain stores and charity shops ALL direct their revenues and profits out of town, back to their HQ's.
4.10	782042	Tesco Stores Ltd		5016	Objecting	The Local Plan identifies the Wincheap Industrial Estate and Riverside Retail Park (to be renamed the Wincheap Retail Area) as a location well placed to act as a satellite retail centre. It refers to a target retail floorspace of 560,000sq m. It is not clear whether this is a target that an additional 50,000 sq m should be provided in this location or whether this relates to an uplift of the existing provision to a limit of 50,000 sq m.	Clarity is therefore required with regard to the amount of additional comparison goods retail floorspace required in both Canterbury.
4.12	778466	Mrs Barbara Hudgell		1392	Supporting	I agree our town centres need to be competitive and feel it would help to keep car park charges to a minimum to attract visitors and rents low to help businesses to survive.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.12	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4706	Objecting	The appearance of the high street (and other retail/business streets) is crucial not only to the commercial success of an area but also to whether residents take pride in their town and enjoy living there. This document does not contain a clear statement regarding the council's stance on cleanliness, removal of graffiti, paving, tree planting, provision of toilets, policies regarding temporary usage of vacant shops, or the quality and maintenance of street furniture.	We think the council should be expending its efforts on the streetscape, in particular shop fronts. Despite its World Heritage status and the presence of historic buildings on the high street, the tacky, brightly coloured and lit signage and overall appearance of some shop fronts, particularly towards the Westgate (Mega-Fone, Tacos Locos), presents a negative impression of the town centre. Shoppers and tourists alike are looking for a charming, historic, well-preserved, clean streetscape. This document does not contain any views let alone regulations regarding the design of new shop fronts or the preservation/maintenance of ones on historic buildings.
4.12	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6166	Supporting	Strongly agree with the statement that "town centres are essential to sustainable and thriving communities and supporting their viability and vitality is crucial".	
4.12	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6523	Objecting	Addition to the Plan: Introduction of a local currency. A local currency would encourage people to buy locally, keep more money circulating locally and give a chance for local stores and businesses to compete against 'chains'.	Addition to the Plan: Introduction of a local currency. Evidence from different studies shows that a higher percentage of a pound spent in a local economy (rather than a chain) stays in that local economy and can be up to twice as efficient at keeping a local economy alive. It also helps preserve local character in a town and helps prevent town centres becoming what the New Economics Foundation describe as 'clone towns', in which the High Street looks like every other High Street in every other town in the country. A local currency would encourage people to buy locally, keep more money circulating locally and give a chance for local stores and businesses to compete against 'chains'.
4.13	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2302	Objecting	There is no statement about the importance of Dane John and Westgate gardens (other than mentioning them as historic sites). Canterbury's public gardens and green spaces are not given the recognition they deserve. Does the Council support the use of these two sites as venues for festivals (food or music), markets, or any other form of entertainment? What is the plan for their development and how do they fit in the Council's view of Canterbury town centre.	
4.13	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5701	Supporting	More specific positives:. Paragraphs 4.13 relating to shopping	
4.13	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6167	Objecting	Add the following text to paragraph 4.13: "Such experiences can be enhanced by a leafier, greener town centre environment. The Council will support measures such as tree planting, green roofs and living walls to bring this about".	Add the following text to paragraph 4.13: "Such experiences can be enhanced by a leafier, greener town centre environment. The Council will support measures such as tree planting, green roofs and living walls to bring this about".

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.14	778367	Incafield Ltd		2374	Objecting	Support town centres but consider Policy TC1 and Para 4.14 are over restrictive towards restaurants and pubs. Town centres should include a variety of uses and a concentration of A3 and A4 nighttime uses are compatible and make a positive contribution to the economy. Undue restrictions relegate these uses to a secondary role when they are actually complementary to retail and it may have an impact on vitality and viability. Amend Para 2 of Policy TCL1.	Amend text of Policy TCL1
4.14	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5702	Supporting	More specific positives:. Paragraphs 4.14 relating to shopping	
Policy TCL1	665473	Dr Richard Norman		548	Supporting	Agree that any new developments in the town centres should be in keeping with their established character and with environmental objectives.	
Policy TCL1	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1040	Objecting	POLICY TCL1: Town Centres - I agree with this policy, but it needs to be more specific on the proliferation of fast food take€aways which bring various problems, including noise and litter.	
Policy TCL1	778367	Incafield Ltd		2373	Objecting	Support town centres but consider Policy TC1 and Para 4.14 are over restrictive towards restaurants and pubs. Town centres should include a variety of uses and a concentration of A3 and A4 nighttime uses are compatible and make a positive contribution to the economy. Undue restrictions relegate these uses to a secondary role when they are actually complementary to retail and it may have an impact on vitality and viability. Amend Para 2 of Policy TCL1.	Paragraph 2 of Policy TCL1 should therefore be amended to read: 'The Council will seek to enhance the established character and diversity of town centre uses, and will seek to avoid the over concentration of particular uses where these would have an adverse impact on the vitality or viability of the locality'.
Policy TCL1	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3670	Supporting	We therefore strongly support Policy TCL1 (character and diversity) especially its second paragraph	
Policy TCL1	127115	B.J. Gore		5282	Objecting	There is an imbalance at present between National shop fronts, and locally based businesses, to the detriment of the latter. The Plan does nothing to redress the balance and talks about attracting even more National retail outlets instead of providing units and encouragement for local business start-ups, and for expansion of existing businesses or employment provision for graduates. York, Winchester, Exeter and Chichester seem to have the balance right unlike the Whitefriars complex.	
Policy TCL1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5704	Supporting	More specific positives	
Policy TCL1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6301	Objecting	Local Neighbourhood Centres, Larger villages. More emphasis please in Policy TCL1 to protect these.	Suggested amendment to last paragraph: Further retail development in Local Neighbourhood Centres and larger villages will only be permitted if it is of an appropriate scale and reflects the rural location.
Policy TCL1	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6905	Supporting	Although currently there are virtually no retail outlets within the South Canterbury Residents Association area, this policy is welcome as it will enhance shopping opportunities and increase choice.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.16	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4697	Objecting	We take issue with the comment on the appearance of many A3 (restaurant/café) venues in Sun Street as potentially damaging. Having a cluster of successful, high-end restaurants and bars a short distance from the Marlowe Theatre, while not taking up any of the valuable retail space on the high street, is good. Any plan for the town centre needs to take a wider view than that of a sub-regional shopping centre.	
Policy TCL2	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1889	Objecting	Section (a) is an absurd, and possibly unworkable, restriction on the free market - how is it determined that a premises is no longer needed for A1 use; who determines a "reasonable rate"? The effect is that, whatever happens to our town's shops, in some areas owners will not readily be able to convert a shop into, say, a restaurant or bar. This seems unnecessarily restrictive when the Council is doing nothing to enhance the town's retail offer, beyond its self-interested sale of the CDA.	Section (b) is sensible, but Section (a) is pointlessly restrictive and should be scrapped.
Policy TCL2	779075	Brigadier M J Meardon	Receiver General Canterbury Cathedral	2623	Objecting	We understand and support the Council's wish to protect the primary shopping area of Canterbury, streets such as Burgate and more especially Sun Street and Palace Street, are not in the prime retail area. At best, they are secondary retail locations. We therefore propose that the Council redefine the boundaries of the Primary Shopping Area so that the Northern boundary is the north side of the High Street, the Parade, and St George's Street.	We propose that the Council redefine the boundaries of the Primary Shopping Area so that the Northern boundary is the north side of the High Street, the Parade, and St George's Street.
Policy TCL2	781925	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd		4918	Objecting	In defining primary and secondary frontages it becomes much clearer to identify edge and out of centre sites when carrying out the sequential test for applications. At present, the Proposals Maps only identify a 'Primary Shopping Area' and 'Mixed Use Shopping Frontages'. Sainsbury's is of the view that these allocations should be revised and made consistent with the NPPF (see Annex 2 in particular for definitions).	The revised maps should contain the following elements: . Primary Shopping Area; . Primary Shopping Frontages; . Secondary Shopping Frontages.
Policy TCL2	121776	Hendersons	Hendersons Global Investors	4994	Objecting	We note Whitefriars is included within the City Centre Primary Shopping Area (PSA) which is appropriate and supported.	
Policy TCL2	121776	Hendersons	Hendersons Global Investors	5001	Objecting	Restaurant and Cafe provision are a natural alternative to A1 in the St Georges Street and Clock Tower Area which suffers in prominence and visibility terms. The inclusion of the St Georges Street Frontage within the Primary Shopping Area frontage represents a significant policy barrier to our objective given the requirement to demonstrate no A1 demand for the premises based on a marketing period of at least 12 mnths. This is unreasonable, will lead to long term vacancies and deter pot. operators	We therefore recommend that the 12 month marketing period is removed from the Policy. Criterion b offers sufficient control. Given the area's role and function, we also propose the St Georges Street / Clock Tower frontage (between numbers 29 - 37) is instead defined as a Mixed Shopping Frontage under Policy TCL3. The area should however remain within the PSA given its proximity to the main part of Whitefriars.
Policy TCL2	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5625	Objecting	Whitstable The Council's commitment to reinforce and protect retail businesses in the town centre and in local centres is welcomed as is its reinforcing and protecting business premises.	
Policy TCL2	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5705	Supporting	More specific positives	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6302	Objecting	What is a reasonable rate? Who determines this? Does this reflect the Planning Minister's encouragement, as reported 06.08.2013, that empty shops should become housing units?	
4.19	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	2163	Objecting	Overtaken by new policy from Whitehall that allows shops to be converted unless core. The whole of Whitstable High St should be defined core	The whole of Whitstable High St should be defined core
4.19	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6303	Objecting	4.19 to 4.22. Without an appendix giving classifications this is meaningless for the lay person	
4.19	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6304	Objecting	4.19 to 4.22 What is a reasonable rate? Who determines this? Does this reflect the Planning Minister's encouragement, as reported 06.08.2013, that empty shops should become housing units?	
4.21	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		986	Objecting	The HBAAP and the Central Development Area are all about bigger stores. These are unlikely to be independent. We need a retail strategy that identifies what is unique about Herne Bay and how it can be supported. What we have in the HBAAP is a pre-recession, out-of-date, unsuccessful attempt to make Herne Bay look like many other High Streets in the UK. herne Bay deserves its own retail strategy, just as much as canterbury does.	A proper retail strategy for Herne Bay
4.22	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5611	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as the cultural ideas set out in the paragraph.	
Policy TCL3	776445	Dr Grainne Evans		636	Supporting	Canterbury's historic city centre has diminished due to an over supply of restaurants.	
Policy TCL3	781925	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd		4919	Objecting	In defining primary and secondary frontages it becomes much clearer to identify edge and out of centre sites when carrying out the sequential test for applications. At present, the Proposals Maps only identify a 'Primary Shopping Area' and 'Mixed Use Shopping Frontages'. Sainsbury's is of the view that these allocations should be revised and made consistent with the NPPF (see Annex 2 in particular for definitions).	The revised maps should contain the following elements: . Primary Shopping Area; . Primary Shopping Frontages; . Secondary Shopping Frontages. The 'Mixed Use Shopping Frontages' identified are not consistent with NPPF terminology, and should be redefined. If these are not intended to represent Primary or Secondary Shopping Frontages, then a description of the purpose of these frontages should be provided in addition to including the above allocations.
Policy TCL3	121776	Hendersons	Hendersons Global Investors	5003	Objecting	Restaurant and Cafe provision are a natural alternative to A1 in the St Georges Street and Clock Tower Area which suffers in prominence and visibility terms. The inclusion of the St Georges Street Frontage within the Primary Shopping Area frontage represents a significant policy barrier to our objective given the requirement to demonstrate no A1 demand for the premises based on a marketing period of at least 12 mnths. This is unreasonable, will lead to long term vacancies and deter pot. operators	Given the area's role and function, we propose the St Georges Street / Clock Tower frontage (between numbers 29 - 37) is instead defined as a Mixed Shopping Frontage under Policy TCL3. The area should however remain within the PSA given its proximity to the main part of Whitefriars.
Policy TCL3	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5706	Supporting	More specific positives	
Policy TCL3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6305	Objecting	What is a reasonable rate? Who determines this? Does this reflect the Planning Minister's encouragement, as reported 06.08.2013, that empty shops should become housing units?	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.23	665473	Dr Richard Norman		550	Supporting	I agree with the policy of building on the success of cultural developments in this area.	
4.23	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5715	Supporting	More specific positives: Paragraph 4.23 and policy TCL4 Cultural Enhancement Area?	
Policy TCL4	779075	Brigadier M J Meardon	Receiver General Canterbury Cathedral	2629	Supporting	The mixed variety of occupiers in these adjoining street to the cathedral, especially the craft users of Sun Street and Palace Street, mean that Policy TLC4 would be a much more appropriate designation for these areas.	
Policy TCL4	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3672	Supporting	We therefore strongly support Policy TCL1 (character and diversity) especially its second paragraph, Policy TCL4 (Cultural Enhancement Area), with the proviso that it should not be confined to an artificially designated Bohemian quarter but should be allowed to flourish wherever it can,	
Policy TCL4	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5716	Supporting	More specific positives: Paragraph 4.23 and policy TCL4 Cultural Enhancement Area?	
Policy TCL4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6306	Objecting	Concerned about the 'nuisance factors', is it possible to add: Any such development should not acerbate any existing disturbance to neighbouring residents and mention what this covers in respect of social behaviour, noise, and rubbish. What is going to make frontage / shopfront 'active'? What control will the Council have over 'activity'? How long will a shop front/frontage remain inactive before the Council takes action?	add: Any such development should not acerbate any existing disturbance to neighbouring residents and mention what this covers in respect of social behaviour, noise, and rubbish.
4.24	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		357	Supporting	I fully support this. The Westgate Towers area was improved for cyclists during the trial as is evidenced by the increased numbers of cyclists counted by Spokes East Kent Cycle Campaign during the trial in their regular cyclist count.	
4.24	665473	Dr Richard Norman		551	Objecting	I object to this if it means reintroducing the experimental traffic scheme for the Westgate Towers. It was right to try the experiment, but the evidence must be accepted that it didn't work. The present situation is much better, and indeed better than it was prior to the experimental scheme, now that southbound buses are not allowed through the Towers.	
4.24	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		609	Objecting	Any "improvements" to the Westgate area needs to be the final stage of a plan to provide better access to Whitstable Road and Canterbury West station. As recent experience shows, any attempt to "improve" this area without major improvements elsewhere makes the pedestrian experience worse.	Remove this paragraph as it is meaningless without a proper plan.
4.24	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	917	Objecting	I remain mindful of recent events and ask for an addition	Add the following text "but these should be fully evaluated prior to implementation so as to avoid any negative consequences elsewhere within the City".
4.24	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1041	Supporting	Cultural Enhancement Area, paragraph 4.24: I support the need to improving the traffic flow in the Westgate Towers area but, to be successful, this will need a well thought out (and expensive!) scheme - unlike the ill-fated recent trial.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.24	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5230	Objecting	Any improvements to traffic flow in the Westgate area ought to be part of a City wide transport strategy, based on sustainable means of travel, and should not focus solely on one particular area - as with the recent flawed Westgate traffic trial.	
4.24	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6170	Supporting	Strongly agree with the intentions expressed here to improve "the pedestrian experience and increasing pedestrian footfall at St Peter's Street and St Dunstan's Street".	
4.24	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6171	Objecting	The following measures should be taken in the St Dunstan's area: a) Westgate Towers closed to traffic and open to pedestrians b) Retention of the wide pavements on lower St Dunstan's Street c) 20mph speed limits throughout the area d) No exit from Pound Lane at Westgate Towers	Add the following measures that should be taken in the St Dunstan's area to paragraph 4.24: a) Westgate Towers closed to traffic and open to pedestrians b) Retention of the wide pavements on lower St Dunstan's Street c) 20mph speed limits throughout the area d) No exit from Pound Lane at Westgate Towers
4.25	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2819	Objecting	No mention of Hawe Farm Way, Broomfield in this section.	
4.25	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3605	Objecting	Local Centres (what is the definition of this?). There is no mention of Hawe Farm Way shops, in Broomfield.	
4.25	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5709	Supporting	More specific positives:. Paragraphs 4.25-4.28 relating to local centres and policy TCL5	
4.26	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		358	Supporting	Agree that use of local centres reduce congestion and improves air quality. To improve their use by sustainable modes of transport cycle parking should be provided at the identified local centres.	Cycle parking should be provided at the identified local centres.
4.26	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		991	Objecting	70p in the pound is already leaving Herne Bay to be spent elsewhere. That suggests there is plenty of room for more convenience and comparison shopping without these smaller shopping clusters being at risk. The Council should not resist development elsewhere that could give much better and cheaper retail options to the town in a bid to save these local shops These local shops are successful because of their location and (often) the lack of mobility of their customers. this will not change.	recognise that we need more and better quality retail choice in the town rather than having to leave town to shop.
Policy TCL5	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3900	Objecting	The Policy and supporting text should also recognise the role of villages as acting as local centres, reflecting the rural settlement hierarchy defined earlier in the plan. The Policy approach would equally apply to the villages as it would to the more urban centres defined	
Policy TCL5	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5231	Objecting	I support retaining the viability of towns across the District. This should include discouraging large supermarket developments in our town centres that will negatively impact both the viability and vitality of local high streets.	
Policy TCL5	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5609	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as some of the ideas for Wincheap. This includes a recognition of a shortage of parks there.	
Policy TCL5	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5626	Objecting	Whitstable The Council's commitment to reinforce and protect retail businesses in the town centre and in local centres is welcomed as is its reinforcing and protecting business premises.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL5	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5710	Supporting	More specific positives: Paragraphs 4.25-4.28 relating to local centres and policy TCL5	
Policy TCL5	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6173	Objecting	Add the following condition to Policy TCL5: "Where there are multiple applications for premises, preference will be given to locally owned shops and/or those that use local produce and labour".	Add the following condition to Policy TCL5: "Where there are multiple applications for premises, preference will be given to locally owned shops and/or those that use local produce and labour".
Policy TCL5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6307	Objecting	Where is any protection for existing small shops? See Plan page 3: "protect" as well as strengthen Village centres	
4.29	778045	Councillor Simon Cook	Canterbury City Council	1197	Objecting	The DTZ retail report underestimates the impact of internet shopping. It draws on a Verdict Research report from 2010 to estimate that internet shopping will be 15.4% of sales by 2014. I have seen reports from CapGemini (17% in 2011) and Boston Consulting (23% by 2016) to suggest that this may be on the low side or at the very least should be questioned. I think it entirely possible that there may not need to be an increase in retail space and it may even shrink.	
4.29	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1891	Objecting	So there has been no examination of "the vitality and viability" of Herne Bay and Whitstable, and Canterbury's retail offer is to be protected at all costs. This Local Plan is for the future of the whole District. The Canterbury-centric focus is a disservice to the wider District.	The same level of attention and analysis of retails needs must be applied across the District.
4.29	13719	Mr Steve Moore	Thanet District Council	4150	Objecting	The preferred level of housing growth implied in the consultation document falls below that applied in the retail and leisure study. On this basis the city council may find it helpful to review its preferred retail floorspace provisions or clarify what other assumptions have been applied in arriving at them.	
4.30	778045	Councillor Simon Cook	Canterbury City Council	1198	Objecting	The DTZ retail report underestimates the impact of internet shopping. Reports by CapGemini and Boston Consulting suggest estimates may be on the low side. It is possible that there may not need to be an increase in retail space and it may even shrink. - there are plenty of empty or transitory shops in the City Centre and vacant warehouses in Wincheap. I suspect that over the lifetime of this plan, the Canterbury High Street will change substantially and may well become more residential.	
4.32	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1001	Objecting	If 70p in the pound is lost now and 12000-15000 people are added to the current population of around 38,000, there will be a massive unmet demand for convenience and comparison shopping in Herne Bay. The plan seeks to boost Canterbury but to not to take action in Herne Bay. This can only worsen the transport situation as thousands of people flock out of Herne Bay to shop in Canterbury and Whitstable.	Less reliance on Canterbury and new and credible plans for a thriving retail heart for Herne Bay

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.32	782028	Terrace Hill		4943	Objecting	This states that Herne Bay is an underperforming town centre due to the limited range of comparison goods retailing and the strength of Canterbury as a centre. Further, it is stated that once completed, significant comparison retail in the Central Development Area, as well as other allocations in the Herne Bay Area Action Plan, will use and indeed exceed, any available capacity for additional floorspace for the foreseeable future.	The NPPF states that retail needs in an area must be met in full. There must be provision in the Plan to meet needs fully in the event that the proposals for the CDA fail to come forward in the form that is set out in the Herne Bay Area Action Plan.
4.33	782042	Tesco Stores Ltd		5014	Objecting	In Canterbury no additional sites have been allocated. The Retail and Leisure Study identifies that based on a constant market share there is the capacity for an additional 1,550 sq m (net) of convenience goods floorspace to 2026. There is clearly a requirement for additional convenience goods floorspace in Canterbury over the plan period as demonstrated by the Council's evidence base which has not been recognised in the Local Plan.	
4.34	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1960	Objecting	The Council says that all Herne Bay's future food shopping needs for the new, massively expanded, population will be met by a supermarket planned in the Central Development Area. The trouble is, none of the quality supermarket chains wants to open a store in that area. This means that we will not get a local supermarket to meet our food shopping needs. The Council will block any development that it will not profit from immediately - this is destructive, selfish greed.	The CDA should be recognised as past its use-by date. Instead of putting all the eggs in one basket, a broader based approach should be adopted. Smaller shops are always more employment-intensive than supermarkets, and independent shops are widely recognised as being far more attractive than the "clone town" look of the same chains you can find on any High Street. An obvious first step would be for the Council to offer the same incentives (or better) to independent start-ups as it does to charity shops. If the concern is retaining consumer spend within the town, then independent shops that are owned by people who live in the town are easily the best solution. Supermarkets, chain stores and charity shops ALL direct their revenues and profits out of town, back to their HQ's.
4.34	782028	Terrace Hill		4944	Objecting	Capacity identified for Herne Bay is, in part, low because of low assumptions in the centre's market share over the assessment period. HB residents are dependant on facilities in Whitstable and Canterbury for convenience needs and new development proposals should be considered on their merits. This should be referenced. There is little prospect of foodstore led regeneration in the CDA and it is essential that there is provision in the plan to support appropriate proposals to meet retail needs.	Amend Policy TCL6 to create a sufficiently robust policy framework to assess retail development proposals over the plan period.
4.35	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6308	Objecting	A review of the retail capacity €! at five-yearly intervals. Is this just applying to Food (convenience) retail need or is it to cover all Retail Development?	
4.36	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6175	Supporting	Part of the reason for the decline of the High Street is that planning decisions have allowed the creation of out-of-town shopping centres and outlets, designed to be accessed principally by people in their cars.	
4.36	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6309	Objecting	4.36 to 4.40. Has the impact of deliveries on road infrastructure been included as a consideration?	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.37	782028	Terrace Hill		4950	Objecting	The proposed application of the sequential test for main town centre uses is inconsistent with the NPPF. The Council is seeking to introduce a new layer of site consideration in the process - a Retail Node - but fails to define or justify this. This is contrary to the NPPF and should be deleted.	
4.37	782028	Terrace Hill		4952	Objecting	Definitions of out of centre and out of town. These terms are used in an interchangeable way through parts of the supporting text to the retail chapter. Their meanings are different and the wording of the retail chapter should be tightened to use the terms accurately and to be consistent with the NPPF	
4.37	782042	Tesco Stores Ltd		5019	Objecting	The Council's approach to the sequential test is contrary to that set out in the NPPF. It may be the case that an out of centre site that is accessible and well connected to the town centre should be considered above a retail node.	
4.38	782028	Terrace Hill		4951	Objecting	The proposed application of the sequential test for main town centre uses is inconsistent with the NPPF. The Council is seeking to introduce a new layer of site consideration in the process - a Retail Node - but fails to define or justify this. This is contrary to the NPPF and should be deleted.	
4.38	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5703	Supporting	More specific positives:. Paragraphs 4.14 relating to shopping	
Policy TCL6	768936		Musgrave Retail Partners GB	59	Objecting	My clients object to the local threshold for retail impact assessments in the second part of Policy TCL6. Whilst they support the setting of a threshold in accord with the NPPF this should be set at 500 square metres gross (and not 950 square metres) to ensure that in particular new foodstores over 500 square metres are properly and thoroughly assessed in terms of their potential impact on existing town centres	Delete the reference to 950 square metres from the second part of Policy TCL6 and replace it with the local threshold of 500 square metres gross
Policy TCL6	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		359	Supporting	This is a very important policy. Point d should be amended to read "The proposed development does not have a detrimental effect on the highway network in terms of congestion, road safety, and pollution." and applied to retail, leisure and office development uses too.	Point d should be amended to read "The proposed development does not have a detrimental effect on the highway network in terms of congestion, road safety, and pollution." and applied to retail, leisure and office development uses too.
Policy TCL6	778690	Dr William Carey		2309	Supporting	Objects to Harbledown Park and Ride because: it is a beautiful, historic area with small roads; it will cause excessive traffic; building additional roads. It would be better to expand the Wincheap one.	
Policy TCL6	779317	Edward & Moria Hughes		3290	Supporting	Concerned over the proposal for three new supermarkets - just one would finish Herne Bay's shopping centre. The idea that an out of town supermarket will bring more visitors into town is nonsense.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL6	782028	Terrace Hill		4937	Objecting	Neither part of draft Policy TCL6 complies with the NPPF. It is essential that it is redrafted to ensure that it is compliant. The wording of bullets a, c and d of the first part of the policy are inconsistent with the NPPF and should be redrafted to use consistent wording with national policy.	In particular it should read as: a) That there are no more sites in, or on the edge of the town centre. c) The site is accessible and well connected to the town centre. d) The residual cumulative impact of the proposed development does not have a severe impact on the transport network. It should be clearly stated in the qualifying text to this policy that development proposals will only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual impacts of development are 'severe'.
Policy TCL6	782028	Terrace Hill		4938	Objecting	Bullet point c) of the second part of the policy does not accurately reflect national planning policy because, as worded, it would expect an assessment of all allocated centres within the District.	The text should be amended to state that only the effects on the vitality and viability of those defined centres within the catchment area of the proposed development need to be assessed. As worded, it is an excessive and irrelevant requirement.
Policy TCL6	782028	Terrace Hill		4939	Objecting	The draft policy states that retail development proposals that give rise to 'adverse impacts' will be refused. This wording is contrary to the NPPF which states that retail development which gives rise to 'significant adverse impacts' will be refused. The implications of each phrase are materially different. There is no justification for applying a lower threshold locally. Applying it would fail to encourage development and support economic growth, as required by national planning policy.	The wording of Policy TCL6 should be reworded to state 'significant adverse impacts', in accordance with the NPPF.
Policy TCL6	782028	Terrace Hill		4941	Objecting	The draft policy proposes a threshold for an impact test of 950sqm. This is substantially less than the 2,500sqm threshold that is specified in the NPPF. Whilst locally set thresholds can be appropriate, no explanation or justification for departing from national guidance is given. Unless there is good justification, the NPPF threshold should be applied.	
Policy TCL6	121776	Hendersons	Hendersons Global Investors	5004	Supporting	We note and support the primacy given to the City Centre in the Local Plan and how it will positively focus new development in this and district centre locations.	
Policy TCL6	782042	Tesco Stores Ltd		5020	Objecting	This policy does not make any reference to the retail nodes as set out in paragraph 4.37. Confirmation is sought from the Local Authority that out of centre locations will be considered within the sequential site assessment after edge of centre locations. Retail nodes do not form part of the overall national guidance for the location of retail development. Each application should be assessed on its individual merits.	
Policy TCL6	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5036	Supporting	The Herne Bay golf club development will provide a small retail development of less than 950m2 so will accord with policy TCL6 which is assessed as sound.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL6	781337	The Garden Centre Group		5243	Objecting	Canterbury Garden Centre, which forms part of the Stour Valley Business Park is keen to promote the site for alternative retail, business or leisure/tourism purposes. Such alternative uses would be consistent with national planning policy and local objectives by reusing a brownfield site and providing opportunities for rural economic growth without detriment to the character of the countryside or increasing the risk of flooding within the vicinity.	Whilst the emerging Local Plan has not sought to identify non-strategic allocations for retail, business or leisure purposes within the rural area, its policies should encourage the sustainable development of this rural site. Accordingly, it is requested that Policy SP4 and EMP14 be revised as set out above.
Policy TCL6	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5707	Supporting	More specific positives	
Policy TCL6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6310	Objecting	Has the impact on infrastructure regarding deliveries as a major consideration been omitted for a reason?	
Policy TCL6	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6499	Objecting	The actions outlined here may undermine the viability and vitality of Town Centres. The wording of this policy should be altered from: ". . including good local public transport services and proposals to enhance accessibility, including that for pedestrians and cyclists" to . . including good local public transport services and good accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists. Where these do not exist, developer contributions will be required for their construction and installation.	The wording of this policy should be altered from: ". . . including good local public transport services and proposals to enhance accessibility, including that for pedestrians and cyclists" to . . . including good local public transport services and good accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists. Where these do not exist, developer contributions will be required for their construction and installation.
4.44	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6509	Objecting	We are concerned that the choice of Wincheap Industrial Estate to act as a "satellite retail centre . . . complementary to the City centre, catering more for bulky goods and large format/mass market retailers and leisure operators" may have the effect of increasing vehicular traffic in an already congested area.	
4.45	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		360	Supporting	I welcome that this paragraph notes the importance of the proximity of the Great Stour Way foot / cycle path to this site.	
4.45	665473	Dr Richard Norman		552	Supporting	Agree with the proposals for mixed development in the Wincheap area.	
4.45	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5610	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as some of the ideas for Wincheap along with the recognition of a shortage of parks there.	
4.45	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5711	Supporting	More specific positives:. Development of Wincheap Retail Area 4.45-4.48 and policy TCL7	
4.45	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6513	Objecting	We are concerned that the choice of Wincheap Industrial Estate to act as a "satellite retail centre . . . complementary to the City centre, catering more for bulky goods and large format/mass market retailers and leisure operators" may have the effect of increasing vehicular traffic in an already congested area.	
4.46	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		361	Objecting	A2 off-slip at Wincheap would introduce more motor vehicle traffic to the Wincheap area. It is also contrary to the hierarchy of transport modes detailed in paragraph 5.24 of this Local Plan. The link with Canterbury East railway station should be strengthened to encourage more sustainable journeys to the area.	Remove proposal for A2 off-slip. Improve cycle and pedestrian connectivity to Wincheap from Canterbury East station and Canterbury city centre.
4.46	665473	Dr Richard Norman		553	Supporting	Agree that the planned redevelopment of the Wincheap estate should include a relief road to reduce congestion in Wincheap itself.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.46	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1043	Supporting	Paragraph 4.46 - I agree with the objectives for redeveloping the Wincheap area and for a relief road, but these need to go further. A route for an additional road/tunnel under the railway embankment needs to be included as a longer term aim, and the route protected on the city side of the embankment.	
4.46	779262	Mr John Bailey		1969	Supporting	Agree that development must include road infrastructure. It also needs to be acted upon quickly as wincheap ind est is becoming an eyesore.	
4.46	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6515	Objecting	Concerned that a new off-slip from the A2 and a relief route for Wincheap will encourage drivers into the area, further increasing congestion and pollution. Wincheap, with its good public transport connections, would be better suited as the site for the high skill 'knowledge economy' development currently proposed for Little Barton Farm.	
Policy TCL7	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	167	Objecting	Other brown field Canterbury sites should be pursued and included, perhaps as windfall sites, namely the Wincheap Estate.	
Policy TCL7	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		362	Supporting	Pedestrian and cycle links with Canterbury city centre need to be improved. Evidence shows that a large number of cyclists consider the Wincheap Roundabout too dangerous to cycle.	Pedestrian and cycle links with Canterbury city centre must to be improved to remove safety fears.
Policy TCL7	779286	Mr Mark Aplin	Planning Policy Team Leader Shepway District Council	2071	Supporting	Shepway may comment under the duty to cooperate on the Plan's retail/office proposals once finalised. It may not be considered consistent with national policy for undue retail growth to jeopardise town centres in the sub-region at a time of intense retail competition.	
Policy TCL7	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3078	Objecting	We are concerned regarding the level of development that is being proposed abutting the Great Stour. We note that part of the Wincheap site is within the LWS. We welcome the commitment that Proposals adjacent to the open space on the Great Stour should also pay regard to its wildlife and landscape quality. This area of habitat is designated as a LWS and AHLV and will be safeguarded in any development proposals. However no protection is incorporated within the policy.	We recommend that a further clause be added to the policy that:- The Great Stour Ashford to Fordwich LWS will be protected within the development and buffered by at least 15m from the boundary. Any habitat protected or created should be managed in perpetuity.
Policy TCL7	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4416	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. comments on the sites proposed for inclusion in the Plan, in policies SP3a - h, HD1, EMP1, TCL7 and TCL10. As a general point, though, we find that the policy guidance on the proposed sites is lacking. In particular we consider that more supporting text is required to explain what is actually proposed for each site and how they will actually be developed. This should then be reflected in the individual policies themselves.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL7	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4492	Objecting	Object to the allocation of this site as proposed. Accept that the site provides opportunities for retail/leisure, believe that residential development will provide part of a mix of uses that comes forward. Plan states a residential element and was previously allocated for more residential development. Policy TCL7 should require an element of residential development to contribute towards the overall housing target, this will be a minimum of 200 units.	Policy TCL7 should specifically require an element of residential development as a contribution towards the overall housing target, and that the Policy should state that this will be a minimum of 200 units.
Policy TCL7	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4698	Objecting	We support the improvement of the town centre offering 'to focus on quality and specialist retail and leisure operators' with the development of a satellite retail area in Wincheap with capacity to cater for chain stores and larger stores (particularly those that need to be supplied by large lorries).	
Policy TCL7	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4699	Objecting	We would want to see proper pedestrian and cycle access. Proximity to the Chartham-Canterbury footpath is cited (4.45), but stretches of this footpath are routinely flooded and impassable in winter. We would want to see proper pedestrian access that is usable in all weathers and enables pedestrians to get from the bus and train stations to Wincheap safely and easily.	We would want to see proper pedestrian and cycle access. Proximity to the Chartham-Canterbury footpath is cited (4.45), but stretches of this footpath are routinely flooded and impassable in winter. We would want to see proper pedestrian access that is usable in all weathers and enables pedestrians to get from the bus and train stations to Wincheap safely and easily.
Policy TCL7	780837	Mrs Margaret Darby		4746	Objecting	Is there any reason to believe that the proposals for the Wincheap Industrial estate are likely to materialise in the near future. I could not find the housing allocation for the proposals in the document but may have missed it.	
Policy TCL7	121776	Hendersons	Hendersons Global Investors	5005	Objecting	Concerned about the scale and impact of out-of-centre retail floorspace being considered in locations such as Wincheap. DTZ Retail and Leisure study does not provide evidence based assessment of impact on centre and is out of date. There are insufficient safeguards to protect the centre, and policies themselves have not been worded to demonstrate compliance with the NPPF. Growth should be approached with caution since capacity only emerges from 2021. Allocations and policy approach are unsound	To protect the City Centre, we recommend either deletion of Policy TCL7 and the retail elements of TCL10 or their amendment to include the following policy safeguards: - Wincheap 'Retail Area' should not be described as a satellite retail 'Centre' . - Any retail development brought forward on these sites should first be tested against Policy TCL6 and Policies TCL7 and TCL10 amended to include an appropriate cross-reference to this policy. - The scale and goods to be sold from these locations should be more clearly defined in the Policies - The provision of a floorspace cap within the Policies based on the level of need identified in the DTZ Study. - The inclusion of phasing and regular review provisions with in the Policies to allow the City Council to test whether the allocations continue to be appropriate - Not allow any form of re-development in Wincheap to proceed until it has been tested and assessed in the Wincheap Retail Development Brief. A clearer understanding of the improved, attractive and convenient pedestrian links that could be provided with the City Centre should be also presented.

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL7	406381	Ms Julia Gavriel		5212	Supporting	I understand that development on land on Wincheap industrial site was previously proposed but the developer pulled out due to the recession. Why is that land not included in the plan?	
Policy TCL7	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5394	Objecting	Object to Wincheap as a retail satellite it is a waste of its position close to major public transport hub, would be better to relocate the high skill knowledge economy development proposed for Barton Farm, here together with some residential development.	
Policy TCL7	784579	Ms Ruth Buckland		5412	Objecting	I am concerned that the Wincheap retail proposals will make congestion worse in another problem area.	
Policy TCL7	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5712	Supporting	More specific positives:. Development of Wincheap Retail Area 4.45-4.48 and policy TCL7	
Policy TCL7	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5747	Objecting	Concerned about plans for retail development, because: will impact negatively on town centre, which needs a vibrant mix of uses with a core of retail, a parallel offer with easy access and parking would have a negative long term impact; retail has changed to click and collect shopping need to facilitate in town centre; A2 slips and Park and ride important to unlocking traffic congestion. Many town centres have been decimated by poor planning decisions, Canterbury is too precious to erode.	
Policy TCL7	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5814	Objecting	KCC support the development of the City Centre, however a primary objective of the local plan should be to sustain the economic functions of the historic core. CCC needs to provide more justification for the development of such large scale retail space at Wincheap near the city centre. Large format stores include clothing/other comparison goods will compete with retail functions in core. Should demonstrate there are no smaller sites available eg County hotel site, clarify additional comparison	
Policy TCL7	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5871	Objecting	Where Wincheap is concerned; creating a further retail area could be seen as a threat to city centre shops. Furthermore, seeking more residential accommodation needs to be considered as does the suggested tunnel to Rheims Way. There are also unanswered questions on both the proposed 4th Slip Road to the A2 and expanding the Park & Ride. Local opinion is firmly against the latter, which is likely to be expensive and worsen the existing congestion on Wincheap.	
Policy TCL7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6311	Objecting	Where is the proposal map for the Wincheap Retail Area? Could its location be crossed referenced here, please.	
4.50	268778	Mrs Janet Hall		169	Objecting	Since completing the original regeneration form and then the news that Morrisons are not going to build a new store I have seen nothing to say what is happening now. There is plenty of talk and rumours but what is happening?Have other big names been approached and if so what is the state of play and do we have big enough sites for them in town.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.50	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1002	Objecting	This is not an accurate representation of what is happening. The CDA site remains untouched. No solution has been found for the Bus Depot site since the attempt to redevelop it that the Environment Agency would not approve. Bill Murray has proposals for the Beach Street area but this is mainly housing with some small retail spaces. Please provide the public with the evidence that these schemes are actively underway and attracting investment.	Please provide the public with the evidence that these schemes are actively underway and attracting investment.
4.50	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1984	Objecting	Nothing has happened on the Central Development Area for nearly four years. There is not so much as a whisper of possible investment for the Bus Depot site. There are plans - mainly housing - for Beach Street. The Council is mis-representing the facts when it says that these areas "are attracting significant new investment." If they really were, the Council would have told us all about it.	The Council needs to state the case honestly.
4.51	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1006	Objecting	The Council needs to define what it means by "out of town". Does this mean "beyond the current limit of development? If it does, that means no new shopping at any of the five new housing estates and no to a large supermarket at Altira. Given the very poor convenience shopping offer in Herne Bay, this will exacerbate the problem of residents travelling to shop in other locations. The Council must not make the mistake of hanging on for a Beach Street store and losing a major player at Altira	recognise that the Central development Area plan has not happened and may never happen and allow Herne Bay residents to have a decent supermarket in their town rather than obliging people to travel to canterbury or Whitstable to shop.
4.51	771556	Mr Phil Rose		1991	Objecting	The Council tells us regularly that 70p in every pound leaks out of Herne Bay to be spent elsewhere (btw, this figure is 6 years out of date, the Council hasn't bothered to update it). This paragraph says that all our retail demand can be met by the sites already identified in the existing, dormant or failed, plans. I do not see how both these statements can be true. Canterbury's retail is to be protected and strengthened, worsening the problem.	The CDA should be recognised as past its use-by date. The 'town centre first' policy should be applied once the "CDA Blinkers" have been removed, and attention should concentrate on incentivising and encouraging independent start ups.
4.53	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1007	Objecting	The plan suggests another 12000-15000 residents. The Council needs to rethink its conclusions on retail capacity. Moreover, if the idea is that a town of 50000-55000 people will all shop in the Central Development Area (if it is ever developed), the Council has to rethink its transport strategy for Herne Bay - that's an awful lot of people travelling to two supermarkets right in the very centre of town.	Recognise that the Central Development Area is not a magic wand that will give Herne Bay all the shopping options that it could need for a radically increased resident population.
Policy TCL8	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5043	Supporting	Herne Bay Golf Club development will support the revitalisation of the town centre due to demand for services. Policy TCL8 is considered sound.	
Policy TCL8	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5708	Supporting	More specific positives	
Policy TCL8	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6312	Supporting	Seems Reasonable	
4.54	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		363	Supporting	Cyclist improvements should be provided in addition to pedestrian improvements.	Cyclist improvements should be provided in addition to pedestrian improvements.
4.55	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		364	Supporting	Whitstable town centre locations should be added to the list. Pedestrianisation of Whitstable town centre should be pursued to redress the balance between pedestrians and motorised traffic.	#NAME?

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.55	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1008	Objecting	A more important priority for Herne Bay is significant improvement of the town centre, moving people from the car park at William Street to Mortimer Street. Public access now to our retail areas is hampered by crossing a main road; broken pavements; and confused pedestrian areas into which cars are allowed. It's a miserable-looking town centre, and visitors are not tempted to walk to good independent shops strung out through the town.	Prioritise the town centre as a "public realm" before Memorial Park. We need a thriving commercial heart to the town.
4.55	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3709	Objecting	No mention is made of the general scruffiness and down-at-heel look of much of the City Centre, which is unworthy of its heritage. Attention needs to be paid to this, as well as to the need to care for Council properties, for example in St Margaret's Street.	
4.55	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4700	Supporting	We support the idea of improving the pedestrian environment between the St George's and Wincheap roundabouts.	
4.55	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5316	Supporting	We supported the St. Dunstan's Traffic management trial as a good step forwards to doing something positive in reducing congestion and improving air quality, though we felt that it might have been better done alongside, or after, the introduction of a greater range of sustainable transport measures, and/or a campaign to promote such measures, to offer alternative ways for people to get in and out of, and around, the city.	
4.55	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6039	Objecting	The objective here clashes with the Harbour Strategy	Remove the harbour from this section.
4.55	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6313	Objecting	Please include the Sturry Road from the Park & Ride and the Vauxhall Road to include the Maybrook estate	
4.55	13835	Mr Michael Steed		7004	Objecting	Supports the City Life Scrutiny Review recommended that the Plan enable Section 106 agreements for city centre developments be used to finance public realm improvements. Carefully spaced public seating along walking routes are needed for elderly infirm. Pedestrians are mentioned in each of these three paras, but not the needs of the many who want to go walking but find it less easy. Benches should be a priority, for section 106.	
4.56	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		365	Supporting	20 mph speed limits and pedestrianisation should also be considered as potential improvements.	The addition of 20 mph speed limits and pedestrianisation to be considered as potential improvements.
4.56	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		610	Supporting	"Environmental improvements might include pedestrian bridges, subway improvements." These are needed also to relieve congestion and by combining both reasons might receive higher priority in the funding decisions.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.56	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2304	Objecting	We would like to see far greater environmental innovation and imagination in the town centre commensurate with its World Heritage status, such as the use of green roofs, green walls, more sculpture and water features. Such features go beyond the purely aesthetic in improving the quality of the environment for residents and visitors.	
4.56	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6535	Objecting	Addition to the Plan: Greening of the City Centre. Through 'greening up' town centres with, for example, living walls, green roofs, and tree-planting programmes, the environment of the City will be improved and visitor experience can be enhanced and visitor numbers increased.	Addition to the Plan: Greening of the City Centre. We believe that, through 'greening up' town centres with, for example, living walls, green roofs, and tree-planting programmes, the environment of the City will be improved and visitor experience can be enhanced and visitor numbers increased. Such green areas absorb carbon and other harmful toxins, add oxygen to the atmosphere and can provide free food. They can play a role in bringing people together in creative and positive ways, thus breaking down barriers and promoting community cohesion. These initiatives also make pedestrian routes more attractive, encouraging more walking and cycling.
Policy TCL9	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		366	Supporting	Provision for cyclists is needed in these areas too. The Environmental Improvement Areas should be extended to include Whitstable's town centre. 20mph speed limits and pedestrianisation should also be considered in the Environmental Improvement Areas.	Provision for cyclists is needed in these areas too. The Environmental Improvement Areas should be extended to include Whitstable's town centre. 20mph speed limits and pedestrianisation should also be considered in the Environmental Improvement Areas.
Policy TCL9	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1044	Supporting	POLICY TCL9: The City Life Scrutiny Review recommended that the Local Plan should enable Section 106 agreements for city centre developments to be used to finance public realm improvements. I strongly support this recommendation	
Policy TCL9	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2296	Supporting	We support the council's "Environmental Improvements Areas", which aim to improve pedestrian access and the general environment around the city, especially key entry points	
Policy TCL9	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2297	Objecting	We are keen to see and improvement in the options for pedestrians between the Wincheap and St Georges roundabouts, which currently consist of poorly lit underpasses and stretches of pavement next to congested roads full of traffic fumes. These need to be addressed as student pedestrian traffic is likely to increase between the main Christ Church University campus, the St Georges Place union buildings/students residences, Augustine House and further student residences in Rhodaus Town.	In particular, the pedestrian crossing at the bottom of Old Dover Road (between the police station and fire station) creates a pinchpoint where traffic comes down this busy road and joins the ring road. We would like to see a safer crossing for pedestrians that doesn't significantly impede the flow of traffic, such as an elevated walkway/bridge.

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL9	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2298	Objecting	The underpasses also need addressing, in particular the underpasses beneath the St Georges roundabout. Students have been running across this busy intersection because they do not feel safe or comfortable. During the day time they are noisy, smelly places often occupied by buskers and beggars, and poor drainage makes them almost impassable in heavy rain and adds to the smell. At night the poor lighting and lack of CCTV add to the perception that these are unsafe areas.	The drains and lighting/CCTV urgently need to be addressed with the whole issue of pedestrian underpasses being rethought. Perhaps the roads should be underground here and the pedestrians above ground?
Policy TCL9	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2299	Objecting	The pedestrian route from both Canterbury East Station and Wincheap into town also needs to be reconsidered. Many people arriving by train prefer to take the narrow alley behind houses that leads to Lansdown Road and then onto Old Dover Road rather than walk beside the ring road. This may be a sensible option for students going to Canterbury College, but it won't help students wanting to get to Augustine House.	The footpath along the ring road needs to be improved and made safer as part of the redevelopment of the old Peugeot garage site on Rhodaus Town. A wider pavement separate from the ring road by an avenue of trees would make the route more attractive and accessible while improving the air quality along that part of the ring road.
Policy TCL9	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3080	Objecting	We note within this policy that riverside links from Northgate to the coach park are proposed. However we cannot find reference to any protection to the Great Stour, LWS within either the policy or the supporting text. We would advise that no pedestrian links should be provided adjacent to the river unless those links already exist. Hard infrastructure should be placed no nearer than 15m from the top of the bank to enable access along the river, free from disturbance for faunal species.	We would advise that this specification be included ideally within the policy but at least within the supporting text. At the very least the presence of the LWS should be highlighted as in Policy TLC7.
Policy TCL9	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3675	Supporting	We therefore strongly support Policy TCL1 (character and diversity) especially its second paragraph, Policy TCL4 (Cultural Enhancement Area), with the proviso that it should not be confined to an artificially designated Bohemian quarter but should be allowed to flourish wherever it can, and Policy TCL9 (Environmental Improvement Areas).	
Policy TCL9	780518	Mr Ken Fox & Family		3802	Supporting	Support Policy TCL9	
Policy TCL9	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5713	Supporting	More specific positives: Environmental Improvement and Redevelopment Areas and policies TCL9 and 10	
4.57	779394	Harris		2166	Supporting	I support the Station Road West development zone adopted brief. In addition to its mention in paragraph 4.57 last sentence it should be also included in policy TCL10 where all adopted briefs for Canterbury are listed. Its omission from policy TCL10 appears to diminish its stature in planning terms.	
4.57	121858	Ms A Knight		4547	Objecting	I wish to object to the council's plans to reduce the amount of parking close to Canterbury West Station. At the moment Canterbury West Station is a dangerous place because cars cannot park easily, there is too much congestion, drivers get stressed looking for parking and it can only be a matter of time before there is a serious injury or fatality. The council should be increasing the amount of parking places to encourage the use of the area as a safe environment for pedestrians and drivers.	The council should be increasing the amount of parking places to encourage the use of Canterbury West station as a safe environment for pedestrians and drivers.

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL10	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	166	Objecting	Other brown field Canterbury sites should be pursued and included, perhaps as windfall sites, namely front of Peugeot Garage site.	
Policy TCL10	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		367	Supporting	Policy welcome. Will encourage more sustainable travel patterns.	
Policy TCL10	779262	Mr John Bailey		1970	Objecting	Kingsmead development should be about open space except the Serco site which could be used for housing.	
Policy TCL10	779394	Harris		2277	Objecting	I support the Station Road West development zone adopted brief. In addition to its mention in paragraph 4.57 last sentence it should be also included in policy TCL10 where all adopted briefs for Canterbury are listed. Its omission from policy TCL10 appears to diminish its stature in planning terms.	The Station Road West development brief should also be included in Policy TCL10
Policy TCL10	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3081	Objecting	There are a number of developments that are likely to impact on the Great Stour, Ashford to Fordwich LWS due to their location either adjacent to the LWS or within 200m. These developments include:- . White Horse Lane . Roger Britton Carpets Wincheap . Kingsmead	To ensure protection of the LWS from deleterious impacts we would recommend that the following clause be incorporated within the policy: The Great Stour Ashford to Fordwich LWS will be protected from increased recreational impact and buffered by at least 15m from the boundary. Any habitat protected or created should be managed in perpetuity.
Policy TCL10	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3082	Objecting	All developments agreed as part of the Herne Bay AAP will need to be included within any strategic HRA to ensure the assessment of in-combination impacts is accurate.	
Policy TCL10	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3083	Objecting	We are concerned that the Warehouse, Sea Street has been allocated for residential or hotel uses as this site is just 14m from Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar site. It is our view that no development, not already existing, should be planned so close to the designated site. This is especially pertinent in regards to residential and tourist uses, where the residents or visitor will use the coast for recreation.	
Policy TCL10	780803	Mr & Mrs T Coleman		3488	Objecting	We to object to the proposed closing of the car park in Herne Bay and the building of another supermarket. We have not met a single person who supports these plans. Yes the area needs tidying up - perhaps a few trees and flowers - but leave our precious car parks as they are.	
Policy TCL10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4024	Objecting	Part 1 of our comments suggest Herne Sites be removed as they form part of the Herne Bay AAP. Peugeot Garage site and Whitstable Harbour be removed and given their own policies. Policy TCL10 should only deal with the re-allocation of the mixed use sites previously included in the currently adopted Local Plan.	Peugeot Garage site be removed and given its own policy. Whitstable Harbour be removed and given own policy. Policy TCL10 should only deal with the re-allocation of the mixed use sites previously included in the currently adopted Local Plan.

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4417	Objecting	Have asked that part 1 be read as a whole. comments on the sites proposed for inclusion in the Plan, in policies SP3a - h, HD1, EMP1, TCL7 and TCL10. As a general point, though, we find that the policy guidance on the proposed sites is lacking. In particular we consider that more supporting text is required to explain what is actually proposed for each site and how they will actually be developed. This should then be reflected in the individual policies themselves.	
Policy TCL10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4494	Supporting	Accept allocation of mixed use for these sites: White Horse Lane Roger Britton Carpets Kingsmead The Warehouse, Sea Street Whitstable Harbour	
Policy TCL10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4495	Objecting	Accept that the range of uses indicated are suitable for Whitstable Harbour. But Policy EMP11 also relates to the Whitstable Harbour area. It would be better to deal with the Harbour in a one Policy to avoid confusion. We suggest that Policy EMP11 would be the appropriate. Therefore, the content of Policy TCL10 in relation to the Harbour should be incorporated into Policy EMP11, and the supporting text expanded.	The content of Policy TCL10 in relation to the Harbour should be incorporated into Policy EMP11, and the supporting text expanded as appropriate.
Policy TCL10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4496	Objecting	Object to the allocation of this site as proposed. This centrally located mixed-use site should include residential development for 50 units. This important site should be subject to its own Policy rather than being part of Policy TCL10. We feel that this is appropriate given that the site is a new allocation as it will allow the text to highlight issues and retention of the old school.	Include residential in the allocation. Provide its own policy.
Policy TCL10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4497	Objecting	Object to allocation of Herne Bay's central development area, Beach St and Bus depot in plan because they are allocated under policies HB1,2 and 3 of the Herne Bay Area Action Plan. Consequently we fail to see the need to re-allocate the sites in Policy TCL10 and under Policy HD1. It would be more sensible to keep the whole of the AAP intact. Delete the sites from TCL10.	Delete Bus depot, Beach Street, Herne Bay central development area from Policy TCL10.
Policy TCL10	780837	Mrs Margaret Darby		4745	Objecting	Given the need for additional student accommodation it might be considered a reasonable option to allocate the remainder of the site adjacent to Augustine House for student housing rather than mixed use. This could be tied in to the development already granted permission with suitable provision for student services on site for example a dedicated medical centre.	
Policy TCL10	781925	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd		4916	Supporting	The existing Sainsbury's store in Canterbury is located within the Kingsmead site, which is allocated for mixed use development within Policy TCL10. Sainsbury's support this allocation on the basis that it will allow for a comprehensive mixed-use development across the whole site to come forward providing modern retail and leisure uses in this part of the city. Sainsbury's also support the recognition that the site has limited potential for residential development - it is in Flood Zone 2.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL10	781925	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd		4917	Objecting	Policy TCL10 states that development of the allocated sites within the policy will need to conform to the associated adopted Development Briefs or agreed development principles. The Kingsmead Brief is out of date and should be afforded very limited weight in guiding land uses on the site in the context of the current economic climate. In addition, the extent of the TCL10 site is significantly smaller, which limited scope and quantum of development that can be delivered at the site.	
Policy TCL10	782028	Terrace Hill		4954	Objecting	Draft policy TCL10 states that the development of the sites will need to conform to the adopted Development Brief or agreed development principles. During the course of the consideration of Terrace Hill's planning application for Altira Park, it has been confirmed by the Council that the Central Development Area (CDA) will not be delivered in its adopted masterplan form. This should be recognised in the next version of the Local Plan.	
Policy TCL10	782028	Terrace Hill		4956	Objecting	The draft Local Plan should make provision for meeting retail needs in the Herne Bay in order to address the leakage of expenditure and the over-trading of existing stores, and the wording of the policy needs to be flexible so that future needs can be met and appropriate alternative development proposals can come forward.	
Policy TCL10	121776	Hendersons	Hendersons Global Investors	5006	Objecting	Concerned about the scale and impact of out-of-centre retail floorspace being considered in locations such as Wincheap. DTZ Retail and Leisure study does not provide evidence based assessment of impact on centre and is out of date. There are insufficient safeguards to protect the centre, and policies themselves have not been worded to demonstrate compliance with the NPPF. Growth should be approached with caution since capacity only emerges from 2021. Allocations and policy approach are unsound	To protect the City Centre, we recommend either deletion of the retail elements of TCL10 or the amendment to include the following policy safeguards: - Any retail development brought forward on these sites should first be tested against Policy TCL6 and Policies TCL7 and TCL10 amended to include an appropriate cross-reference to this policy. - The scale and goods to be sold from these locations should be more clearly defined in the Policies - The provision of a floorspace cap within the Policies based on the level of need identified in the DTZ Study. - The inclusion of phasing and regular review provisions with in the Policies to allow the City Council to test whether the allocations continue to be appropriate

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL10	121776	Hendersons	Hendersons Global Investors	5007	Objecting	Concerned about the scale and impact of out-of-centre retail floorspace being considered in locations such as Kingsmead. DTZ Retail and Leisure study does not provide evidence based assessment of impact on centre and is out of date. There are insufficient safeguards to protect the centre, and policies themselves have not been worded to demonstrate compliance with the NPPF. Growth should be approached with caution since capacity only emerges from 2021. Allocations and policy approach are unsound	To protect the City Centre, we recommend either deletion of the retail elements of TCL10 or the amendment to include the following policy safeguards: - Any retail development brought forward on these sites should first be tested against Policy TCL6 and Policies TCL7 and TCL10 amended to include an appropriate cross-reference to this policy. - The scale and goods to be sold from these locations should be more clearly defined in the Policies - The provision of a floorspace cap within the Policies based on the level of need identified in the DTZ Study. - The inclusion of phasing and regular review provisions with in the Policies to allow the City Council to test whether the allocations continue to be appropriate
Policy TCL10	784234	Sea Street Developments Ltd		5104	Supporting	We support the proposed allocation under Policy TCL10.	
Policy TCL10	784234	Sea Street Developments Ltd		5105	Objecting	We support the proposed allocation under Policy TCL10 but would ask that the list of potential uses be expanded to read: self-catering accommodation, retail, food and drink. We would also comment that the capacity of the site is greater than 5 units indicated in the Schedule of Housing Allocations (Site CA309) - Appendix 2 to the Draft Local Plan. We have been preparing proposals for the redevelopment of the site and consider that the capacity of the site could be in the region of 14 units	- that the list of potential uses be expanded to read: self-catering accommodation, retail, food and drink. - that the capacity of the site could be in the region of 14 units
Policy TCL10	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5352	Objecting	We have been unable to assess the domestic sites in this policy with respect to water and wastewater capacity. This is because there is no indication of number of dwellings on the sites thus we are unable to estimate the anticipated flows to and from them.	
Policy TCL10	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5640	Objecting	Whitstable Historic assets associated with the former Crab and Winkle Railway, including the remaining embankments and track-bed, need to be carefully preserved. A museum in the Harbour with the Invicta engine relocated here from Canterbury and an exhibition of this very significant historic railway would be very appropriate!	
Policy TCL10	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5714	Supporting	More specific positives: Environmental Improvement and Redevelopment Areas and policies TCL9 and 10	
Policy TCL10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6314	Objecting	Does this reflect the Planning Minister's encouragement, as reported 06.08.2013, that empty shops should become housing units?	
4.58	779262	Mr John Bailey		1971	Supporting	Cinema complex in wincheap is needed as an attraction in Canterbury.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
4.59	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	697	Supporting	SSRA would support the development in Canterbury of leisure facilities for families and young people, for example, cinema, bowling, ice skating and a laser arena. These should be planned in consultation with potential users including local Residents' Associations plus the 2 major universities. Thought should also be given to ensuring that the sites are accessible by public transport.	
4.59	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3697	Supporting	We support what is said in para 4.59 about the enhancement of the early evening economy,	
4.59	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6315	Objecting	Did 'Canterbury' mean City or District? Open to similar confusion as can occur when 'Sturry' is mentioned - Parish or Village.	
4.61	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	698	Supporting	St Stephen's RA views Kingsmead Depot as the ideal site for the development of leisure facilities. Along with the Leisure Centre, the Open Space at Kingsmead Field and the Riverside Centre (all of which should be retained) this would create a Leisure Quarter for the city. The development should be mixed leisure and housing and offers the opportunity for the creation of a riverside walk with seating areas and restaurants/cafes. Cinema, ice skating, bowling and laser arena would all be suitable.	
4.61	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1010	Objecting	What land is this and what plans does the Council have for it? If residents are to comment usefully on this, we need more information.	What land is this and what plans does the Council have for it? If residents are to comment usefully on this, we need more information.
Policy TCL11	766790	M Hogben		88	Objecting	A multi-screen cinema has been needed for a long time.	
Policy TCL11	766797	Miss L Dowle		111	Objecting	I feel Canterbury is lacking in major leisure facilities i.e. a decent sports centre and swimming pool, cinema facilities, bowling complex, ice skating rink and football stadium. There are no proposals to accommodate these essential facilities in the draft plan.	
Policy TCL11	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		368	Supporting	Importance of pedestrian and cyclist accessibility should also be emphasised.	Reword the second paragraph of the policy to: "Major commercial leisure and cultural facilities serving the City or the coastal towns should be located close to the town centre, or if this is not achievable, at other locations within the urban area which favour accessibility by sustainable means of transport over private motor vehicles as detailed in the hierarchy of transport modes in paragraph 5.24."
Policy TCL11	13680	Ms Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust	965	Supporting	Support policy as it will enhance existing cultural facilities. However, the policy should include the word 'protect' or protection or protect and improve.	Include the word 'protect' or 'protection, replacement or enhancement' or the phrase 'protect and improve'.
Policy TCL11	778047	Mr Michael Perkins		1240	Objecting	No reference to the provision or support for sea based leisure facilities, in particular at Whitstable. This is a serious omission as plans for the future of the Harbour and the surrounding area need to be included in any Plan for Whitstable.	Makereference to sea based leisure and facilities in the Plan.

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL11	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3618	Objecting	Policy TCL11 is welcome if it will be held to apply to stabling and indoor riding schools. If not as presently drafted, then an amendment to make it clear that it will apply is needed.	Change the wording of Policy TCL11 to apply to stabling and indoor riding schools.
Policy TCL11	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4704	Objecting	Active planning needs to occur to remedy Canterbury's low-quality leisure offering, especially for young people. Canterbury is poorly served by sports facilities and the nightclubs are not highly regarded by the people who use them (or might want to use them) and seen as a source of nuisance by residents living in and around the town centre. The buildings used by nightclubs are not purpose-built and are often close to residences and main shopping areas.	Active planning needs to occur to remedy Canterbury's low-quality leisure offering, especially for young people.
Policy TCL11	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5045	Supporting	Herne Bay golf Club development will include a sports hub which will enhance sports provision in area so accords with Policy TCL11 and NPPF para 73. Policy TCL11 is assessed as sound.	
Policy TCL11	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5615	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as the cultural ideas set out in the policy.	
Policy TCL11	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5717	Supporting	More specific positives:. Policies relating to leisure, cultural and tourist activities TCL11 and 12 + TV1, 2 and 3	
Policy TCL11	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6043	Objecting	In Whitstable, with its unique set-up this and other development policies should be subordinate to the requirement that sufficient infrastructure is in place for development.	Ideally the policy should distinguish between development for local people and those for visitor or those from the suburbs in Whitstable. Tourist developments should be resisted until all the infrastructural issues affecting the town are certain of resolution. Public transport cannot be relied on for the centre as buses are delayed by the jams of visitors coming in cars at certain times in cars and this is made worse by the trains from London having ten minutes added to their timetable due to the HS 1 and the long walk from the station with no bus service or taxi rank, whilst Canterbury benefits from much shorter train times which discourage car use and a short walk to the centre). Until these infrastructural issues are resolved in Whitstable, development should be focussed on areas outside the centre on bus routes and not in the centre. Development that must be in the centre for the use of local people who live in the centre should have sufficient parking spaces for users due to serious congestion and parking problem in Whitstable at certain times of the year
Policy TCL11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6316	Objecting	Broadly accepted, however 2 years is a long time if premises are going to be empty can there be provision regarding the look of the frontage.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL11	785163	Canterbury Christ Church University		6984	Objecting	Following on from the comments under Policy OS7 in relation to the University's interests at PFSC it is requested that the proposed expansion area at the PFSC site, as shown on the attached plan be considered for a designation for leisure facilities under Policy TCL11. It is considered that such a designation will assist in cementing the University's future plans for the site and the general acceptance of such uses as part of an existing leisure facility.	
4.62	665473	Dr Richard Norman		554	Objecting	I oppose ANY town centre uses which lead to late-evening noise and anti-social behaviour.	
4.62	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2300	Objecting	Concerned about noise disturbance and other problems caused by the night-time economy. We would like to see the Council taking a more proactive approach to this problem by developing the idea of an entertainment/leisure hub away from housing, where adequate late night entertainment can be offered and therefore drawing the nightclub scene out of the city centre.	
4.62	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2301	Objecting	We also request that there should not be any public sale of alcohol in residential areas after midnight. If this became policy, the council and residents would not be constantly confronting (and fighting) attempts by landlords in the city centre to increase their opening hours, and it would make a hub outside the centre much more attractive.	
4.62	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3698	Objecting	We appreciate what is said in para 4.62 about late evening noise and anti-social behaviour. We are astonished that nothing is said about late night and indeed early morning noise and nuisance, which blight life in the City Centre for residents and tourists alike. Unless vigorous action is taken to combat the negative effects of the nighttime culture, much of the otherwise admirable aspiration for Canterbury City Centre will be in vain.	
4.62	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4705	Objecting	Disappointingly, only two sentences are dedicated to the issue of the night-time economy and the noise nuisance (and anti-social behaviour) that often follows. People living in the town centre (or near the ring road) are often on the dispersal routes of pubs and clubs and consequently residents can have their quality of life significantly diminished by late-night noise, vandalism (particularly to cars), fighting and littering.	There is no explanation as to what measures are to be taken and how they might effectively be policed. Although this is a licensing issue and the Local Plan is a planning document, there are opportunities to address problems caused by the late-night economy through planning. The Local Plan is an opportunity for the council to designate an area on the edge of town (possibly part of a business/development park) as a site for a sports centre, cinema complex, restaurants, bars and nightclubs provided with a dedicated bus link and cycle path to the centre of town or to other public transport links.
4.62	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6317	Objecting	Wherever the location, the proximity of homes must be a major consideration and effective measures put in place to minimise disturbance.	
Policy TCL12	665473	Dr Richard Norman		555	Objecting	Planning permission should not be given for ANY development which could lead to an increase in night-time activity.	

Summary Chapter 4 - Town Centres and Leisure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TCL12	778367	Incafield Ltd		2379	Objecting	Support principle but objects to wording of Policy TCL12c. Unacceptable may just be unsatisfactory but an adverse impact causes clear harm, replace unacceptable with materially adverse and ensure all compiling proposals are granted. A balance needs to be struck between impacts, vitality and viability. Policy lacks guidance on factors used to determine impacts on residential amenity and the criteria used to assess cumulative impacts as A3 and A4 uses maybe quite different. Provide clarity.	Amend policy to change unacceptable to materially adverse, provide guidance as to factors taken into account as to the individual impact on amenity and what criteria will be used to determine cumulative impact.
Policy TCL12	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3699	Objecting	Policy TCL12 (evening and night-time activity) should be rewritten in such a way that the default position is that planning permission for night-time activity will not be granted unless conditions a, b and c are met. Our experience over the past ten years is that they never are. The virtual withdrawal of the Police from the City Centre at night can only make matters worse.	
Policy TCL12	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5616	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as the cultural ideas set out in the policy, as well as the long delayed concern for curbing anti-social behaviour.	
Policy TCL12	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5718	Supporting	More specific positives:. Policies relating to leisure, cultural and tourist activities TCL11 and 12 + TV1, 2 and 3	
Policy TCL12	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6319	Objecting	Appreciated. Will it be delivered?	
Policy TCL12	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6906	Supporting	Whilst we welcome a policy which could lead to an increased in evening and night time activity we consider the note in (b) regarding tackling anti-social behaviour is insufficiently forceful to meet the assurances set out in (c).	Note (b) needs to be strengthened with respect to (c), as commented on above.

Comments Summary:

Chapter 5: Transport Infrastructure

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.1	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3637	Objecting	The aspiration for economic and population growth and a better quality of life requiring improved transportation choices should include equestrians. The alternative to travelling on the hoof is to use a horsebox, which contributes to congestion and air quality problems as well as being expensive and inconvenient. Wherever possible, reference should be made to non-motorised transport, multi-user non-motorised routes or to walkers, cyclists and equestrians, rather than just to walking and cycling.	Wherever possible in Chapter 5, reference should be made to non-motorised transport, multi-user non-motorised routes or to walkers, cyclists and equestrians, rather than just to walking and cycling.
5.1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3901	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent is very concerned with the Council's admission that its aspirations for economic and population growth will bring increasing demands on the transport network. These ambitions, as we explain in Part I of our response, have resulted in a strategy that is based on significant and costly new road building. We believe that the strategy should seek to reduce the need for, and the impacts of travel rather than increase them.	
5.1	781734	Mr Chris Lowe		5119	Objecting	The full benefit of any improvements [to the Westgate Towers and St Dunstons area] referred to in the Draft Plan can only be achieved if the traffic impacts are reduced. Although strengthened Plan policies to support more sustainable transport modes will help, a more radical change is likely to be needed. Hence there needs to be a policy to protect the area and avoid developemnts which could obstruct proposed changes to improve the area.	ADD NEW POLICY: Developments around the west side of Canterbury will not be permitted if they exacerbate the traffic levels around the Westgate Towers and St Dunstons area, or if they potentially block any changes which would enable the traffic flows or impacts in that area to be altered or reduced.
5.1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5567	Objecting	Are the core traffic problems adequately addressed? No.	
5.1	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5569	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'On Traffic'. This includes the recognition that the local highway network is already under pressure.	
5.1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6320	Objecting	IPSOS MORI POLL: 85% of people were of the opinion that infrastructure should be in place first.	
5.1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6536	Supporting	Support many of the stated aims and objectives in this chapter, especially with the emphasis on sustainability, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and on creating more road space by prioritising measures to promote walking, cycling, public transport use and car clubs. Also in agreement with many of the measures proposed to deliver these aims.	
5.1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6537	Objecting	Concerned that certain statements [in this chapter], and specific proposals for infrastructure at developments, would have the opposite outcome to those suggested above and result instead in more traffic congestion, poorer air quality and higher emissions.	
5.2	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		82	Objecting	The HST may be benefitting Canterbury, but the service along the coast, serving Whitstable and Herne Bay, has actually deteriorated over the years and especially since the introduction of the HST service.	
5.2	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	239	Objecting	Is encouraging commuting environmentally sound?	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.2	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1011	Objecting	The high speed rail service has significantly worsened the rail journey from Herne Bay to London.	Lobby Southeastern trains to invest to improve the North Kent line
5.2	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2427	Objecting	The HST maybe benefitting Canterbury, but the service along the coast, serving Whitstable and Herne Bay, has actually deteriorated over the years and especially since the introduction of the HST service. The Canterbury East Line down to Dover is also under threat and may be cut altogether as it nearly was under the last review in 2009 . Therefore, we would like to see a specific policy included that sets out the Council's commitment to preserving and enhancing these rail services.	
5.2	406391	Mr Alan Best	Swale Borough Council	5499	Supporting	We both share a common issue in terms of the motorway junctions on the M2/A2, specifically junctions 5 and 7. We are sure that you will be liaising with the HA on the wider implications of Local Plan (and wider) proposals on the strategic road network. No doubt this will be an important Duty to Cooperate matter for us both as we move forward.	
5.2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6321	Objecting	...this [is] an attractive area to live'. All the factors which contribute to this MUST be maintained.	
5.3	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		81	Objecting	Not within CCC's remit, but since you mention the projected increase in Port of Dover traffic, why not bring to the table the possibility of restoring Dover Marine railway station!? The first 4 items must include point-of-planning provisions for walkers, cyclists etc., with safe crossings geared to the needs of non-vehicular traffic.	
5.3	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	236	Objecting	Whereas the expansion of Manston may be welcome in terms of improved transport infrastructure and job creation, noise and the inevitable increase in traffic are less so.	
5.3	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		290	Objecting	Rail links need to be improved and incentives provided for their use before there is any further expansion of Manston or Dover.	Emphasis on rail needed.
5.3	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		2351	Objecting	The Local Plan needs to be strengthened in respect of the Council's position relating to increased growth at Manston Airport and how the adverse environmental effects of aircraft and road traffic movements affecting Herne Bay and Whitstable are going to be dealt with.	
5.3	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2428	Objecting	The projected increase in Port of Dover traffic should require the consideration of restoring Dover Marine railway station in line with promoting sustainable transport options between the districts. A specific inter district policy to support sustainable transport modes over motorised vehicles should be included.	
5.3	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3940	Objecting	Query that Manston is a key enabler in Thanet's economy, this does not reflect the current thinking of the Council and its local plan. There is an over capacity of runway space. Dover port will be affected by new port at Shellhaven so it is unlikely to impact on traffic on the A2 within Canterbury District.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6322	Objecting	Expansion of Manston Airport' ... 'Thanet Parkway station located near Minster ..'. What impact would a Thanet Parkway station serving Manston airport (para 5.3) have on Sturry Station? Indeed, on the whole of Canterbury District's Plans and Strategies? But then any scenario for Manston actually being delivered is probably very unlikely for the rest of this century!	
5.3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6323	Supporting	... traffic using A2 through District'. Strengthen's argument for A2 improvements	
5.4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6324	Objecting	'... multi-modal transport infrastructure both within and between centres'.The Canterbury/Ashford A28 is still a country road. Do any plans exist to change this into a major inter-centre route at sometime in the future?	
5.5	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1012	Objecting	Some of this could be resolved by investing outside Canterbury for schools; jobs and retail. This plan makes the district even more Canterbury-centric than it is now.	Some of this could be resolved by investing outside Canterbury for schools; jobs and retail. This plan makes the district even more Canterbury-centric than it is now.
5.5	777839	Miss Margaret Stirling	Secretart Craddock Road Residents Association	1747	Supporting	Cycle paths must be fit for purpose with the safety of cyclists and pedestrians at the forefront of the planning of new roads. Traffic needs to be managed and provision must be made before roads are opened.	
5.5	777839	Miss Margaret Stirling	Secretart Craddock Road Residents Association	1748	Supporting	Cycle paths must be fit for purpose with the safety of cyclists and pedestrians at the forefront of the planning of new roads. Traffic needs to be managed and provision must be made before roads are opened.	
5.5	779228	Miss Margaret Stirling		1770	Supporting	Cycle lanes that are fit for purpose, that are in the plans from the start and not put in as an afterthought. Improvement to bus services	
5.5	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3945	Objecting	If the city 'depends on a large net inflow of commuters to support the level of jobs', then this situation will be made much worse if more housing were provided than is needed for such commuters.	
5.5	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5568	Objecting	Rightly acknowledges that Canterbury functions as a regional hub drawing in large numbers of commuters and school children and higher education students. The continuing implications of this not squarely faced in the DLP!	
5.5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6329	Objecting	.. large net inflow ... education and shopping'. Investment to develop alternative locations at elsewhere in the District. eg Herne Bay would: - ease traffic into Canterbury, - regenerate Herne Bay Does this Plan really make sufficient strides to effect this beneficial change.	
5.6	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		369	Objecting	All modes of travel should be represented to give a balanced picture.	This paragraph should also detail the pedestrian, cycle, and bus (beyond the Park & Ride) infrastructure which already exists in order to present a balanced picture.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.6	665473	Dr Richard Norman		559	Supporting	I agree with this diagnosis of Canterbury's transport problems and the factors which make any solution difficult, in particular the fact that congestion is exacerbated by two railway crossings which are frequently closed. Serious consideration should be given to lowering the level of the Canterbury West railway line in a cutting between Rheims Way and Broad Oak Road, and eliminating the level crossings.	
5.6	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	716	Objecting	Change to paragraph 5.6 to read: Canterbury has two railway stations which serve the City. High Speed One services now stop at Canterbury West station cutting the journey time to London from approximately 90 to 56 minutes.	Wording of last sentence of paragraph 5.6 needs to be amended.
5.6	778541	Mr Robert Marshall		1259	Objecting	The transport system in Canterbury needs to take a joined up approach. That means that there should be practical integration between Canterbury East and West stations, ease of access for buses, taxis and adequate short term parking for people wishing to pick up commuters and tourists to visit both the city and outlying villages.	If rail users could access Canterbury West station from Roper Road it would reduce the need for them to journey further into and out of Canterbury across the level crossing and into the current station concourse. I request that you add an additional policy which safeguards both the car sales site and rental site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for car parking, a taxi rank and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.6	778650	Mrs. Rebecca Smith		1387	Supporting	There needs to be a way to better support commuter parking at Canterbury West Train Station or accomidation so that the park and ride or local bus routes from Thanington go directly to Canterbury West.	
5.6	777839	Miss Margaret Stirling	Secretart Craddock Road Residents Association	1745	Supporting	We support change needs to take place but want health and safety of local residents to be thought about when these changes are made. We also want more cycle paths to be constructed to enable more people to cycle in safety.	
5.6	404737	Mr Richard Guest		3839	Objecting	â€¢ A way to remove traffic from the centre of town - for example the junction to the A2 at Harbledown 4-way (i.e. You could leave Canterbury to travel in the dover direction and you could leave the A2 from the dover direction to exit for Canterbury) would relieve the town of some traffic. In this way, those people who would typically come from S Canterbury to get to the north (The University of Kent, Blean, Sturry road, Whitstable), could then exit the A2 at Harbledown, and vice versa.	
5.6	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5485	Objecting	There is an inexcusable failure to fully accept, face up to and address the congestion issue in and around Canterbury which has been constantly highlighted in so many ancillary reports and even here in the DLP itself. The SA report on the overall DLP highlighted concerns on this front which are not properly disclosed or tackled. There is a dearth of references to sustainability when traffic and transport is being discussed in the DLP and in the briefing papers laid before Councillors.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.6	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5570	Objecting	Admits that 'the highway network is under acute pressure' yet the DLP does not properly address or tackle this issue! The historic layout of the city, the dominating radial road pattern, and the very limited bypassing opportunities pose very considerable constraints. Commuter routes are already overloaded with consequent poor air quality. The Plan, with its proposed additional larger housing schemes in South Canterbury and at Sturry/ Broad Oak, both ignores and exacerbates this existing situatn.	
5.6	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5677	Supporting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:â€¢ Recognition that 'the highway network is under acute pressure' and that there is a need to shift to more efficient ways of travelling.	
5.6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6331	Objecting	'.. Canterbury West Station...' How effective is the bus service for this, as the bus station is at the opposite end of town?	
5.7	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	919	Objecting	The car parking demand in Whitstable is understated. Whitstable has a high number of weekend visitors throughout most of the year and this can include dry sunny weekends in the winter. Most weekends in the summer period produce long queues into town down Borstal Hill.	
5.7	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		2358	Objecting	Para 5.7 Given the acknowledged very high seasonal demand for car parking especially during the weekend of the Oyster Festival when 70,000 people visit the town, could I suggest that urgent consideration is given to the provision of toilets including facilities for the disabled during the peak periods. The existing facilities are not able to cope duringpeakdemand and some temporary facilities are needed	
5.7	780327	Mr Robin Townsend	Secretary to the Trust The Crab & Winkle Line Trust	3263	Objecting	The Plan needs updating to take account of the progress made by the (Crab and Winkle) Trust in acquiring this vital land for community access to provide sustainable transport (walking and cycling). Whistable suffers from traffic congestion, and in spite of attempts at solutions it only gets worse. Very few towns can have the chance of a sustainable traffic-free safe route linking major centres:- a Harbour, Medical Centre, Railway Station, Schools, etc that goes through the heart of a busy town.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.7	780369	Mr Malcolm Scott		3274	Objecting	To improve traffic flow car parking in the High Street should be banned, say between April and September. The only parking allowed would be for genuine goods vehicles to load/unload. Parking restrictions would be strictly enforced and this would ensure traffic could travel freely through the town. A park and ride system would then have a better chance of success. To assist disabled drivers a number of disabled parking bays could be provided.	Whitstable suffers from popularity and traffic flow and parking opportunities creates problems for people wishing to visit the town. To improve traffic flow car parking in the High Street should be banned, say between April and September and between 9am and 6pm. The only parking allowed would be for genuine goods vehicles to load/unload. Parking restrictions would be strictly enforced and this would ensure traffic could travel freely through the town. With free traffic flow a park and ride system would have a better chance of success. To assist disabled drivers a number of disabled parking bays could be provided in Gladstone Road, Argyle Road, Cromwell Road and Terry's Lane, for example, and also at the adjacent car parks.
5.7	780807	Mrs & Mr Judith & Norman Ames		5487	Objecting	Upset by bias on Canterbury City in transport and infrastructure, needs focus on Whitstable. Not enough emphasis on residents and too much on tourists who have no consideration. No acknowledgement of train station. Action needed to improve traffic movement through whitstable high st. Issues with parking slowing traffic. Stationary traffic causing pollution and stress for residents. Need traffic wardens in High St. Give 1/2 hour free parking.	Improve road traffic through Whitstable, deal with illegal parking, 1/2 hour free parking, enstate park and ride.
5.7	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6048	Objecting	Describing Whitstable as just an artistic town is grossly misleading actual and especially local plan terms.	The misleading fallacy of artistic town as it stated in 5.7 must be removed from the plan or anywhere where it is stated. It is PR and not planning professional terminology and analysis. There is a clear danger that the local plan through such an official description, becomes part of the massive PR output related to this tiny art group. The draws that suck in such huge number of visitors can be easily listed. they include the quaint town, the beach and water craft activities, the restaurants and pubs and the generally tranquil atmosphere generated by the unique (in Kent /Sussex) absence of a beach side road.
5.8	771556	Mr Phil Rose		2126	Objecting	"Herne Bay does not suffer from high levels of congestion" - YET! This fails to take into account the Council's plan to add thousands of homes around Herne Bay. If we did all come to shop in the town centre instead of going to Canterbury and elsewhere, congestion would be massive and there would be a gross under-provision of parking. If only we had a Transport Strategy...	We need a comprehensive and coherent Transport Strategy that addresses the current and future needs of each town, and the District as a whole.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.8	775156	Mr David Parish		2535	Objecting	We have the two main parallel streets in Herne Bay (Seafront and High Street). These could provide us with an opportunity to create two one way streets. This would free up space for short stay parking bays, boosting our retail trade, and car parking drop off access to the accommodation on the sea front. The main streets of the town would then have space to be planted up with trees and would be safer for pedesrians and cyclists. This would deal with increasing populations before problems occur.	
5.8	782028	Terrace Hill		4957	Objecting	Terrace Hill agrees that it is important that the Herne Bay area is allowed to develop to remain vital in the context of competition from nearby centres. The Council's own evidence base estimates that Herne Bay residents are consistently leaving the area for retail opportunities elsewhere, resulting in 69p of every Â£1 or convenience expenditure leaking out of Herne Bay (Herne Bay, An Economic Assessment, January 2009).	The Local Plan should support measures that would stem this leakage.
5.8	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6049	Objecting	The Plan permits commercial units to be used as retail units . They , with their free parking and lower rates, threaten coastal shopping centres.	The plan should prevent developers of commercial centres, especially with frontage to the Thanet WayÂ from permitting retail activity that does not need cars for the pick-up of goods. If possible this should affect existing sites not yet used for this purpose. To illustrate the point, the commercial unit proposed for the Paddock would have had frontage on the Thanet Way and may well be used now or later in our view as retail units further leading to the Thanet Way becoming a rival High St for the existing shopping centre of Herne Bay and Whitstable.
5.9	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		291	Supporting	You have identified the problems. What plans are there to solve them?	
5.9	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1801	Objecting	There is an opportunity here to draw attention to the 'Rural Streets and Lanes: a Design Handbook' which advocates shared space and gives guidance on the design and treatment of rural streets and lanes. This is adopted by Kent County Council. It is available on the Kent Downs AONB website: www.kentdowns.org.uk/publications . Developers, KCC and the relevant Highways authority should be implementing the guidance which is also part of the Kent Downs AONB's suite of guidance supporting the Kent Down	Add Kent County Council has adopted the guidance in 'Rural streets and Lanes: a design Handbook' for all rural areas in Kent http://www.kentdowns.org.uk/publications/rural-streets-and-lanes-a-design-handbook Â This guidance gives advice on shared use and design guidance and criteria for new road schemes and developers.Â It covers: conservation of historic features management and conservation of habitats and wildlife in the highways signage and waymarking gateway treatments and traffic calming in rural settlements fencing and other boundary treatments consideration for all road users new road and road improvement schemes shared /multi user use The Kent Downs AONB suggests that this guidance is used to set criteria for all road improvements and new roads and development in all rural areas in Canterbury District.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.9	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3946	Objecting	welcome recognition of rural issues. Need to recognise accident rate on rural roads. Reduction in speeds would be beneficial as well as footpaths between houses and hops and bus stops. Include policy, use materials that blend into the environment. Air quality and rat runs are an issue and park and rides attract people from outside the district. Put preventative measures in place including the withdrawal of housing allocations. If not done Air Quality Management Areas may arise.	
5.9	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6334	Objecting	'The main transport issues for rural areas is ...'. This is a very broad coverage, and is not true for the rural centres.	Suggest amendment: The main transport issues for these rural areas
5.10	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		83	Objecting	If pavement repairs are such a top priority, why don't you introduce the simple legislation which would prevent a lot of the damage thereto in the first place - a district-wide, no-exception pavement parking ban? If London can do it, why not Canterbury district? There can be no rational, intelligent argument against such a ban, and the savings would be immense.	
5.10	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2429	Objecting	If pavement repairs are such a top priority, the Council ought to introduce policy in the Draft Local Plan and byelaws which would prevent a lot of the damage thereto in the first place - a district wide, no-exception pavement parking ban should be introduced. If London can do it, why not Canterbury district? There can be no rational, intelligent argument against such a ban, and the savings would be immense.	
5.10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3948	Objecting	The Council needs to take a more robust attitude with KCC about highways generally, as some KCC policies do not accord with what is needed for the City. We are unconvinced that the Development Management Section of the City Council is making a special case with KCC to reflect the City's special needs.	
5.10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6337	Objecting	'The Council has committed to ten pledges ..'. Could these pledges be listed in the Plan as appendix? They are all over the place.	
5.10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6339	Supporting	support and encouragement of KCC'. Suggest insert: much appreciated support	Suggest insert: much appreciated support ...
5.10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6344	Objecting	'The Council's stated aim for 2016 is:'. Could these pledges be listed in the Plan as appendix? They are all over the place.	
5.11	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		84	Objecting	Please add in the 20's Plenty commitment here.	
5.11	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		85	Objecting	Please add in the 20's Plenty commitment here. I should like to see the appointment of a Sustainable Transport "Czar" who would be able to have an over-arching view of all the strands linking Sustainable Transport. S/he would also be able to liase with NGOs such as hospitals, universities, factories etc etc to help them with their ST policies.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.11	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1154	Objecting	WPC notes that Section 5.11 lists a number of actions that CCC has identified in connection with transport, but many of them are facilitative rather than directly active, and only one action appears to apply particularly to the proposal for 3000 new homes to be built in South Canterbury. This is the action to ensure that: "new building development occurs in the right places to support broader travel options and promoting alternatives to reduce traffic across the district."	This action item is drafted too generally and WPC would like to see specific reference made to ensuring that current traffic flows in the main access routes to Canterbury are maintained at current levels by introducing new routes for residents in the additional housing to use into the City rather than just from the new developments into the nearest existing road such as Nackington Road.
5.11	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1784	Objecting	Rather than increasing traffic movements on the Old Thanet Way A2990 by allowing development along this road, traffic movements should be kept on the modern realigned Thanet Way A299 as was recommended at the time the new road was built. The land adjacent to the old Thanet Way was made Protected Open Space, so that the Old Thanet Way did not return to being as busy as it was prior to the new road being built.	
5.11	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3700	Objecting	The Council's stated aim for 2016 of keeping traffic on the ring road to 2011 levels (5.11) is inadequate; traffic should be reduced. However, even this modest aim will be unrealisable, if large numbers of houses are built in South Canterbury. A reduction in the number of people saying that traffic congestion needs to be improved does nothing to solve the problem. Not only parking but also A-boards and tables and chairs should be discouraged on pavements (5.12. and 8.85).	
5.11	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3950	Objecting	Disagree with indicators, more cars using park and rides is contrary to using more sustainable modes. P&R's are shown to increase vehicle miles. An indicator of bus, train, walking and cycling would be more helpful. More detail should be provided on air quality measures. Should reduce car parking spaces. All businesses should charge their staff for parking.	With regard to air quality, detail should be provided of the measures that will be employed. With regard to the bullet on parking, this should use the term 'reducing total car parking spaces' rather than identifying the locale of changes. In the sixth point after "increasing" insert "and improving the separation of". The final bullet on businesses should contain reference to workplace charging. Several organisations, such as Barretts and Kent & Canterbury Hospital, charge employees for use of workplace car parking. This should be expanded to all business, especially within the city itself, and possibly in Whitstable.
5.11	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4431	Supporting	DIO supports the principles set out in the Corporate Plan, in particular the action set out at paragraph 5.12	
5.11	778536	Ms Patricia Marsh	Committee Member Wincheap Society	4622	Objecting	Unclear how CCC will keep traffic movements to 2011 levels if building at S Cant. Large new devts should be car free or with regular bus shuttles. P&R should extend hours of operation. Bus service in Wincheap is inadequate. Should be more provision ofr pedestrians in local plan. No suitable crossing on Wincheap Green, problems with subway should be resolved. Should take action on cycling on pavements - a particular hazard in Wincheap with house doors opening out onto pavement. More cycle paths	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.11	13812	Mr N J Blake		5195	Objecting	It is felt that the traffic implications of this huge increase in housing to South Canterbury have been underestimated. The aims for congestion will surely be undermined by pouring all the extra traffic demand from the new development down the Old and New Dover roads to the ring road. The effect of a new junction to the A2 on traffic in this area is not calculated in the DLP and the addition of 400 park and ride spaces will not tempt existing traffic. The fast bus link is unlikely to be fast.	
5.11	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5235	Objecting	The Plan should recognise the need for a District wide strategy for reducing pollution and congestion, and not rely on piecemeal schemes such as the recent flawed Westgate Traffic trial. The trial showed that without a wider coherent strategy, traffic volumes will be pushed from one place to another, with the risk of shifting traffic onto residential roads unsuitable for such volumes.	
5.11	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5573	Objecting	The Council has committed in its Corporate Strategy to tackling congestion and its stated aim for 2016 is that "more people will choose to travel sustainably ... congestion will remain at 2011 levels and air quality will not have worsened". Central to achieving those aims is 'keeping traffic movements on Canterbury's ring road to 2011 levels'. Is the air quality aim sufficient? Will this DLP do anything to fulfil the professed desire to keep traffic flows and congestion at the 2011 levels? No	
5.11	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5575	Objecting	The promised incorporation in the Plan of action 'ensuring new building development occurs in the right places to support broader travel options and promoting alternatives to reduce traffic across the District' has not materialised!	
5.11	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5583	Objecting	The Employment Land Review cites the accessibility and transport difficulties in Canterbury as a key impediment to economic growth in the District - is the Plan rigorously tackling this problem or just blindly exacerbating it by proposing development in the wrong places or in advance of the transport and traffic relief required?	
5.11	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5869	Objecting	The transport actions to be incorporated into the DLP are totally aspirational. They rely on hopes of changing people's behaviour but fail to answer the point that people are not easily persuadable i.e. Westgate Towers. Equally there is no indication of what might be done if the nudges on which the Council expects to rely, do not work. In other words, the transport basis for the South Canterbury proposal does not exist.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.11	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6050	Objecting	1) Locate non-retirement homes where job growth is. 2) Be honest about park and ride plans 3) Inappropriate City-centricity to the extent of ignoring issues in Whitstable.	Make this policy truly District wide or have separate sections, for example, for Whitstable. This plan should honestly address that there should be a park and ride for the people of Whitstable to alleviate the jams and help the triangle buses to run to time (as well as other purposes mentioned elsewhere) or state that there will not be one. It is in the hands of the Councillors whether there is one. Add 'locating houses where the jobs are' instead of what the 2003 plan did in locating houses away from the jobs so traffic commuting increased vastly as a result. Update for new polices on town parking provisions http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/general/news/stories/2013/august13/290813/29082013_2
5.11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6346	Objecting	'By 2016 more people will choose'. Sounds as though we are living in a dictatorship. Have people been asked to agree to this? This must also be on the assumption that bus passes are not removed.	
5.11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6348	Objecting	Improving air quality measures'. What difference do AQMA documents and maps and Action Plans really make? In actual practical terms, what changes have been implemented to make things better? Para 5.56 - the short link Chaucer Road and St Martins Hill would provide practical relief.	
5.11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6349	Objecting	'reduce City centre parking spaces'. Who will city centre parking be aimed at? The retail economy will be delicate. Building with maintaining public parking at ground level on existing open air car parks could provide the best of both worlds. Also, potential loss of considerable Council revenue.	
5.11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6350	Objecting	'ensuring new building development occurs in the right place to reduce traffic across the district'. The development of Wincheap retail centre again means people from the north and north/east of Canterbury having to cross the district.	
5.11	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6542	Objecting	Would prefer specific targets to be set for the numbers walking, cycling, using public transport and car-sharing and lift-sharing by car. Concerned that, although sustainable transport measures are evident in the proposed developments, sustainable transport access to and from the city from these will negatively affect traffic flow, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. The target for congestion to remain at 2011 levels and for air quality to not to worsen, lacks ambition.	
5.12	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		673	Objecting	I object to one of the stated aims being "encouraging businesses to develop plans that minimise congestion and parking problems." on the grounds that the council itself has failed over the years to show any progress in this area and this document gives no reason to suppose that it will be able to do so in the future. The clearest example of this is the opening hours of the Recycling facility in Vauxhall Rd, (8:00 to 4:30) which are the hours of maximum congestion on the surrounding roads	Removal of this as an aim or an explanation of why it might succeed in the future when it has clearly failed in the past.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.12	780327	Mr Robin Townsend	Secretary to the Trust The Crab & Winkle Line Trust	3265	Objecting	This paragraph perfectly describes the potential of the C&W. This potential with a modicum of political will needs to be realized and should be made clear and explicit in the Local Plan. The Crab & Winkle project ticks all the 'Green, Environmental and Sustainable boxes' The C&W opportunity is to translate rhetoric into reality and to herald a revolution that is long overdue!	
5.12	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5577	Objecting	Makes for fascinating reading! Has CCC actually produced any policies here in this DLP that constitute 'a transport system that is an engine for growth [and] one that is also greener and safer and improves quality of life in our communities'? No.	
5.12	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6352	Objecting	"a transport system that isalso greener and safer". In view of the AQMA's are the Council's road priorities in the correct order?	
5.13	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		370	Supporting	I believe that this is the correct approach. I will support measures which are in line with these objectives.	
5.13	780327	Mr Robin Townsend	Secretary to the Trust The Crab & Winkle Line Trust	3266	Objecting	This paragraph perfectly describes the potential of the C&W. This potential with a modicum of political will needs to be realized and should be made clear and explicit in the Local Plan. The Crab & Winkle project ticks all the 'Green, Environmental and Sustainable boxes' The C&W opportunity is to translate rhetoric into reality and to herald a revolution that is long overdue!	
5.13	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5578	Objecting	This Plan will NOT fulfil the aims expressed here!	
5.13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6353	Objecting	'... public transport...'. The cost, frequency and reliability of public transport are the keys. London has now got it right.	
5.15	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5318	Supporting	CAST strongly agrees with the following statements from the Local Plan: 5.15: The NPPF recommends... that development plans and decisions should take account of: '...the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure.'	
5.15	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6355	Objecting	The NPPF recommends that Transport Assessments and Travel Plans accompany applications for developments. The Transport Report to support this Local Plan was not in the public domain at the start of this consultation period. The Jacobs VISUM Draft Report December 2012 has some interesting observations, but also flaws and omissions. Has CCC complied with the spirit of the NPPF in identifying sites for developers without a prior, clear understanding of what the transport implications might be?	
5.15	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6547	Supporting	"(The NPPF) sets out three tests that development plans and decisions should take account of: the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure." We strongly agree with this statement.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.16	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5873	Objecting	There is no reference to National Policy Framework Section 75, "Planning policies should look to protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users wherever possible". KCC's Local Transport Plan (LTP3) is referred to however, KCCs Countryside and Coastal Access Improvement Plan is not evidenced. It is crucial that this is referred to as a statutory policy document for PROW and acts as an appendix to LTP3.	
5.18	399017	Mr Andrew Hall		101	Objecting	Sounds good but where is the traffic impact assessment that looks at the impact of 8000 plus new homes, equating to some 15000 people (an increase of 30% on current levels in Canterbury)	A proper traffic impact report to be drawn up before proceeding with any commitments to additional housing
5.18	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	237	Objecting	"Growth without gridlock": nice soundbite, but feasible??	
5.18	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5580	Objecting	This Plan will NOT fulfil the aims expressed here!	
5.18	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6366	Objecting	LTP Themes...EXCELLENT, just one problem - who has the money! If it is housing developers then they MUST produce it FIRST to ensure road infrastructure and all other promised community benefits are actually delivered. There are too many examples of large scale development promises turning to dust after the houses were built. THIS MUST NOT HAPPEN IN CANTERBURY - TOO MUCH IS AT STAKE.	
5.19	772200	Solihin Garrard		257	Objecting	The level of traffic now (let alone in 2030) is in crisis and is something" everyone" has something to say about. The problem can only worsen and section 5.19 of the draft plan acknowledges this. The Council's idea that a new access point at Bridge and an expectation that people will intuitively change their habits (walking, cycling and park and ride) is frankly just wishful thinking: it's not a solution.	
5.19	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		1349	Objecting	The policy states that "Since much of the frustration arises from being unable to predict how long a journey will take the Draft Transport Strategy aims to improve journey time reliability" and then goes on to imply that increasing the reliability, i.e. making all journeys longer, would be the preferred option. This conclusion is absurd.	The plan needs to clearly set out substantial road infrastructure improvements that will allow the traffic from the proposed development to be added to the road network without increasing congestion. If these cannot be funded then the associated development should not proceed.
5.19	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2825	Objecting	The Strategy approach is recognised as being appropriate for a Local Plan, as it provides a framework against which the Plan can be tested and adjusted over its period of implementation. However - it is flawed to produce a preferred option before the completion of the strategy that purports to justify it.	
5.19	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2827	Objecting	The Draft suggests that the construction of more roads would not be affordable, would threaten the City and would not be supported by residents. However -the Plan, takes a contradictory approach, as the infrastructure that is tied to the various strategic allocations includes predominantly new road building. By comparison, within the strategic allocations, the only reference to a specific bus measure is the requirement for the South Canterbury allocation to provide a bus link to the city centre.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.19	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3701	Supporting	We welcome what is said in The Strategy Approach, but point out that cycling does not in itself take up less road space. Four people on bicycles take up more space than a family car.	
5.19	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3959	Objecting	The text appears to be very car-centred - 'Congestion and delays are the main source of problems and frustration for travellers.' Rail delays are usually less than hitherto, and bus delays have been reduced by bus lanes, and travellers sometimes have real time information which is a great help. The cost of rail travel and indeed buses, are more of an issue for many travellers, and the lack of an integrated and safe-seeming cycle route network is also a big frustration	
5.19	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4710	Objecting	The VISUM transport modeling, upon which so many strategic decisions depend, is flawed. At the present time the Council is totally without reliable traffic data upon which to base major road, housing, employment and retailing developments.	It is clear that the modelling will need to be re-calibrated and run using up-to-date data including that pertaining to the present development plans of the City Council.
5.19	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4718	Objecting	It is surprising to find that almost no reference was made to air pollution in this chapter, given that transport is the over-riding source of all Canterbury's pollution. This issue has been discussed in Chapter 12 where a reasonable explanation of the current situation was given. However, of great significance is the fact that the Council has no Policy in its Local Plan to address this issue.	
5.19	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4960	Objecting	A careful perusal of the Jacobs Report indicates that the validity of the VISUM traffic modelling as described must be seriously questioned.	
5.19	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5410	Objecting	Evidence shows that investment in sustainable transport measures reduce car use, congestion and improve air quality. Evidence from cost-benefit evaluations of sustainable transport investment suggests this investment offers the highest value-for-money scores of any transport schemes, attracts substantial additional investment. Further research shows that half of all drivers would like to reduce car use. City should follow European Cities to get people out of cars. Plan offers the opportunity	
5.19	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5858	Supporting	KCC are working closely with the City Council on the Canterbury Transport Strategy and are playing a key role in its development. This must be recognised in the CLP and our support for the CLP is conditional upon a workable and deliverable Transport Strategy being agreed.	
5.20	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		86	Supporting	Absolutely agree	
5.20	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	240	Supporting	The pressing need to promote rural transport is correctly identified. The City Council should be petitioning the Government for expansion, rather than scrapping, of bus passes.	
5.20	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		292	Supporting	Alternative forms of transport good, but not feasible in rural areas where people have to rely on cars	Better bus service and free bus passes extended.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.20	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		371	Supporting	Building more roads is indeed the wrong approach. Therefore the proposals in this plan to provide a number of substantive new roads is therefore extremely worrying and contradictory with this paragraph and the hierarchy of transport modes in paragraph 5.24.	
5.20	665473	Dr Richard Norman		556	Supporting	I support the policy of promoting alternative forms of travel such as walking, cycling, and public transport.	
5.20	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		651	Objecting	If "It is clear that merely building more roads to meet demand is unaffordable" then it is also unaffordable to build more houses. The one needs to accompany the other.	The first sentence should be changed to read "It is clear that merely building more roads to meet demand will never be the complete answer, would be opposed by local residents, threatens the historic fabric of the City and would generate increased traffic elsewhere on the network but it is also recognised that a number of significant road improvements will be required to meet the objective of ensuring that the traffic congestion and pollution does not significantly increase"
5.20	777046	Miss Jane Gallimore		655	Supporting	Subsidise and improve the bus service for Rural and local area, for workers and local residents to use. To make it economically attractive to leave their car at home. This would reduce pollution levels, reduce congestion at peak times and remove the need for another Park and Ride.	
5.20	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		1350	Objecting		The assertion that improvements to the road infrastructure is "unaffordable, would be opposed by local residents, threatens the historic fabric of the City and would generate increased traffic elsewhere on the network" needs to be removed from the plan, or the scale of housing reduced drastically and limited to those areas where the road infrastructure can be improved.
5.20	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1479	Supporting	Remove the rough, sharp stones on existing cycle paths (e.g. Crab and Winkle) by using tarmac	
5.20	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4432	Supporting	DIO supports the principles set out in the strategy approach in paragraph 5.20-5.22	
5.20	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4711	Objecting	This paragraph contradicts Policy T1 which says that the Council will seek "the construction of new roads ... which will improve environmental conditions and/or contribute towards the economic well-being of the District"? This begs the question why there are proposals for new A2 slip roads, a new traffic interchange near Bridge, new bypasses for Sturry and Herne, and why the Council has set land aside for an eastern by-pass of the city.	
5.20	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5319	Supporting	CAST strongly agrees with the statement in paragraph 5.20 from the local plan	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.20	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6367	Objecting	... walking and cycling ...Bear in mind that this Plan emphasises that our population is aging, and that is one of the main reasons for the scale of the proposed development. So, whilst cycling and walking are activities good for health the practicalities of these, even for short journeys, will exclude them as options for many people.	
5.20	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6548	Supporting	Strongly agree with the whole of this paragraph.	
5.20	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6550	Objecting	Add the following text to paragraph 5.20: For this approach to be most effective, sustainable transport measures should be introduced instead of, rather than alongside, new infrastructure to facilitate car travel. Also, sustainable transport measures should be 'built into' any proposed new developments. All development should be designed to be public transport centred and be easiest to access by sustainable means of transport rather than being easiest to access by car	Add the following text to paragraph 5.20: For this approach to be most effective, sustainable transport measures should be introduced instead of, rather than alongside, new infrastructure to facilitate car travel. Also, sustainable transport measures should be 'built into' any proposed new developments. All development should be designed to be public transport centred and be easiest to access by sustainable means of transport rather than being easiest to access by car. Sustainable transport measures provide better pound for pound value than road schemes and developer's contributions should be sought for such schemes only.
5.21	778650	Mrs. Rebecca Smith		1388	Supporting	Two plots that immediately adjoin the Canterbury West Train Station behind platform 2 should be available to provide more space for car parking and taxi ranks to serve the station.	
5.21	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4433	Supporting	DIO supports the principles set out in the strategy approach in paragraph 5.20-5.22	
5.22	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		372	Supporting	In support. I believe that the requirement for locating development near to transport hubs would be better written as follows: "looking to locate development near existing transport hubs, particularly where this will encourage the use of sustainable transport"	Reword the requirement for locating development near to transport hubs as follows: "looking to locate development near existing transport hubs, particularly where this will encourage the use of sustainable transport"
5.22	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1013	Objecting	None of the five housing estates planned for Herne Bay is near a transport hub	Recognise that this plan will increase reliance on car travel as people travel from Herne Bay to scholl; to work; and to shop. reduce the development that is planned to surround Herne Bay and rethink plan to regenerate its centre - accepting that nothing is progressing on the current plans
5.22	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2830	Objecting	The draft suggests that there will be a hierarchical approach to the way that the use of sustainable transport will be facilitated by the planning process. The approach is flawed as it pre-supposes that there is a need to travel in the first place. The correct approach is to locate development in locations where the need and extent of travel is minimised. Reducing journey distance to the widest range of facilities opens up opportunities for people to consider a wider range of alternative modes.	Therefore, the correct hierarchy for the Preferred Draft would be: Remove the need to travel as far as possible, by seeking to minimise journey length; then, Ensure that where journeys have to be made they can be made conveniently by "soft" modes; then, Where development is appropriate for other reasons, require that measures to maximise walking, cycling and public transport use are provided as part of the development.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.22	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3640	Objecting	Paragraph 5.22 should be amended to make reference to non-motorised transport, multi-user non-motorised routes or to walkers, cyclists and equestrians, rather than just to walking and cycling.	Change the wording of paragraph 5.22 to make reference to non-motorised transport, multi-user non-motorised routes or to walkers, cyclists and equestrians, rather than just to walking and cycling.
5.22	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4434	Supporting	DIO supports the principles set out in the strategy approach in paragraph 5.20-5.22	
5.22	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5321	Supporting	We agree with the intention in para 5.22 but would add references to sustainable transport measures; new developments should be public transport centred; sustainable measures should be introduced instead of new infrastructure; developer contributions should be sought for sustainable measures only as provide better value.	In addition, we would add the following: c) That sustainable transport measures should be 'built into' any such development and that developer contributions be sought to pay for them. d) All such development should be designed to be public transport centred and be easiest to access by sustainable means of transport rather than being easiest to access by car. e) To limit and/or reduce traffic from any proposed new development, CAST strongly believes that sustainable measures should be introduced instead of , rather than alongside, new infrastructure to facilitate car travel. f) Sustainable measures provide better pound for pound value than road schemes and that developer's contributions should be sought for such schemes only
5.22	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6368	Objecting	..locate development near existing transport hubs'. What makes a 'transport hub'? Hersden and Herne hardly qualify.	
5.22	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6369	Objecting	Ensuring mixed-use developments where housing and employment are located in close proximity to encourage shorter commuting journeys'. This is not the case for either the Sturry/Broad Oak development. In both case there is a relatively small, unspecified allocation of land for unknown local business use. Compliant with NPPF 160? What is 'close proximity'? Meeting plan objectives? How many real jobs will be created by new businesses in the Parish of Sturry for some 1,000-2,000 more people?	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.22	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6554	Objecting	Add the following text to paragraph 5.22: - looking to locate development near existing transport hubs and on major public transport corridors - ensuring a relationship exists between higher housing density and lower car use and that development should therefore have as high a housing density as possible - providing residents of new developments with free bus travel for a year - making parking on new developments only at the edge of such developments for an annual fee	Add the following text to paragraph 5.22: looking to locate development near existing transport hubs and on major public transport corridors ensuring a relationship exists between higher housing density and lower car use and that development should therefore have as high a housing density as possible providing residents of new developments with free bus travel for a year making parking on new developments only at the edge of such developments for an annual fee, which is then put into a fund for sustainable transport measures ensuring car clubs are established to reduce the need for car ownership be on each new development and throughout the existing central and inner city providing robust support for car-sharing measures and promoting "kentjourneyshare" at each new development. ensuring the number of car parking spaces per unit is limited to less than one per household ensuring each new major development has a Travel Centre on-site.
5.23	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		373	Supporting	I completely agree with this.	
5.23	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3644	Objecting	Paragraph 5.23 should be amended to make reference to non-motorised transport, multi-user non-motorised routes or to walkers, cyclists and equestrians, rather than just to walking and cycling.	Change the wording of paragraph 5.23 to make reference to non-motorised transport, multi-user non-motorised routes or to walkers, cyclists and equestrians, rather than just to walking and cycling.
5.23	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5358	Objecting	We believe that a relationship exists between housing density and car use. Residential development should be concentrated, where densities of 100 dwellings/ha can be achieved, either within the city, or at traditional compact village densities in surrounding villages that can be served by good public transport; or development should have as high as housing density as possible. All new housing devts should be designed with a local centre with 800m. Local Centres reduce the need to travel.	
5.23	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6370	Objecting	For larger scale residential development, planning policies will promote a mix of uses with key facilities'. What consideration should also be made where development is within an existing community? What is 'large scale'? Surely 1,000 houses on one site, such as Sturry Broad Oak is not 'small scale or insignificant?	
Policy T1	766238	Mr Mike Sole		26	Objecting	What considerations have been given to the future traffic speeds in Canterbury? The local plan is an opportunity to introduce a city wide 20mph area reaching out well beyond the ring road. This should be considered.	Reduce traffic speeds in Canterbury

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T1	766790	M Hogben		91	Objecting	Now that it is proposed to build this huge number of new houses, surely we must seize the opportunity, TAKE THE BULL BY THE HORN and provide the long needed long term infrastructure in the form of a partial or perhaps a complete ring road around Canterbury to take the through traffic away from the main roads into the town and adjacent areas. This I would suggest is LOGIC	Partial or complete ring road around canterbury
Policy T1	766829	Mr Stuart Field		108	Objecting	Prior to ANY development in South Canterbury the road infrastructure needs to be looked at as a priority. A full 'entry/exit' needs to be provided at the north end of the A2 Canterbury junction.	
Policy T1	268778	Mrs Janet Hall		173	Objecting	The bus depot (Herne Bay) is a thorn in everyone's side. Could this not be moved to the old sorting office site. This would be ideal for town, the Thanet Way and bus stop for children attending the new grammar school if built on the old golf course.	
Policy T1	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		374	Supporting	I largely agree, but the emphasis should be on providing for the most sustainable modes of transport first.	Reword point f to: "Seeking the construction of new roads and/or junction improvement which will improve environmental and sustainable transport conditions and/or contribute towards the economic well-being of the District and which will not lead to an increase in private motor vehicle usage" Add the following point to the policy to merge in the hierarchy of transport modes from paragraph 5.24: "Actively encouraging sustainable means of transport and restricting the impact of private motor vehicle access by considering access in decreasing order of importance by following this hierarchy of transport modes: walking cycling public transport park and ride private car"
Policy T1	776051	Mr Rick Strange		867	Objecting	It is difficult to understand how the CCC, KCC can even contemplate the building of any new roads when it is painfully obvious that they cannot even look after the roads that already exist. Many of the roads around Canterbury are little more than connected pot holes in all too many places. CCC / KCC need to maintain the existing roads correctly and to a reasonable standard before they contemplate the building of even more roads that they will not be able to afford to maintain either.	
Policy T1	777570	Mr J K Rishworth		1062	Objecting	There are huge queues at busy times of day, and gridlock any time there is an incident anywhere in the city. The document lacks a definite plan for transport. It states that a District Transport Action Plan is expected to be adopted in 2013. We need to see a definite and credible plan to increase transport capacity within and around Canterbury, before major new development can be considered.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T1	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1156	Objecting	The making available of additional means of travel and related transport infrastructure for residents in the new housing proposed for South Canterbury is not mentioned as such in Policy T1. WPC would like to see an expansion of the transport strategy in Policy T1 to ensure that journey times into Canterbury are not increased by an influx of additional vehicles from large numbers of new residences without a corresponding expansion in the transport infrastructure available to the new residents	
Policy T1	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1224	Supporting	We support the principles which should be taken into account when considering the location of new development. We consider it very important that they should be adhered to, and we believe that they are completely incompatible with proposal SP3a for a major new development of 4000 new dwellings in South Canterbury, which would inevitably increase the harmful impact of vehicular traffic	
Policy T1	778387	Mr David Smith		1336	Supporting	hope that the City Council will take account of Lynn Sloman's "Sustainable Transport Blueprint for Canterbury" commissioned by The Canterbury Society when developing the Transport Strategy.	
Policy T1	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1785	Objecting	Add encourage use of roads already improved such as the A299 (built through Open Countryside), to keep reduce traffic on the A2990. See 5.11 comment.	Add encourage use of roads already improved such as the A299 (built through Open Countryside), to keep reduce traffic on the A2990 by restricting development that would increase traffic to previous levels.Â
Policy T1	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1933	Supporting	Support the principles of the draft Transport Strategy to be taken into account when considering the location of new development. However, it is thought that they are incompatible with the proposal for South Canterbury, which would inevitably increase the harmful impact of vehicular traffic, in particular air quality; as well as increase cross-town traffic movements.	
Policy T1	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		2052	Objecting	The policy needs to recognise explicitly the problem of traffic noise, which is more damaging to health than is generally appreciated.	After "including air quality" add "and noise"
Policy T1	778486	Prof & Mrs Osman & Lorna Durrani		2132	Objecting	Build a ring road around Canterbury so not all traffic has to go through Canterbury.	Build a ring road around Canterbury
Policy T1	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2207	Supporting	We support the principles which should be taken into account when considering the location of new development. We consider it very important that they should be adhered to, and we believe that they are completely incompatible with proposal SP3a.	
Policy T1	778770	S Thorne		2226	Objecting	The Local Plan takes no account of the increase in road traffic that will occur as a result of the number of new houses (8,400) proposed. The Council should give consideration to new road schemes such as a proper ring road for Canterbury.	The Council should give consideration to new road schemes such as a proper ring road for Canterbury.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T1	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2352	Objecting	It is our firm belief that the principles underpinning Dr. Sloman's Sustainable Transport Blueprint for Canterbury should also guide the transport, housing and infrastructure plans for all of the district. Without significant changes to the proposals in the draft local plan, car use and pollution will increase, health levels worsen and climate change will be exacerbated rather than mitigated. The draft plan as it now stands is not fit for purpose, not sustainable and it therefore cannot be sound.	We ask that the transport section along with the proposed developments be amended and or removed in order to achieve the necessary shift to sustainable transport modes that is an integral part of sustainable development.
Policy T1	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		2360	Objecting	Policy T1(b)- I think it is important to remember that walking and cycling are not necessarily viable options for those who are disabled or in their retirement years. Given the expected increase in older people especially in Herne Bay and Whitstable (Paras 2.4 & 2.12) this will become an even bigger issue over the plan period.	
Policy T1	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2366	Objecting	The Canterbury Parking Strategy is outdated and should not be used to form the basis of the local plan. It is about management and flexible growth of parking supply rather than reduction of parking. It should not form the basis of the emerging Local Plan because it will not lead to a reduction in car use nor assist in the change to sustainable travel modes.	
Policy T1	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2384	Objecting	Get Britain Cycling Report 2013. We would like to see these recommendations included in the draft Local Plan:	local authorities should seek to deliver cycle-friendly improvements across their existing roads, including small improvements, segregated routes and road reallocation
Policy T1	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2388	Objecting	NICE Public Health Guidance 41 on Walking and Cycling needs to underpin the Local Plan. It aims to set out how people can be encouraged to increase the amount they walk or cycle for travel or recreation. This will help meet public health and other goals. Relevant recommendations include: ensure walking and cycling are included in relevant plans and policies - pedestrians and cyclists should be considered before other user groups; improve walking and cycling infrastructure and informatin.	The draft local plan needs to be redrafted in line with NICE Public Health Guidance 81. This will improve the health and well being of every resident and save substantial sums of money to the NHS and the local authority.
Policy T1	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2437	Objecting	Spokes would like the following principles from the Draft Transport Strategy to be rewritten along the following lines.	a) Reducing (remove the word controlling) the level and environmental impact of vehicular traffic including air quality. Reason: The legal duty is to work towards meeting air quality limits which requires reduction of existing levels rather than controlling current levels. To get a reduction one must reduce car use and this will help to actually prioritise walking and cycling measures over car biased infrastructure. In effect and contrary to paragraph 5.24, the private car, new roads, park and rides and car infrastructure reliant development locations are given far greater weight in the draft local plan and this must be changed.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T1	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2438	Objecting	Spokes would like the following principles from the Draft Transport Strategy to be rewritten along the following lines.	Reducing cross-town traffic movements in the historic town of Canterbury by increasing the provision of walking and cycling infrastructure and by the reduction of car parking spaces. Reason: To prioritise walking and cycling over and above car use.
Policy T1	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2440	Objecting	Spokes would like the following principles from the Draft Transport Strategy to be rewritten along the following lines.	d) needs to be removed. Reason d) as stated above is an outdated approach and will not decrease car use. A new parking strategy is required.
Policy T1	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2441	Objecting	Spokes would like the following principles from the Draft Transport Strategy to be rewritten along the following lines.	Â f) needs to be removed. f) is also outdated and will merely generate greater car use.
Policy T1	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2873	Objecting	Road infrastructure is fundamental to the spatial strategy, they commissioned independent planning advice which highlights potential costs in excess of Â£100M. I also highlights infrastructure linkages between sites and the key role of Sturry crossing. The lack of an implementation plan or strategy means it is impossible to see how it will be developed. The strategy should not be driven by infrastructure against NPPF. Development should be located sustainably.	
Policy T1	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3079	Objecting	Canterbury has significant traffic problems. CCC is not in a position to do much about transport infrastructure as it has to work with KCC and HA to achieve any major changes. Many plans have been devised, and efforts made, to improve traffic flow through the City but no solutions have yet been found. To proceed without improved transport infrastructure in place does not make economic sense as it may be difficult to attract new employers when transport delays cost money.	
Policy T1	414960	Cllr Alex Perkins	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3183	Objecting	The plan avoids discussion of possible potential rail, tram and public transport solutions - in favour of cramming more motor cars onto already congested roads.	
Policy T1	408268	Ms Beatrice Shire		3248	Objecting	I do not think the Council has addressed the issues relating to the thousands of workers wishing to enter Canterbury every day.	Subsidising buses would be much cheaper than building more infrastructure for the private car.
Policy T1	13837	Mr William Leetham		3282	Supporting	Bus use, cycling and walking to be encouraged as the prime means of getting around.	
Policy T1	13837	Mr William Leetham		3283	Objecting	More pedestrianisation in the City Centre.	More pedestrianisation in the City Centre.
Policy T1	780488	Mr Philip Norwell	Managing Director Stagecoach South East	3359	Supporting	Stagecoach is integral to the daily lives of thousands of local people and visitors. In Canterbury we were inaugural members of the Quality Bus Partnership, having a firm belief that the company has its strength in providing attractive, quality local bus services that can only be successful where there is a commitment by the local council to providing the infrastructure. We look forward to being party to a carefully considered approach to development.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T1	13751	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Lower Hardres Parish Council	3376	Objecting	By the time a bus reaches Lower Hardres, there is no room or standing room only, hence encouraging further vehicles on the road undertaking school runs etc. At present, travelling by car is equally problematic with the roads unable to cope during peak times. With a forecast increase of some 4000 cars, hundreds of which will access Nackington Road from the new development, the result will be gridlock	
Policy T1	780207	Pru Cherry	The Whitstable Road Residents Association	3407	Objecting	Disappointed that the issue of weight restrictions on roads in the city is not mentioned. HGVs cause disproportionate levels of congestion and pollution. The weight restrictions are about to be lifted from Whitstable Rd. This is incompatible with the Air quality Management area and objective outlines in 5.26.	
Policy T1	13751	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Lower Hardres Parish Council	3421	Objecting	We welcome the proposal for new cycle ways, but sadly these have been restricted to the development sites. No consideration has been given to extending them to the outlying villages. There are many residents in Lower Hardres who would welcome a cycleway to the City and as a Parish Council we have been looking into how this can be achieved. This should be included in the local plan.	There are many residents in Lower Hardres who would welcome a cycleway to the City and as a Parish Council we have been looking into how this can be achieved. This should be included in the local plan.
Policy T1	780651	Mr Kevin Bown	Asset Manager Area 4 (Kent) Highways Agency	3536	Supporting	We note that a District Transport Strategy is currently being prepared. The HA is supportive of the principles of this document which seek to promote sustainable modes of transport, achieving reliable vehicle journey times and supporting sustainable development.	
Policy T1	780651	Mr Kevin Bown	Asset Manager Area 4 (Kent) Highways Agency	3538	Objecting	The HA is supportive of the principles of the Draft Transport Strategy which are consistent with the NPPF. However, we would recommend an additional point which seeks to ensure that development can effectively mitigate its impact on the local and strategic road networks.	We would recommend an additional point which seeks to ensure that development can effectively mitigate its impact on the local and strategic road networks.
Policy T1	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3576	Objecting	I agree that we should all promote alternatives to the car, i.e: public transport, walking and cycling but this is not appropriate for all. There is no footway/pavement for much of the A291 especially in the area near the Wildwood/Wealden Forest Park industrial estate.	
Policy T1	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3639	Objecting	Policy T1 should be amended to read "providing alternative modes of transport to the motor vehicle by extending provision for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians and the use of public transport".	Change the wording of Policy T1 to read "providing alternative modes of transport to the motor vehicle by extending provision for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians and the use of public transport".
Policy T1	780518	Mr Ken Fox & Family		3803	Supporting	Support Policy T1	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3960	Objecting	generally support this Policy, but: The hierarchy in 5.24 should be in the Policy (Park and ride should be excluded); Reword a) to read: "Preventing development that will increase air pollution and improving the air quality so that dangers to public health are lessened." Alter f) add: "Accepting that new roads and/or junction improvements may bring environmental problems, including traffic congestion and air pollution, and that the environment should take precedence over further economic growth.	The hierarchy set down in para 5.24 should be included in the Policy (though Park and ride should be excluded); Reword a) to read: "Preventing development that will increase air pollution and improving the air quality so that dangers to public health are lessened." Alter f) add: "Accepting that new roads and/or junction improvements may bring environmental problems, including traffic congestion and air pollution, and that the environment should take precedence over further economic growth."
Policy T1	780975	Mr Frederic Stansfield		4226	Objecting	Plans should be developed for a rail/tram scheme in the Canterbury area. This should include a route from Canterbury to Whitstable via the University of Kent main site. The scheme for a tram route from Whitstable via Herne Bay and Sturry to Canterbury, first suggested over a hundred years ago, should be resurrected. Trams from both routes could join the railway before Canterbury West and proceed, using a new junction to Canterbury East, and if feasible onwards to Dover using the local service.	
Policy T1	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4251	Objecting	The objection to this policy is that it fails to include the assessment of transport infrastructure requirements and their deliverability. The policy is further evidence of a flawed approach which seeks to make allocations on a deficient evidence base and then produce an infrastructure implementation plan as an afterthought. The policy needs to be reworded to ensure that key development sites are only included in the emerging plan if the necessary infrastructure is deliverable.	
Policy T1	780986	Mr Peter Taylor-Gooby		4294	Supporting	I congratulate the council on bringing cycling, walking and other environmentally-desirable transport options into consideration. It is important to recognise that cycling safety is deteriorating in the district due to the increasing numbers of other road users and the congested road network.	
Policy T1	780965	Mrs D Jeffers		4332	Objecting	I also understand that Canterbury City Council has recommended these sites without having received the results of their transport modelling. Without these results, how can the significant impact of a development of this size be determined by the Council in an informed way and be assessed in terms of its sustainability. Has the issue of the junction capacity of Brenley Corner A2/Thanet Way been assessed correctly?	
Policy T1	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4371	Objecting	In the Canterbury area, traffic is bound to increase from the population living in 15,000 new houses. School runs will be a nightmare as residents try to cross the city. It is vital that ALL transport infrastructure is in place before house building starts, otherwise congestion will only increase.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T1	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4375	Objecting	Any new road building should be part of a co-ordinated road strategy that moves traffic around and away from the City centre. There is not much evidence of this being a central part of the local plan. However, given the strife caused by the Westgate Towers scheme, public confidence in CCC's ability to manage traffic flow is understandably low.	
Policy T1	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4435	Objecting	DIO supports this policy in principle but the link road as shown on the Proposals Map could prejudice the implementation of enhanced public transport provision at the redeveloped Barracks, which does not encourage the modal shift the Council seeks by this policy.	
Policy T1	781348	Mr David Greenway		4538	Objecting	Adding the number of homes proposed to the city will generate sufficient traffic to create frequent logjams of vehicles which are frequent CURRENTLY. So much fossilised fuel is wasted now further homes, especially on the scale you propose, would add to that considerably. In addition the pollution associated with this situation has to be seriously considered.	
Policy T1	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4558	Supporting	Support the principles which should be taken into account when considering the location of new development. I consider it very important that they should be adhered to, and I believe that they are completely incompatible with proposal SP3a for a major new development of 4000 new dwellings in South Canterbury, which would inevitably increase the harmful impact of vehicular traffic, including the impact on air quality, and would increase cross-town traffic movements in the centre of Canterbury.	
Policy T1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4630	Supporting	We support the recommendations of the transport chapter with its emphasis on cycling and public transport, and a reduction in the impact of cars.	
Policy T1	781435	Ms Margaret Young		4692	Objecting	The Local Plan avoids any discussion of rail, bus, tram or any other public transport solutions and seems to be weighted in favour of yet more cars on already congested roads.	
Policy T1	781435	Ms Margaret Young		4693	Objecting	The Plan does not offer any sustained employment opportunities in the area, other than the jobs created by the construction of an additional 4000 dwellings. New houses do not equal new jobs.	
Policy T1	781438	SJ Tarrant		4701	Objecting	I object most strongly to the above scheme. The area is not suitable for the vast amount of cars that will be using it, nor the local roads. Harbledown is a peaceful Conservation Area. There is too much at stake for a short term benefit. Please don't destroy our historical part of Canterbury	
Policy T1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4707	Supporting	Almost every proposal and policy in the Local Plan depends on transport provision to determine its success. We very much welcome much of the substance of this transport section.	
Policy T1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4717	Objecting	There is an almost complete lack of any Council led, reliable and up-to-date documentation on transport although, throughout the chapter there are hints that a Transport Strategy is in progress but is not yet available. Given that transport is probably the single most important topic underlying the whole of the Local Plan we consider that this situation is far from satisfactory.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T1	780837	Mrs Margaret Darby		4743	Objecting	The Transport section (5.11)has a wish list for 2016 Even if these aims were to be met 4000 new homes (5,200+ cars) can only make matters worse. Policy T1 refers to reducing cross town movement. How is this to happen without an extensive road building programme? An improved A2 junction does not help south Canterbury residents access the Whitstable and Sturry roads or Canterbury West Station.	
Policy T1	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4862	Objecting	The NPPF states a need to re-balance our transport demands to be more sustainable and encourages local authorities to be proactive. The Draft Local Plan fails to create an integrated approach to transport in the District. A detailed vision for transportation is long overdue and a "Transport Plan" should be presented as a way of strategically delivering the aspirations set out in Chapter 5.	
Policy T1	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5046	Supporting	Support policy because it is sound and Herne Bay Golf Club Development accords with it due to transport links.	
Policy T1	13812	Mr N J Blake		5184	Objecting	All the quasi-scientific calculations will not disguise the reality that the number of houses proposed, can only be arbitrary . It must be constrained by what communities can accept and what can be built without unacceptable damage to the environment. The DLP, without setting out to do so, has demonstrated that its aims about future traffic levels are totally incompatible with the construction of 15,600 new homes, even with the road improvements that may be made.	
Policy T1	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5232	Supporting	I agree with the promotion of sustainable forms of transport as outlined in this chapter. Greater use of cycling, car sharing, and public transport is critical to challenging levels of congestion and pollution across the District.	
Policy T1	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5320	Objecting	We are particularly concerned that the policy T1 is incompatible with paras 5.15 5.20 POLICY T1: f) Seeking the construction of new roads and/or junction improvements which will improve environmental conditions and/or contribute towards the economic well-being of the District There is very little evidence that new roads have improved environmental conditions or helped the economic wellbeing of an area -the evidence seems to show that the reverse is truer. It should be deleted.	
Policy T1	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5565	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'On Traffic'. This includes a commitment to reducing cross town traffic movement in the historic centre.	
Policy T1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5588	Objecting	Will other choke-points in the city road network, including along New Dover Road, be relieved? No! The New Dover Road ones will be made far worse by the proposed South Canterbury development site.	
Policy T1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5632	Objecting	Whitstable Traffic circulation, parking and congestion issues need to be addressed.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5678	Supporting	Positive but requiring more study and more definite proposals could be brought forward:â€ Recognition that 'the highway network is under acute pressure' and that there is a need to shift to more efficient ways of travelling. As an aspiration T1 is commendable (but infringed elsewhere in the DLP by policies and proposals put forward).	
Policy T1	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	6007	Supporting	We support the principles which should be taken into account when considering the location of new development. We consider it very important that they should be adhered to, and we believe that they are completely incompatible with proposal SP3a for a major new development of 4000 new dwellings in South Canterbury.	
Policy T1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6371	Objecting	Fine in principle, but why not refer to SP5?	
Policy T1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6373	Objecting	' Principle of the Draft Transport Strategy'. Where is the Draft Transport Strategy? Is it mentioned elsewhere? Is this on page 13? If so, it is not cross referenced. There has not been a sub-heading as such in this chapter in the lead up to this policy. All very confusing.	
Policy T1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6374	Objecting	Policy T1 f) Why not say 'support the aims of the Government's White Paper - Creating Growth Cutting Carbon - Making Sustainable Local Transport Happen'? Surely this Plan is also looking for "a transport system that is an engine for economic growth, but one that is also greener and safer and improves quality of life in our communities". Whether it has deliverable answers is another matter.	
Policy T1	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6441	Supporting	Support all 6 points of policy as good planning practice across the District. which is why we oppose S Canterbury development as would be inconsistent with points a) on care for the environment and air quality b) little actual evidence in Plan of provision of alternative modes of transport The "good cycle network" does not extend to South Canterbury c) reducing cross-town traffic in the historic city. New junction will increase pressure on road network expense mean less community facilities.	
Policy T1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6556	Objecting	The construction of new roads and/or junction improvements rarely, if ever, improves environmental conditions. The sustainable transport measures in paragraph 5.20 and implied in the hierarchy of transport modes would be much more likely to yield improvement in environmental conditions.	
5.24	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		87	Supporting	I hope that this hierarchy is not only "in order" but "in order of importance", with walking being the number one important, etc.	
5.24	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		375	Supporting	I fully support this hierarchy of transport modes which is now widely recognised as best practice and supported by national policy. It should be integrated into policy T1 to stress its fundamental importance.	Integrate into policy T1 as per my comments on that policy.
5.24	665473	Dr Richard Norman		557	Supporting	I support the prioritising of transport modes in this sequence.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.24	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1014	Objecting	The housing estates planned for Herne Bay are all some distance out of town. Most are the other side of the A299 or a busy road from the centre of town. It is obvious that people will not walk from here into the centre of town.	reduce the development planned for the outskirts of Herne Bay. Develop a realistic public transport strategy.
5.24	779149	Wortham		1664	Objecting	There is an incomplete view of transport needs and modes of transport available. (1) Older and less physically able people's needs should be considered on an equal basis to able people. (2) Rail transport should be considered. (3) Access needs to be considered and improved to railway stations, e.g. Canterbury West from south of city which plan as currently put forward will be more problematic.	As stated above - inclusion of variety of public transport including rail. Consideration of transport needs of less able and disabled. Plan to improve access by public transport and road to stations including Canterbury West for residential areas using these stations.
5.24	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3084	Supporting	We welcome the hierarchy of transport and the focus of sustainable modes of transport.	
5.24	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3645	Objecting	Paragraph 5.24 should be amended to make reference to non-motorised transport, multi-user non-motorised routes or to walkers, cyclists and equestrians, rather than just to walking and cycling.	Change the wording of paragraph 5.24 to make reference to non-motorised transport, multi-user non-motorised routes or to walkers, cyclists and equestrians, rather than just to walking and cycling.
5.24	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3702	Objecting	In the hierarchy of transport modes (5.24) public transport should be subdivided into bus and rail, with rail given priority. This appears to be reversed in Table 1 (5.25).	
5.24	780975	Mr Frederic Stansfield		4222	Objecting	In relation to Chapter 5, Transport Infrastructure, the plan is deficient because it overlooks rail and trams as transport modes. In particular, as recent investigations of transport problems in the St. Dunstan's area have shown, bus travel to the University of Kent campus, whilst currently essential, places heavy demands on road capacity.	
5.24	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6557	Supporting	Strongly agree with this transport hierarchy.	
5.25	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		376	Supporting	I welcome that sustainable journey times will be used as one of the measures of the success of the District Transport Strategy. This needs to be conducted to a level which could support statistically significant results. Clarity is needed as to how the impact on journey times of pedestrians and cyclists will actually be measured given that it is difficult to uniquely identify these people at different points in their journeys.	Assurance that measures of all sustainable transport journey times will be conducted to a level which could support statistically significant results. Clarity is needed as to how the impact on journey times of pedestrians and cyclists will actually be measured given that it is difficult to uniquely identify these people at different points in their journeys.
5.25	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		652	Objecting	It is complete nonsense to measure access by comparing: 1. average journey times to key destinations by sustainable forms of transport 2. journey time reliability for the private car/van This is comparing apples with oranges and saying one is better. The only reason for making this comparison is that to make the fair comparison, e.g. cost of each or time of each would show that public transport is often unable to provide a reasonable alternative.	change text to "access to be measured by a combination of travel time, cost and suitability for the goods to be transported (e.g. the weekly shopping).

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.25	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1803	Objecting	There is nothing in either Table 1 or Table 2 that supports the aim of multi user use and quality of the travel experience as advocated in the Rural Streets and Lanes; a Design handbook which is adopted by Kent County Council. If CCC is serious about promoting walking and cycling and the reduction in car usage techniques and design for safe multi user/shared use must be addressed.	Add to Table 1 More safe multi user routes between residential areas, commuter hubs and places of employment will be provided. Amend Policy T2 to reflect.
5.25	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2386	Objecting	Get Britain Cycling Report 2013. We would like to see these recommendations included in the draft Local Plan:	promote cycling as a safe and normal activity for people of all ages and backgrounds
5.25	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3646	Objecting	Table 1 in paragraph 5.25 should be amended to make reference to non-motorised transport, multi-user non-motorised routes or to walkers, cyclists and equestrians, rather than just to walking and cycling.	Change the wording of Table 1 in paragraph 5.25 to make reference to non-motorised transport, multi-user non-motorised routes or to walkers, cyclists and equestrians, rather than just to walking and cycling.
5.25	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4712	Objecting	This states that Table 1 shows seven strands into which the Draft Transport Strategy is broken. Table 1 shows only four strands. However, we guess that the 7 strands might comprise of Tables 1 and 2 together, though the headings are not the same in each. And in Tables 1 and 2, it is not clear how the "Headline Aim" column relates to the other three columns. This should be clarified	This states that Table 1 shows seven strands into which the Draft Transport Strategy is broken. Table 1 shows only four strands. However, we guess that the 7 strands might comprise of Tables 1 and 2 together, though the headings are not the same in each. And in Tables 1 and 2, it is not clear how the "Headline Aim" column relates to the other three columns. This should be clarified
5.25	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5236	Supporting	It is encouraging to see 20mph zones included in this section, which I believe should be considered in all residential streets throughout the District.	
5.25	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5369	Objecting	Travel centre: Each new major development should have a Travel Centre on-site to provide information about all the above.	
5.25	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6375	Objecting	Layout in table format confusing and unnecessary	
5.25	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6376	Objecting	Table 1 Headline 1. Average journey times to key destinations by sustainable forms of transport This could be very revealing IF the results of such an exercise were already available FOR EACH DEVELOPMENT SITE. The duration times should also reveal the complexity of journey and costings at different times of the day.	
5.25	476233	Mrs Catherine Cantwell		6721	Supporting	The idea of building new housing to fund unnecessary new roads, to the detriment of our environment, makes no sense. New road developments run counter to the policy to reduce travel demands and should be abandoned. Council should follow the strategy to focus on controlling and reducing road traffic. It has been found that the building of new roads increases traffic. Plans for new roads and link road should be abandoned.	
5.26	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		377	Objecting	The "Access for All", "Air Quality & Freight", and "Road Safety" strands of the District Transport Strategy must be considered essential to the strategy's successful delivery.	The "Access for All", "Air Quality & Freight", and "Road Safety" strands of the District Transport Strategy must be considered essential to the strategy's successful delivery.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.26	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2385	Objecting	Get Britain Cycling Report 2013. We would like to see these recommendations included in the draft Local Plan:	extend 20mph speed limits in towns, and consider 40mph limits on many rural lanes
5.26	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2387	Objecting	Get Britain Cycling Report 2013. We would like to see these recommendations included in the draft Local Plan:	local government should appoint a lead politician responsible for cycling.
5.26	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3647	Objecting	Table 2 (Road Safety) in paragraph 5.26 shows a lack of imagination in that it fails to mention the contribution which public rights of way for all non-motorised transport can make.	
5.26	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3962	Objecting	Air quality and freight aims should be separated. Air Quality should be expanded, and freight aims reworked. Separate out air quality issues/modes. Under road safety include safety perceptions, reducing clutter and advertising.	Also the Aims should be: Air Quality: ' Reduce emissions and, where possible, reverse the adverse effect of transport' Freight: ' Enable the sustainable movement of goods with minimal adverse impacts '. The Transport Modes/issues should be amended to: For Air Quality: 'Local air quality management Air quality action plan' For Road Safety, 'Safety perceptions (e.g. for NMUs), Reduce Clutter, and advertising on roundabouts ' should be added to the Modes/issues.
5.26	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6377	Objecting	Layout in table format confusing and unnecessary	
5.26	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6378	Objecting	Table 2 Headline 1. Average journey times to key destinations by sustainable forms of transport This could be very revealing IF the results of such an exercise were already available FOR EACH DEVELOPMENT SITE. The duration times should also reveal the complexity of journey and costings at different times of the day.	
5.27	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		378	Supporting	I fully support this priority in favour of sustainable transport.	
5.27	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		653	Objecting	I object to this being stated as a policy when there is no sign that it has been a consideration in the proposal for a major housing development in South Canterbury. The only reference to transport being the suggesting that there will be a "high speed bus service" presumably along one of the most congested roads in the city.	Either this objective needs to be deleted, or the proposed housing development in South Canterbury abandoned or a significant upgrade to the road infrastructure included in the plan.
5.27	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2355	Objecting	Dr. Sloman made it clear that in order for the Blueprint to succeed, the Blueprint (and only the Blueprint measures) would need to be fully implemented (not cherry picked and added on to car reliant infrastructure and development proposals) for 5 years in order to allow the changes of travel behaviour to bed in.	We ask that the transport section along with the proposed developments be amended and or removed in order to achieve the necessary shift to sustainable transport modes that is an integral part of sustainable development.
5.27	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5409	Objecting	Developer contributions should be sought for for the following measures: pedestrian and cycle paths; all measures listed in A Sustainable Blueprint for Canterbury; Reallocation of road space Rheims Way; promotion of workplace and residential travel plans; payment of a bond/cash deposit returnable in instalments as targets for car mode share are met; workplace parking levies; peg city car parking charges to bus fares; consideration of congestion charging & low emissions zones.	
5.28	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3653	Objecting	The section titled "Walking and Cycling" should be amended to "Non-motorised Transport"	The section titled "Walking and Cycling" should be amended to "Non-motorised Transport"

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.28	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6051	Supporting	Supporting	
5.28	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6379	Objecting	... walking and cycling ...Bear in mind that this Plan emphasises that our population is aging, and that is one of the main reasons for the scale of the proposed development. So, whilst cycling and walking are activities good for health the practicalities of these, even for short journeys, will exclude them as options for many people.	
5.28	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6526	Objecting	Addition to the Plan: A healthy, functioning sustainable transport system. A transport system which prioritises walking, cycling and public transport above car use and seeks developer contributions for measures to promote these instead of those that would encourage travel by car.	Addition to the Plan: A healthy, functioning sustainable transport system. A transport system which prioritises walking, cycling and public transport above car use and seeks developer contributions for measures to promote these instead of those that would encourage travel by car. Research commissioned by London Councils in November 2012 into the impact of parking and parking charges on town centres and whether there is a link between free or cheap parking and the amount of commercial activity found that ". . . the number of people arriving at a town centre by car is frequently overestimated. Although car drivers spend more on a single trip to a town centre, walkers, cyclists and people using public transport visit more frequently and spend more money there over a week or a month than motorists do". This evidence has been supported by research from the USA and elsewhere: "The indications . . . are that a strategy of reducing dependence on cars and making it easy, attractive and affordable for people to travel by sustainable modes has been a key factor in the prosperity and vibrant city life of British cities such as York and Cambridge, as well as continental cities such as Utrecht, Copenhagen, Delft, Freiburg, Strasbourg, Winterthur and others.
5.29	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	714	Supporting	St Stephens RA support the statement that 'Pedestrian priority measures in residential streets will be sought and vehicle speeds must be kept low' as they believe that there are many inner city roads such as The Friars and Duck Lane that could either be pedestrianized or make use of shared space schemes. It is hoped that the redesign of Canterbury West station by the rail operator will provide safe access to the station for pedestrians, including a new entrance to the NW from Roper Road	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.29	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2837	Objecting	Reference is made (5.29) to the Kent Design Guide and the potential to provide new bridge or tunnel connections for walking and cycling routes. This approach is not generally supported by the Manual for Streets 2, which notes that subways in particular, but footbridges too, are generally disliked by users, and have personal security issues. They are often ignored, and require guard railing to enforce their use. This is generally considered poor planning and sub-optimal urban design.	The Local Plan would be expected to be based on the most up to date thinking, and current best practice in order to be considered sound.
5.29	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3703	Objecting	In Encouraging Sustainable Travel a study should be undertaken into the feasibility of radically pedestrianising the whole of the ancient walled City, except for access and early morning servicing. (Munster in Germany is a good example). More heed should be paid to Canterbury's membership of the Walled Towns Friendship Circle.	
5.29	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3976	Objecting	The major issue for many people, particularly in rural areas, is the lack of a safe footway between a house and the nearest services such as bus stops and shops. This major omission should be recognised and a target put in the Plan.	
5.29	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5368	Supporting	Walking and cycling greenways, pedestrian friendly street-design, and 'filtered permeability' should be 'built-in' features of each new development. Pedestrians should be given priority in allocation of roadspace or for crossing all roads with the minimum of delay even if cars have to queue.	
5.29	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6380	Objecting	'...tunnel...' Can be a deterrent for many people, particularly the vulnerable. Perceived as areas of anti-social behaviour and places to be avoided.	
5.29	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6559	Objecting	Add the following text to paragraph 5.29 after ". . . new developments will need to take into account the requirements of pedestrians in terms of design, layout and permeability . . .": This entails walking and cycling greenways, pedestrian-friendly street design, and 'filtered permeability' as 'built-in' features of each new development. and Special consideration should be given to the safe separation of pedestrians and cyclists in all new shared use proposals.	Add the following text to paragraph 5.29 after ". . . new developments will need to take into account the requirements of pedestrians in terms of design, layout and permeability . . .": This entails walking and cycling greenways, pedestrian-friendly street design, and 'filtered permeability' as 'built-in' features of each new development. and Special consideration should be given to the safe separation of pedestrians and cyclists in all new shared use proposals.
5.29	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6566	Objecting	Amend the following text in paragraph 5.29 "Pedestrian priority measures in residential streets will be sought and vehicle speeds must be kept low." to read: Pedestrian priority measures in residential streets will be sought, pedestrians be given priority for crossing all roads with the minimum of delay, and vehicle speeds in residential streets, throughout the city and near all schools and children's play areas will be limited to 20mph.	Amend the following text in paragraph 5.29 "Pedestrian priority measures in residential streets will be sought and vehicle speeds must be kept low." to read: Pedestrian priority measures in residential streets will be sought, pedestrians be given priority for crossing all roads with the minimum of delay, and vehicle speeds in residential streets, throughout the city and near all schools and children's play areas will be limited to 20mph.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.30	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		379	Supporting	Cycle route connectivity is also important for the provision of a contiguous cycle network. Speed limit reductions must also be considered at existing sites and not be restricted to just residential developments.	Cycle route connectivity must also be a consideration in order to deliver a contiguous cycle network. Speed limit reductions must also be considered at existing sites and not be restricted to just residential developments.
5.30	665473	Dr Richard Norman		560	Supporting	I agree with these reasons for promoting cycling in Canterbury. The existing cycle network is not yet good enough, as cycle routes in the centre of the city are discontinuous, petering out and coming to abrupt ends. Better dedicated cycle routes in the city are needed.	
5.30	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1225	Supporting	We agree with the commitment to provide more and improved traffic-free cycle routes. We question the claim that 'Canterbury already has a good cycle network'. From the area covered by our Residents Association, for instance, there is now a good cycle route from Beaconsfield Road to North Lane, but it then stops. From then on there is no safe and convenient cycle route across the city.	
5.30	778387	Mr David Smith		1337	Supporting	I support this Policy but as my main means of transport in and around Canterbury is by bicycle, I do not agree that "Canterbury already has a good cycle network". It has a poor supply of cycle routes and definitely not a "network".	
5.30	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1934	Supporting	Support the commitment to provide more and improved traffic-free cycle routes. However, question the claim that 'Canterbury already has a good cycle network' as the area covered by our Residents Association, has no cycle paths. There is also concern about recent reports on the sale of land at the rear of the Wincheap Estate that would shut the current cycle path to Chartam and damage the Stour Valley route.	
5.30	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2381	Objecting	Get Britain Cycling Report 2013. We would like to see these recommendations included in the draft Local Plan:	Local government (should) allocate funds to cycling of at least the local proportion of journeys done by bike.
5.30	780327	Mr Robin Townsend	Secretary to the Trust The Crab & Winkle Line Trust	3262	Objecting	The Local Plan needs updating to take account of the progress made by the Trust in acquiring this vital land for community access to provide sustainable transport (walking and cycling). When the Plan is revised it will better reflect the laudable aims enshrined in the aims of NPPF, KCC and CCC,, to reduce car movements, improved air quality, address climate change and improve environmental, and physical/mental health.	
5.30	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4559	Supporting	I agree with the commitment to provide more and improved traffic-free cycle routes. Cycling in Canterbury remains hazardous and haphazard. The present patchy network needs to be improved and developed into a coordinated and comprehensive network of cross-city cycle routes.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.30	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5363	Objecting	Cycle: a) Segregated cycle routes should be created on all major routes into the city. b) Cycle lanes should be created from each new devts and be linked to the existing cycle lane network, the city centre, major sites of employment in the city and public transport hubs. c) There should be cycle parking/storage for all households. d) There should be 20mph speed limits and 'home zones' on all new major developments, throughout the central and inner city, and near schools and children's play areas	
5.30	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6381	Objecting	'..identified as part of the strategic site allocations'. NOT shown on the indicative map for Site 2 - Sturry/Broad Oak	
5.30	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6570	Objecting	Amend the following text in paragraph 5.29 "Canterbury already has a good cycle network and more routes may be identified in the emerging Transport Strategy, these are necessary to make cycling a sustainable alternative to the car." to read Canterbury has the potential for a really good cycle network and, in addition to those new routes outlined in the Local Plan, the following routes/measures will be identified in the emerging Transport Strategy as essential factors in making cycling a sustainable alternative to the car: a) a segregated cycle route on New Dover Road running from the roundabout at the existing Park and Ride directly into the city. New Dover Road is comfortably wide enough to accommodate such a measure. b) a cycle route from the proposed new development in Sturry to link to the existing 'riverside' route to provide a direct, off-road cycle route directly into the centre of Canterbury. c) cycle lanes to link the proposed new development in Hersden to the cycle lanes proposed above for Sturry. d) a cycle lane on the A28 (at times a shared bus/cycle lane) all the way from the Sturry direction to the Military/Tourtel Road roundabout. e) a cycle lane along the Whitstable Road entrance to the city. f) direct, easy cycle and pedestrian access from Thanington Without to the Great Stour Way cycle route. g) cycle priority measures to enable cyclists from the south part of Wincheap to easily and safely cross the A28 and then be able to access the Horses and Goats underpass route into the city centre. h) investigation of the use of Broad Oak Road for cycle/bus lanes after completion of the 'riverside' route detailed above. i) All cycle paths/lanes/tracks proposed in the Walking and Cycling Strategy not included above to be completed.
5.30	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6576	Objecting	Amend the following text in paragraph 5.30 "All new development will look to provide traffic free segregated cycle routes with residential streets that are safe for cycling through low vehicle speeds." to read All new development will provide traffic-free segregated cycle routes and 'home zones' with residential streets that are safe for cycling through low vehicle speeds of a maximum of 20mph.	Amend the following text in paragraph 5.30 "All new development will look to provide traffic free segregated cycle routes with residential streets that are safe for cycling through low vehicle speeds." to read All new development will provide traffic-free segregated cycle routes and 'home zones' with residential streets that are safe for cycling through low vehicle speeds of a maximum of 20mph.
5.31	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		89	Supporting	Once again, I wish to stress the importance of a safe walking/cycling route between Herne Bay and Canterbury, especially with the increased housing and population proposed for both towns. At present there is absolutely no way to walk or cycle safely.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.31	769475	Dr Gillian Corble		90	Supporting	Once again, I wish to stress the importance of a safe walking/cycling route between Herne Bay and Canterbury, especially with the increased housing and population proposed for both towns. At present there is absolutely no way to walk or cycle safely.	
5.31	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		380	Supporting	A definition of what constitutes a "sufficient" number of cycle parking spaces is needed. Further clarity on the siting and type of cycle parking provision should be provided.	- This should state that cycle parking provision must meet or exceed the levels defined in the Kent Vehicle Parking Standards; - Cycle parking should also be required to be well lit, properly spaced (as defined in the Kent Vehicle Parking Standards), and
5.31	665473	Dr Richard Norman		561	Supporting	I support these priorities for promoting cycling. New routes such as the Crab & Winkle and the Canterbury-Chartham route have been very successful, and need to be matched by better cross-city routes.	
5.31	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		654	Objecting	The policy, as stated, seems again to have been ignored in the plan as produced. I fail to see any provision for a cycle route from South Canterbury nor one from the Hersden development. In addition cycling will always be an option for a minority unless substantial improvements are made to the cycling infrastructure.	If this objective is to remain then the plans as published need to detail possible new cycle routes that would be a requirement before planning permission was granted.
5.31	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	724	Objecting	The connectivity of cycle routes across the city needs to be reviewed and improved where gaps exist, with clear signposting provided. This will encourage greater use of cycling as an alternative to the car and increased uptake of cycle hire schemes at railway stations.	A review of the connectivity of cycle routes across the city with joining up of the gaps.
5.31	777527	Dr Noel Bridge		761	Supporting	Cycle routes must be convenient to cyclists in order to attract them off the main roads. The ones we have are less than uniformly successful.	
5.31	171665	Mr John Burden		1164	Supporting	I wish to record my personal submission about the long term future of the entire length of the old historic Canterbury to Whitstable Railway, a Conservation Area travelling from Canterbury to Whitstable. It offers everything from health, tourism, and alternative transport for an area with heavily congested roads. Ensure the aims of The Crab & Winkle Line Trust are fully included in the new Local Plan, that is to promote the line and to bring back as much of it as possible for public use.	
5.31	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1226	Supporting	We agree with the commitment to provide more and improved traffic-free cycle routes. We question the claim that 'Canterbury already has a good cycle network'. From the area covered by our Residents Association, for instance, there is now a good cycle route from Beaconsfield Road to North Lane, but it then stops. From then on there is no safe and convenient cycle route across the city.	
5.31	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1480	Supporting	Strongly support this, but we need more dedicated cycle only routes (and not just lines painted on the road).	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.31	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1935	Supporting	Support the commitment to provide more and improved traffic-free cycle routes. However, question the claim that 'Canterbury already has a good cycle network' as the area covered by our Residents Association, has no cycle paths. There is also concern about recent reports on the sale of land at the rear of the Wincheap Estate that would shut the current cycle path to Chartam and damage the Stour Valley route.	
5.31	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2364	Objecting	The draft Walking and Cycling Strategy 2003 needs to adopted and made a key part of the Local Plan along with the further suggestions for cycling improvements made in the Blueprint and in this submission	
5.31	780327	Mr Robin Townsend	Secretary to the Trust The Crab & Winkle Line Trust	3267	Objecting	This paragraph perfectly describes the potential of the C&W. This potential with a modicum of political will needs to be realized and should be made clear and explicit in the Local Plan. The Crab & Winkle project ticks all the 'Green, Environmental and Sustainable boxes' The C&W opportunity is to translate rhetoric into reality and to herald a revolution that is long overdue!	
5.31	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3658	Objecting	New paragraph to be inserted after 5.31: "Where possible and where there is likely to be demand for it, new cycle routes should be provided in the form of bridleways, restricted byways or other public multi-user non-vehicular routes that include equestrians. New off-road routes that connect bridleways, byways and restricted byways to form long distance equestrian routes and local circuits will be sought"	New paragraph to be inserted after 5.31. " Where possible and where there is likely to be demand for it, new cycle routes should be provided in the form of bridleways, restricted byways or other public multi-user non-vehicular routes that include equestrians. New off-road routes that connect bridleways, byways and restricted byways to form long distance equestrian routes and local circuits will be sought. Existing bridleways, byways and restricted byways, especially those that form part of the North Downs Way National Trail, will be protected and enhanced."
5.31	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4560	Supporting	I agree with the commitment to provide more and improved traffic-free cycle routes. Cycling in Canterbury remains hazardous and haphazard. The present patchy network needs to be improved and developed into a coordinated and comprehensive network of cross-city cycle routes.	
5.31	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5595	Objecting	Applicable to all the above chapters: We need explicit protection of the remaining undisturbed track-bed and embankment of the former Crab and Winkle Railway Line in Whitstable i.e. the sections from the end of the existing cycleway in the vicinity of All Saints Close and along the rear of Clare road to the Sidings development.	This wooded corridor should be protected as a crucial green buffer with important biodiversity features
5.31	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6382	Objecting	'..the Canterbury to Sturry cycle route'. Does this refer to the existing cycle lane on the A28? Is something more meaningful and safer planned for the future? If this is the case, it is very hard to find the maps.. Could this be the Fordwich/Canterbury cycle route, but misnamed?	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.31	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6579	Objecting	Amend the following text in paragraph 5.31 "A sufficient number of secure and covered cycle parking spaces must be provided as part of new residential developments . . ." to read There should be cycle parking / storage for all households on new developments.	Amend the following text in paragraph 5.31 "A sufficient number of secure and covered cycle parking spaces must be provided as part of new residential developments . . ." to read There should be cycle parking/storage for all households on new developments.
Policy T2	766238	Mr Mike Sole		27	Objecting	Bridge need a safe and direct cycle and footpath to from the village to the South Canterbury Schools. There appears to be provision for this in the plan but it is a priority that if in place now would reduce car journeys, keep children fitter and save families money as they would not have to pay the high bus fares for these short distances. We cannot wait 20 years for this path, it should be at the top of the list for improvements.	Deliver footpaths from bridge to South Canterbury schools needs to be a priority.
Policy T2	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		381	Supporting	A number of additional sites should also be safeguarded under this policy as detailed in my answer to Q2 and supported via the attached annotated maps.	A number of additional sites should also be safeguarded under this policy as detailed in my answer to Q2 and supported via the attached annotated maps.
Policy T2	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	707	Supporting	There need to be cycle paths for key routes into the city eg. Old Dover Road and New Dover Road. Spring Lane, Whitstable Rd, London Rd, Kingsmead Rd and the Ring Road are all dangerous for cyclists, as are crossing points into the city centre at the roundabouts. If local residents are realistically going to use cycles in our city, these inadequacies in the network of cycle paths need to be remedied. Cycle routes must be provided where they are needed, not simply where they are easy to build.	
Policy T2	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1045	Supporting	POLICY T2: Walking and Cycling - I fully support this policy.	
Policy T2	171665	Mr John Burden		1165	Objecting	The aims of Crab & Winkle Line Trust should be fully included in the new Local Plan, that is to promote the line and to bring back as much of it as possible for public use. The entire length deserve protection by their local plan.	The Beverly Farm Footpath Arch should be preserved and presented to the general public; reopen Tyler Hill Tunnel for public use; turn half mile section of trackbed from the north portal of the tunnel into a proper cycle/footpath; foot/cycle path could pass to the west of Halt bungalow and rejoin the original track bed which travels through Amery Court Farm.
Policy T2	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1227	Supporting	We agree with the commitment to provide more and improved traffic-free cycle routes. We question the claim that 'Canterbury already has a good cycle network'. From the area covered by our Residents Association, for instance, there is now a good cycle route from Beaconsfield Road to North Lane, but it then stops. From then on there is no safe and convenient cycle route across the city.	
Policy T2	777494	Mr Fred Wilson		1511	Objecting	Cross-city cycle routes are needed and these could be more explicitly included in the Plan.	Include more cross city cycle routes in plan.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T2	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1806	Objecting	Multi user/ shared space and its careful design is not addressed as an important element of reducing the dependence on car usage and supporting other means of transport such as cycling and walking. KDAONB refer you to the 'Rural streets and Lanes; a design handbook' which is adopted by Kent County Council. This policy should address the need of cyclists/ pedestrians in more than just the safeguarding of new routes. Upgrading and design changes to existing routes is also needed.	Change T2 as follows in BOLD: 'Land will be safeguarded for the proposed pedestrian and cycle routes as shown on the Proposals Map (Inset maps1,2,&3). OPPORTUNITIES WILL BE SOUGHT TO PROVIDE SAFE MULTI - USER ROUTES AND SHARED SPACE ON EXISTING ROUTES, NEW DEVELOPMENTS WILL BE EXPECTED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF DESIGN OF EXISTING ROUTES, AND WHERE PROVIDING NEW ROUTES ,BE GUIDED BY THE KCC'S ADOPTED 'RURAL STREETS AND LANES; A DESIGN HANDBOOK''
Policy T2	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1936	Supporting	Support the commitment to provide more and improved traffic-free cycle routes. However, question the claim that 'Canterbury already has a good cycle network' as the area covered by our Residents Association, has no cycle paths. There is also concern about recent reports on the sale of land at the rear of the Wincheap Estate that would shut the current cycle path to Chartam and damage the Stour Valley route.	
Policy T2	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		2053	Objecting	The provision for cycling is wholly inadequate. Provision for pedestrians is poor.	Add: "During the period of the plan the Council will actively seek to identify and safeguard further pedestrian and cycle routes."
Policy T2	778486	Prof & Mrs Osman & Lorna Durrani		2133	Objecting	Provide better cycle paths and ensure cyclists don't ride on the pavement. Encourage use of school and walking buses.	Provide better cycle paths and ensure cyclists don't ride on the pavement. Encourage use of school and walking buses.
Policy T2	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2209	Supporting	We agree with the commitment to provide more and improved traffic-free cycle routes. The present patchy network needs to be improved and developed into a coordinated and comprehensive network of cross-city cycle routes.	
Policy T2	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2442	Objecting	Spokes supports this policy. However we believe the following sites should be added to the land safeguarded by this policy:	Public bridleway CB160 between Bekesbourne and Littlebourne Reason: This will link Littlebourne into the existing cycle network and offer a safe alternative to the busy road which links the villages; The full route of the former Elham Valley Railway through Canterbury District. Reason: This will provide a continuous walking and cycling link both within the city of Canterbury and provide a safe link between the villages such as Bridge, Kingston and Barham; The Ridgeway, Chestfield. Reason: This both provides a convenient cut-through and serves the employment at John Wilson Industrial Estate; Public bridleway CC8 between the Crab & Winkle Link and Leycroft Close, Canterbury. Reason: This provides a link to Archbishop's School and serves as part of a cross-city route;

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T2	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3085	Objecting	We are however concerned regarding the level of direct impact that this policy and proposed riverside walks will have on the AS27 Ashford to Fordwich LWS. We are unsure how much of the infrastructure is already present but if this is to be new development we would have serious concerns regarding the individual and in-combination impacts of the proposed development on the ecology within the LWS.	
Policy T2	780327	Mr Robin Townsend	Secretary to the Trust The Crab & Winkle Line Trust	3261	Objecting	The present map in the Local Plan does not show the full 1km route from the end of the existing Invicta Way (South of Whitstable railway Station) to the Harbour. The Local Plan will not be complete, until this land is fully designated and made "belt and braces" safe, so that we may see a future fit for our children. When the Plan is revised it will better reflect the aims of NPPF, KCC and CCC to reduce car movements, improved air quality, address climate change, improve environment and health.	The Local Plan needs updating to take account of the progress made by the Trust in acquiring this vital land for community access to provide sustainable transport (walking and cycling).
Policy T2	13837	Mr William Leetham		3275	Supporting	The Crab and Winkle line from Invicta Way over the railway and Old Bridge Road along the Clare Road embankment must be retained as a sustainable transport route for pedestrians and cyclists. This will encourage less car use, whilst making it safer for children to access local schools.	
Policy T2	13837	Mr William Leetham		3276	Objecting	The former railway route from the north portal of the Tyler Hill tunnel to Tyler Hill Road should likewise be earmarked for a sustainable transport route for cyclists and pedestrians.	The former railway route from the north portal of the Tyler Hill tunnel to Tyler Hill Road should likewise be earmarked for a sustainable transport route for cyclists and pedestrians.
Policy T2	13837	Mr William Leetham		3277	Objecting	The Tyler Hill Tunnel should be classed as a possible for reopening as a sustainable transport route for cyclists and pedestrians.	The Tyler Hill Tunnel should be classed as a possible for reopening as a sustainable transport route for cyclists and pedestrians.
Policy T2	13751	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Lower Hardres Parish Council	3423	Objecting	We welcome the proposal for new cycle ways, but sadly these have been restricted to the development sites. No consideration has been given to extending them to the outlying villages. There are many residents in Lower Hardres who would welcome a cycleway to the City and as a Parish Council we have been looking into how this can be achieved. This should be included in the local plan.	There are many residents in Lower Hardres who would welcome a cycleway to the City and as a Parish Council we have been looking into how this can be achieved. This should be included in the local plan.
Policy T2	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3665	Objecting	Policy T2 should be amended to read "Land will be safeguarded for the proposed non-motorised routes...."	Change the wording of Policy T2 to read "Land will be safeguarded for the proposed non-motorised routes...."
Policy T2	780518	Mr Ken Fox & Family		3804	Supporting	Support Policy T2	
Policy T2	404737	Mr Richard Guest		3836	Objecting	What we do need in Canterbury are: Proper cycle routes (not just a token sharing of a bus lane) that children can also use, including a route through the town centre from north to south. This may take more traffic out of the city centre . At the moment it is too dangerous to cycle down the main roads since they are so narrow	
Policy T2	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3977	Supporting	Whilst CPRE Protect Kent supports this Policy it could be more proactive in promoting and encouraging walking and cycling generally.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T2	780986	Mr Peter Taylor-Gooby		4295	Objecting	It is important to recognise that cycling safety is deteriorating in the district due to the increasing numbers of other road users and the congested road network. I hope the Council will give urgent consideration to including further dedicated cycle paths in its plan.	
Policy T2	781346	Mr Tim Burden		4535	Supporting	The proposed new policy T2 largely replicates previously Saved Policy C3 and states that "Land will be safeguarded for the proposed pedestrian and cycle routes, as shown on the Proposals Map (Inset maps1, 2 & 3)". In general, I support the proposed T2 policy, which should be carried forward into the submitted version of the Plan.	
Policy T2	781346	Mr Tim Burden		4536	Objecting	The proposed new policy T2 largely replicates previously Saved Policy C3 and states that "Land will be safeguarded for the proposed pedestrian and cycle routes, as shown on the Proposals Map (Inset maps1, 2 & 3)". The need to continue include reference to these routes is supported, but the Proposals Map plan should show existing as well as proposed cycle routes, to show how these link together.	
Policy T2	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4561	Supporting	I agree with the commitment to provide more and improved traffic-free cycle routes. Cycling in Canterbury remains hazardous and haphazard. The present patchy network needs to be improved and developed into a coordinated and comprehensive network of cross-city cycle routes.	
Policy T2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4713	Objecting	Policy T2 needs to be strengthened with the addition of: "Complete linkages along cycle routes will be designed into the present cross-city cycle routes."	Policy T2 needs to be strengthened with the addition of: "Complete linkages along cycle routes will be designed into the present cross-city cycle routes."
Policy T2	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5233	Supporting	I support Policy T2 on safeguarded land, subject to local public consultation when areas of land are to be used.	
Policy T2	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5976	Objecting	As per planning policy framework 75 this section must include the protection and enhancement of public rights of way. This inclusion will help support other policies within this document and send a clear message to developers that public rights of way are a material consideration at the start of the planning process following amendments within the growth and infrastructure act 2013.	
Policy T2	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	6008	Supporting	We agree with the commitment to provide more and improved traffic-free cycle routes. We question the claim that 'Canterbury already has a good cycle network'. The present patchy network needs to be improved and developed into a coordinated and comprehensive network of cross-city cycle routes.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T2	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6186	Objecting	The draft plan, the last plan and the specific transport strategies have ignored cyclists in the west of Whitstable.	Maximum efforts to make the route from the west and south west to the centre of the town safer to travel . We propose the local plan should explicitly seek a share cycle route from the Canterbury Rd to the level crossing, where changes to gates could allow cyclists to wheel bikes across and into the quite lanes on the the other side side and travel in safety into the heart of the town. A cyclists' safety strip should be added at the traffic lights on all three roads to reduce danger for those who can only cyclists on the main road. Other measures should be encouraged.
Policy T2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6383	Objecting	Seems reasonable, but if there is safeguarded land for the Sturry/Canterbury pedestrian cycle route it is not easily found on Inset Map 1 or 2.	
Policy T2	781036	Brother Austin SSF	EastBridge Hospital	6952	Objecting	Cogan's Passage will not be suitable as a cycle route but only possibly for pedestrian traffic. If the Council wish to create a cycle path through the City Centre, another route should be found. Given the uncertainties of any future use of Cogan's Passage, it would be sensible not to zone this land for any particular transport use until the future route of any footpath and cycle route through the City Centre is more certain.	
5.32	778650	Mrs. Rebecca Smith		1389	Supporting	There should be improved bus routes from Thanington to Canterbury West Train Station rather than just stopping at the bus station.	
5.32	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5360	Objecting	Bus: a) All devts should be on main bus corridors into city with bus lanes/bus priority measures. May include queue relocation to other places in the road network . b) New bus routes include bus priority measures. c) On-street parking should be removed where such parking inhibits the construction of bus and cycle lanes. d) bus services from new devts every 10 mins e) real time bus info displayed at bus stops f) residents of new devts should receive free bus travel for a year.	
5.32	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5868	Objecting	No thought seems to have been given to continuing the [bus] service to the north of the city. Equally, there is no thought of electric buses to reduce pollution.	
5.32	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6384	Objecting	'...success story'. How much of this is down to free bus passes, particularly as the population is weighted more towards the elderly? What would be the effect on the economy and traffic if these are withdrawn?	
5.33	780823	S Suti		3394	Objecting	Canterbury needs to deal with its congestion and parking problems. A public transport policy which forces all bus travellers to endure a lengthy wait at the bus station, wherever they are going, is a failure.	
5.33	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bokesbourne with Patricbourne Parish Council	4688	Objecting	To discourage car use it is imperative that the bus services operates over a longer time period and over a wider area. There is no evidence of traffic flow monitoring from current residential areas to employment and leisure premises in order to better plan bus routes.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.33	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4886	Objecting	Much is made of the success of local bus travel, in particular the "Quality Bus Partnership" and links with Stagecoach. However, the text in paragraph 5.33 should acknowledge that the market is open to other operators.	
5.33	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6385	Objecting	Canterbury Quality Bus Partnership -Stagecoach - The Council will not be able to guarantee the deliverability of its Transport Policy as it relies upon outside market forces.	
5.34	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	711	Objecting	St Stephen's Residents Association believes the Local Plan should incorporate an intention to provide electronic time displays so that passengers have real time information at bus stops about bus arrivals and departures. This would improve passenger use and commercial viability of bus services.	
5.34	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3978	Objecting	The Plan should identify the routes referred to in: 'Stagecoach believes it should be possible to achieve similar frequencies on other key routes in the medium-term through upfront 'Kick-start'-style public investment. These routes could be further improved by additional bus priority measures'. We consider that a key route under-served is Faversham-Canterbury.	
5.34	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6386	Objecting	Stage coach believes it should be possible to achieve similar frequencies on other key routes in the medium term through upfront 'Kick-start'-style public investment. A belief is hardly a guarantee of deliverability. In the short-term what does this mean? Is the medium-term soon enough? Is the funding likely?	
5.35	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		657	Objecting	This short list of improvements does not include New Dover Road. All references in the plan to a fast bus service should be deleted unless New Dover Road is included in the list of roads to be widened and or given a bus lane.	Delete all references to a fast bus service from South Canterbury
5.35	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	723	Objecting	Bus priority measures are not the main improvement needed. These are important but also needed are a wider choice of services, cheaper fares and integrated timetabling of trains and buses in order to provide people with a genuine alternative to the car.	An acknowledgement of the need for a wider choice of services, cheaper fares and integrated timetabling of trains and buses.
5.35	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2845	Objecting	The reference to bus priority is inconsistent with the strategic allocations, and with the P&R policy set out. The main improvements identified are to the A28 on the north-eastern approach to the City, with no mention made of Wincheap - despite the fact that additional P&R spaces are to be provided there under the strategy.	
5.35	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3979	Objecting	We strongly disagree with 'especially for those routes that support the park and ride service.' As we identify elsewhere, P&R is not the optimum solution and bus lanes for the west side of Canterbury and within Whitstable are priorities to reduce delays to the more sustainable mode of standard buses. Hence the second proposal 'A28 - new bus link from new development at Sturry and Broad Oak to park and ride site', should be deleted	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.35	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6387	Objecting	'A28 complete in-bound bus lane between the Vauxhall roundabout and Tourtel Road'. After that nothing changes. Is this the priority for limited resources? The real problem is the Military Road/Broad Street and that needs resolution first. As the existing trees along the road are likely to be sacrificed what an even more miserable stretch of road this will become.	
5.35	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6388	Objecting	'A28 - new bus link from new development Sturry/Broad Oak to park and ride site'. Does this mean that a Broad Oak resident, who works at the K & C Hospital, will catch the bus at Sweechgate to the Park and ride, change bus there to go the bus station and change again to get a bus to the hospital? This will never happen. What are the benefits of a bus to a park and ride? The explanation in para 5.36 should come before 5.35, although the benefits not proven as being deliverable or cost effective.	
5.35	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6584	Objecting	Add the following text to paragraph 5.35: ... including the removal of some on-street parking where such parking prevents the construction of bus lanes. In such cases, residents should be given ample notice and alternative parking arrangements provided if unavailable â paid for, if necessary, from developer contributions. And the two following bullet points: - real-time bus information displayed at every bus stop - free bus travel for a year for residents of new developments	Add the following text to paragraph 5.35: ... including the removal of some on-street parking where such parking prevents the construction of bus lanes. In such cases, residents should be given ample notice and alternative parking arrangements provided if unavailable â paid for, if necessary, from developer contributions. And the two following bullet points: real-time bus information displayed at every bus stop free bus travel for a year for residents of new developments
5.36	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		658	Objecting	Since you are promoting the advantages of the High speed rail link, Canterbury West station needs to be considered as a significant transport hub and a solution proposed to the time it takes to travel between this station and the bus station.	Include Canterbury West station as a transport hub.
5.36	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3980	Objecting	This seems very vague, and although some linkage with standard buses could be achieved at existing P&R sites, we believe that transport hubs are more appropriate and a higher priority, at rail stations, which currently have very poor bus connections.	
5.36	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6389	Objecting	Park and Ride sites will have to expand considerably to accommodate 'community transport schemes'. This will also reduce car parking spaces. Has this been really thought through in terms of logistics, likely timetabling, waiting facilities and cost of fares, etc? The ease of journey appears to have been under estimated in this scheme and it is a major factor for the travelling public when deciding which form of transport to choose. A Sturry hub could have provided train/bus/park/cycle option.	
Policy T3	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		382	Supporting	Development at the strategic allocation sites must be expected to also provide a bus service.	Development at the strategic allocation sites must be expected to also provide a bus service.
Policy T3	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	722	Objecting	As well as park and ride sites, Canterbury West Station should be developed as a transport hub , to integrate bus and rail services in the city. This will require partnership working to succeed.	Reference to the development of Canterbury West Station as a transport hub with integrated timetabling of trains and buses.
Policy T3	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2443	Supporting	This policy support better sustainable transport implementation.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T3	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3981	Supporting	Whilst CPRE Protect Kent supports this Policy it could be more proactive in promoting and encouraging use of bus services and expressing the Council's intention to improve services.	
Policy T3	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4714	Objecting	Policy T3 should be strengthened to read, "The Council will, along with the bus operators, seek to extend the bus routes within (and between) local District Council areas?"	Policy T3 should be strengthened to read, "The Council will, along with the bus operators, seek to extend the bus routes within (and between) local District Council areas?"
Policy T3	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6185	Objecting	Recognise how to help buses in Whitstable.	The Policy should explicitly recognise the need to make the High St more free flowing though better signage, parking enforcement and parking resections on pinch points and provision of a park and ride.
Policy T3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6390	Objecting	Only to be expected. Why is there no mention of the criteria in Policy T9?	
5.37	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	721	Objecting	St Stephen's RA believes that changes at Canterbury West Station should include the development of a transport hub there, so that there are easy links by bus to and from other parts of the city. Partnership working will be required to ensure integrated timetables.	Reference to the development of a transport hub at Canterbury West Station and an aim to achieve integrated timetabling to facilitate transfers between bus and rail services.
5.37	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1015	Objecting	This is a very Canterbury-centric view. The High Speed service has made rail journeys longer from Herne Bay	Recognise that Canterbury City is not the whole district and develop plans to improve Herne Bay's transport options
5.37	778478	Mr Paul Masters		1538	Objecting	Add a Policy safeguarding the Car Sales, Rental and Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car Parking, a Taxi Rank and access to west Station.	Add a Policy safeguarding the land in Roper Road for Parking, Taxi's and Station access.
5.37	778480	Mr J Dagley		1541	Objecting	Proper provision should be made for parking at Canterbury West station. Retain the Car Sales, Rental and Network Rail Sites in Roper Road for parking/taxis/access.	
5.37	778484	Mr & Mrs Hodge		1543	Objecting	Add a Policy safeguarding the Car Sales, Rental and Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car Parking, a Taxi Rank and access to west Station.	Add a Policy safeguarding the land in Roper Road for Parking, Taxi's and Station access.
5.37	778483	Ms Yvonne De Graaf		1550	Objecting	Objects to development of the area around west station in a manor that decreases parking spaces as the car parking is well used from early in the morning. Reserve area in Roper Road for Car Parking, a Taxi Rank and access to Station.	Add a Policy safeguarding the land in Roper Road for Parking, Taxi's and Station access.
5.37	778943	Mrs P Fuller		1552	Objecting	Add a Policy safeguarding the Car Sales, Rental and Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car Parking, a Taxi Rank and access to west Station.	Add a Policy safeguarding the land in Roper Road for Parking, Taxi's and Station access.
5.37	778191	Mr Jamie Paton		1624	Objecting	I object to the plan to develop houses on the station's existing overflow carpark and undeveloped land, and ask that the city safeguard the 2 sites in roper road currently owned by network rail for car parking/taxi ranks and access to canterbury west from the north.	I ask that the city council safeguard the 2 sites in roper road currently owned by network rail for car parking/taxi ranks and access to canterbury west from the north.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.37	773027	Ms Sofiah Garrard		1631	Objecting	I object to the outrageous proposal in the draft local plan to build 40 houses on the station's existing overflow car park and adjoining underdeveloped land.	I would like to ask the city council to add to the draft plan an additional policy which safeguards the car sales and rental site and the network rail control site in Roper road for car parking, a taxi rank and access to canterbury west station from the north.
5.37	778643	Francis Stileman		1657	Objecting	Canterbury West railway station.I am writing to object to strongly object to the plans to reduce the amount of car parking and taxi spaces.	
5.37	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	2047	Objecting	Openness about the lengthened train journeys of most people in the District during the last plan caused by HS is missing as is planning to reverse it. of Whitstable and Herne Bay's trains services.	Commitment is needed for the authorities to do everything possible to achieve cheaper fares and reduce travel times so the services to the north Kent coast can be restored (ie cut the ten minutes that was added when HS1 was introduced). This would help make train travel from Whitstable more sustainable.
5.37	778486	Prof & Mrs Osman & Lorna Durrani		2134	Objecting	Get rid of the three level crossings in Canterbury, which cause a lot of congestion.	Get rid of the three level crossings in Canterbury
5.37	121447	K P Poole		2220	Objecting	Additionally I would like to suggest that to provide against future needs at the station, the Local Plan should explicitly safeguard from development the two remaining plots of Network Rail-owned land accessible from Roper Road behind platform 2. They should be used to provide a second access to the station from the north avoiding the level crossing; also more space for car parking and taxi ranks.	
5.37	778755	Mr Richard Williams		2325	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Canterbury West Station Forecourt, which south-eastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.A new access to the station, with a Taxi Rank and parking, is now urgently required in Roper Road.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional policy which safeguards both the Car Sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail control site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury west Station from the north.
5.37	778496	Mr Andy Irons		2404	Objecting	Highlights concerns about proposed layout of Station west Forecourt and the lack of Taxi and car pick up bays. A new access to the Station with taxi ranks and parking is needed from Roper Road. Include a safeguarding area on Roper Road for parking, Taxi rank and access to the station.	Include a Policy which safeguards both the Car Sales and Rental site and the Network Rail control site in Roper Road for Car Parking, a Taxi Rank and access to Canterbury West station from the north.
5.37	780816	H Taner		2733	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	780817	G Gevorwian		2735	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.37	780819	Saberi Daoueli		2737	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	780820	Mr S Hasan		2739	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	780821	Mr Erjon Korra		2740	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	780822	Mr Monshad Ali		2741	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	780815	H Harctiunfon		2742	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	780814	Mr John Darby		2743	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.37	780813	Saymir Merkay		2744	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	780812	A Okhanyaroll		2745	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	780811	Xhelal Mustafa		2746	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	780810	S Bjihall		2747	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	458920	Reverend Michael Morris		2886	Objecting	Object to plans to develop Station Road West Car Park and overflow car park. The loss of the Station Street West Car park would have a serious effect on the shops in Westgate and commuters.	
5.37	458920	Reverend Michael Morris		2887	Supporting	Suggests providing access to the West Station from Roper Road using the undeveloped land there. This will enable access to the station for commuters relieving the traffic flow over the level crossing.	
5.37	781320	C Winters		2953	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.37	781321	Mr Michael Boyle		2954	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	781322	G S Ludgate		2956	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	781324	D Oates		2957	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	781326	Occupier		2958	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	781328	A Stonham		2961	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	781327	Mr David James Gentry		2964	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.37	781329	D Gale		2966	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	781330	Mr D Baddiley		2968	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	781331	Bardhul Likaj		2969	Objecting	I am very concerned that the layout of the new Station Forecourt, which Southeastern Trains will be constructing this autumn, will have grossly insufficient space for Taxis to meet trains.Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.	Please would you include in the Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car parking, a Taxi Rank, and access to Canterbury West Station from the north.
5.37	780295	Mr Charles Gooderham		3206	Objecting	Objects to the improvement scheme currently being undertaken on the West Station forecourt, including drop off//pick up spaces, loss of trees, number of cars and congestion, is there an integrated traffic plan? Add a policy safeguarding the Car sales/rental and Network Roa sites in Roper Rd for car parking, taxi rank and station access.	That the City Council add to the Draft Local Plan an additional policy which safeguards both the car sales and rental site and the Network Rail control site in Roper Road for car parking, taxi rank and access to the station from the north.
5.37	121820	Mrs IVD Baker		3430	Objecting	Objects to the non-identification.protection (network rail) land at Roper Rd for station access, parking and taxi rank, because; it's the only land in the area not identified/developed for other uses; the forecourt refurbishment will reduce private/taxi parking; congestion in Station Rd West; need for a second access; not enough day/long stay parking for station;additional houses will increase commuter and leisure travel; need to remove traffic from level crossing. Safeguard land in Roper Rd	Please safeguard all the remaining railway land in Roper Road (ie Sites 8 and 9 as referred to in the Brief) for an access to the Station, parking and a Taxi rank.
5.37	780828	Mr Jeremy D I Baker		3432	Objecting	Objects to the non-identification.protection (network rail) land at Roper Rd for station access, parking and taxi rank, because; it's the only land in the area not identified/developed for other uses; the forecourt refurbishment will reduce private/taxi parking; congestion in Station Rd West; need for a second access; not enough day/long stay parking for station;additional houses will increase commuter and leisure travel; need to remove traffic from level crossing. Safeguard land in Roper Rd	Please safeguard all the remaining railway land in Roper Road (ie Sites 8 and 9 as referred to in the Brief) for an access to the Station, parking and a Taxi rank.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.37	121830	Mr MJR Baker		3433	Objecting	Objects to the non-identification.protection (network rail) land at Roper Rd for station access, parking and taxi rank, because; it's the only land in the area not identified/developed for other uses; the forecourt refurbishment will reduce private/taxi parking; congestion in Station Rd West; need for a second access; not enough day/long stay parking for station;additional houses will increase commuter and leisure travel; need to remove traffic from level crossing. Safeguard land in Roper Rd	Please safeguard all the remaining railway land in Roper Road (ie Sites 8 and 9 as referred to in the Brief) for an access to the Station, parking and a Taxi rank.
5.37	780827	Mr M P J Baker		3434	Objecting	Objects to the non-identification.protection (network rail) land at Roper Rd for station access, parking and taxi rank, because; it's the only land in the area not identified/developed for other uses; the forecourt refurbishment will reduce private/taxi parking; congestion in Station Rd West; need for a second access; not enough day/long stay parking for station;additional houses will increase commuter and leisure travel; need to remove traffic from level crossing. Safeguard land in Roper Rd	Please safeguard all the remaining railway land in Roper Road (ie Sites 8 and 9 as referred to in the Brief) for an access to the Station, parking and a Taxi rank.
5.37	780975	Mr Frederic Stansfield		4227	Objecting	Plans should be developed for a rail/tram scheme in the Canterbury area. This should include a route from Canterbury to Whitstable via the University of Kent main site. The scheme for a tram route from Whitstable via Herne Bay and Sturry to Canterbury, first suggested over a hundred years ago, should be resurrected. Trams from both routes could join the railway before Canterbury West and proceed, using a new junction to Canterbury East, and if feasible onwards to Dover using the local service.	
5.37	780975	Mr Frederic Stansfield		4228	Objecting	The Local Plan should also be co-ordinated with provisions for early inclusion of the railway line through Canterbury West in plans to convert railway lines in Southern England from third rail to overhead electrification.	
5.37	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4369	Objecting	At Sturry there is one fast train to London in the morning and no fast train stops in the evening. It is not inconceivable that the train companies will cut out the morning fast train. One train an hour in each direction is hardly going to encourage people to abandon their cars. Unless the service is improved and guaranteed, the proposed car park (details uncertain) will become a useless space of tarmac. Passenger numbers are falling.	It would be helpful if the plan could inform residents who will run and own the car park. Currently the station is waiting for funding to clear the small garden there and turn it into two parking spaces. That does not seem to be a priority for Network Rail.
5.37	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4370	Objecting	Perhaps Canterbury should look to Ashford, where the effective high-speed link has developed a commuter base that can sustain extra housing. Ashford has a large modern station with plenty of nearby parking. With its two stations and a bus service that neither joins or directly serves the two stations, Canterbury needs a new approach to transport. Perhaps the Plan should consider a Parkway station where the two lines cross and then develop the area surrounding it.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.37	781400	Charlie Mount		4908	Objecting	The Plan should include an additional policy to retain the land to the North of Canterbury West Station so that it can be developed to allow access to the station and as additional parking. As an important transport hub for the High Speed Link, a gate from platform 2, a path to Roper Road and a taxi rank should be a priority. The current overflow car park should also be safeguarded.	The Plan should include an additional policy to retain the land to the North of Canterbury West Station
5.37	781734	Mr Chris Lowe		5085	Objecting	Land north of Canterbury West Station, namely the Network Rail and car rental site, both in Roper Road should be safeguarded. These are critical for providing a second access to the station from the north, which avoids the level crossing, and would also provide space for cycle racks, taxis and cars. This would be a major benefit for rail users, as well as reducing traffic going across the Level Crossing.	Additional Policy with supporting text: The sites of the Car Sales & Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road will be Safeguarded for access to Canterbury West Station from the north side and for Taxi Rank and car parking.
5.37	13812	Mr N J Blake		5223	Objecting	Muddy Boots PR assert that the enhanced car park serving Sturry Station would support the railway to become a park and ride facility. Again it is strange that this, presumably un-researched, project is advanced by a separate private consultant without any analysis as to whether there is any line capacity, or if the frequency of trains would be adequate to make a park and ride viable. It is yet another speculative and unreliable attempt at "sustainability", albeit from an extraneous source.	
5.37	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5238	Objecting	Furthermore, I believe that land available in Roper Road adjacent to Canterbury West should be retained for future possible use should the station be enhanced in the future. This is land identified as Site 8 and Site 9 in the Canterbury West Regeneration Zone Development Brief, July 2011. With pressure on traffic flows at the existing entrance to Canterbury West, these two areas of land could serve as an alternative access point if required in the future and remove pressure on Station Road West.	
5.37	781600	Ms Avril Leonard		5391	Objecting	Add to the draft local plan an additional policy which safeguards both the car sales and rental site and the Network Rail Control site in Roper Road for Car parking, a taxi rank and access to Canterbury West Station from the North	Add to the draft local plan an additional policy which safeguards both the car sales and rental site and the Network Rail Control site in Roper Road for Car parking, a taxi rank and access to Canterbury West Station from the North
5.37	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5582	Objecting	Given the narrow, largely unimprovable and congested road corridors converging on Canterbury, is there scope to realise the potential for harnessing and developing the rail network? This might well facilitate the growth without gridlock that is envisaged in KCC 2011-2016 Local Transport Plan?	
5.37	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5866	Objecting	Why has no thought been given to opening up the northern side of Canterbury West Station ? This would relieve a lot of traffic across the city.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.37	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6391	Objecting	'improved high speed rail service...'.How will the Council respond to any request for the closure of Sturry and Shelford level crossings in the future? What influence would the Council have to keep Sturry station open, with both a local service and a hi-speed stopping service? Without the station at Sturry, building 1,000 houses and a station car park for 100 cars (according to the Developers) could be seen as unsustainable development, since no local employment and no increase in amenities.	
Policy T4	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1046	Supporting	POLICY T4: Rail - I support this policy, but believe more needs to be done to ensure that there is sufficient parking available at Canterbury West Station for the continuing growth in passenger numbers for the High Speed rail service.	
Policy T4	778624	Dr Olaf Chitil		1351	Supporting	Canterbury West Station will need more parking spaces in the future and hence space for these needs to be safeguarded now.	
Policy T4	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2444	Supporting	This policy support better sustainable transport implementation.	
Policy T4	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3982	Supporting	Whilst CPRE Protect Kent supports this Policy it could be more proactive in promoting and encouraging use of bus services and expressing the Council's intention to improve services.	
Policy T4	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4715	Objecting	We are not convinced that policy T4 on rail improvements is serious. This is because similar statements could be made with respect to almost any of the proposals or recommendations made in the Local Plan.	We are not convinced that policy T4 on rail improvements is serious. This is because similar statements could be made with respect to almost any of the proposals or recommendations made in the Local Plan.
Policy T4	782446	John & Stuart Earl		5076	Objecting	Add to the Draft Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car Sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car Parking, a Taxi Rank and access to Canterbury West Station from the North.	Add to the Draft Local Plan an additional Policy which safeguards both the Car Sales and Rental Site and the Network Rail Control Site in Roper Road for Car Parking, a Taxi Rank and access to Canterbury West Station from the North.
Policy T4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6392	Objecting	Only to be expected. Why is there no mention of the criteria in Policy T9?	
5.38	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		383	Supporting	I support the reduction of city centre car parking spaces and setting of car parking charges to influence travel behaviour.	
5.38	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		659	Objecting	Limiting the city centre parking does not have the effect of reducing traffic that might be expected for two reasons. 1) it can double the number of car journeys if people opt to be delivered to the city centre and then collected later by a friend or family member and 2) it can encourage people to use out of centre shopping since free parking is provided.	Add to the end of the 3rd sentence, "...but recognises that for many reasons the use of a private car is reasonable by a fair percentage of those wishing to come to the city centre and the parking policy will not seek to unreasonable penalise such a choice."
5.38	778650	Mrs. Rebecca Smith		1391	Objecting	There should be more parking spaces at Canterbury West Train Station for commuters. The current plan will reduce parking spaces by 7 spaces making it much more challenging to find parking. Weekly and monthly season ticket holders should also be allowed to purchase parking tickets at the the train station for the available parking lots.	There should be more parking spaces at Canterbury West Train Station for commuters. The current plan will reduce parking spaces by 7 spaces making it much more challenging to find parking. Weekly and monthly season ticket holders should also be allowed to purchase parking tickets at the the train station for the available parking lots. I believe two adjoining lots to the Canterbury West Train Station should be used for commuter parking.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.38	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2365	Objecting	The Canterbury Parking Strategy is outdated and should not be used to form the basis of the local plan. It is about management and flexible growth of parking supply rather than reduction of parking. It should not form the basis of the emerging Local Plan because it will not lead to a reduction in car use nor assist in the change to sustainable travel modes.	
5.38	775156	Mr David Parish		2537	Objecting	We have the two main parallel streets in Herne Bay (Seafront and High Street). These could provide us with an opportunity to create two one way streets. This would free up space for short stay parking bays, boosting our retail trade, and car parking drop off access to the accommodation on the sea front. It's short stay parking that helps with quick visits to shops like bakers, florists, deli's that need a high turnover of this type of business.	
5.38	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6053	Objecting	This is for the City only despite being headlined for the District in effect.	Label as for the City only and add specific policy for Whitstable.
5.38	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6393	Objecting	'reduce City centre parking spaces'. Who will city centre parking be aimed at? The retail economy will be delicate. Building with maintaining public parking at ground level on existing open air car parks could provide the best of both worlds. Also, potential loss of considerable Council revenue.	
5.38	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6394	Objecting	'...setting parking charges to influence travel choice'. Canterbury is already seen as being an expensive to park. Competition is on the increase from other areas (para 5.3) and destination choices will extend as well as form of transport.. The balance is a fine one, especially when convenience for carrying several heavy shopping bags is factored in.	
5.39	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		384	Objecting	The increase in Park & Ride capacity at Wincheap is not achievable without unacceptable adverse impacts.	No increase in Park & Ride capacity at Wincheap.
5.39	777046	Miss Jane Gallimore		656	Objecting	Park and Ride sites being built on beautiful countryside when there are brownfield or industrial sites available, would increase air pollution and destroy for ever part of the charm of Canterbury.	
5.39	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		661	Objecting	It is significant that there is no provision of Park and Ride for those using the Littlebourne Road or the Whitstable Road/Tyler Hill Road and Faversham will only be served once the 4th slip road at Wincheap is complete. The policy needs to state what provision is to be made for commuters from these directions or make it clear that increases to the Park and Ride provision will have limited impact	Mention made of plans for Park and Ride to serve the Littlebourne Road, Whitstable Road and Tyler Hill Road or a general reduction to the claims for the difference Park and Ride can make.
5.39	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1255	Objecting	A fourth Park and Ride at Lakesview Business Park, Westbere WPC, in their Parish Plan (section XI.9), suggest a Park and Ride at Lakesview. This would alleviate congestion and improve the economy. In the event of increased traffic congestion residents may make the decision to shop at Westwood Cross, as this offers an easier alternative for access and free parking.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.39	121447	K P Poole		2213	Supporting	I was surprised to read in paragraph 5.39 that 800 additional park and ride sites are needed, but pleased that additional spaces can be provided at the existing sites	
5.39	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2874	Objecting	There are other reasons while P&R is desirable. P&R sites should be the sustainable "hubs" where development is to be anchored. P&R can also provide benefits where the quantity of land within a city centre is limited or constrained and so it is helpful to displace parking activity to the outskirts. They can also aid navigation into the city for visitors Wincheap makes sense as a hub with this in mind. However the addition of P&R spaces and the apportionment to the various sites is not justified	
5.39	780456	Mr Rory White		3354	Objecting	It is simply never going to be the case that everyone who wants to come into Canterbury could and would use the park and ride. In any event, the increased numbers driving to the Park and Ride would in itself lead to increased congestion! Far from improving business in the city, the inevitable increased congestion and difficulty in accessing the city would lead to people choosing to go elsewhere to shop.	
5.39	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4004	Objecting	Park & rides (P&R) are not less environmentally damaging they do not decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT). User survey showed most use was by car, only 10% public transport abstraction. The P&R's have not reduced congestion. Studies show that P&R's increase VMT. The parking policy is outdated and needs scrutiny. If P&R's are retained modify them in line with research. Improve public transport to make P&R's less attractive. 800 extra spaces not needed, reduce spaces use sustainable transport.	Policies T6, T7,T8 and T9 Â and their supporting text (paragraphs 5.39-5.46 should be deleted from the Plan.
5.39	781629	Kathryn Nevell	Canterbury Student Lets	5332	Supporting	The Park and Ride in Harbledown is very unpopular and I am pleased to see in Policy T5 that it is not highlighted and the additional slip road at Wincheap and the enlargement of current Park and Rides are the favoured option. The Northern Approach Park and Ride located on The Victoria Hotel/ The Red House Nursing Home on the corner of the A2050 and London Road. This is walking distance from the city centre and would require only minimum road changes.	One possibility for a Northern Approach Park and Ride could be to relocate The Victoria Hotel and/or The Red House Nursing Home from the corner of the A2050 and London Road. This would utilize a brown field site and would be in walking distance to the City Centre and would require only minimal road changes.
5.39	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5974	Supporting	These sites are close to two secondary schools (St Anselms and Simon Langton for Girls). This provision may also provide a drop off place.	
5.39	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6395	Objecting	'It is better to have part of the journey into the City made by bus than none at all'. For whom? The travelling public do not have to choose Canterbury as their destination. Canterbury, however, is relying on people to visit. Park and Ride should be incredibly cheap and the comparative costs advertised very much more: eg on the back of every bus.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.39	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6396	Objecting	800 additional park and ride spaces'. Is this extra provision at the 3 sites mentioned available in addition to space needed for the 'Community transport scheme' - para 5.36?	
5.40	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4007	Objecting	Park & rides (P&R) are not less environmentally damaging they do not decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT). User survey showed most use was by car, only 10% public transport abstraction. The P&R's have not reduced congestion. Studies show that P&R's increase VMT. The parking policy is outdated and needs scrutiny. If P&R's are retained modify them in line with research. Improve public transport to make P&R's less attractive. 800 extra spaces not needed, reduce spaces use sustainable transport.	Policies T6, T7,T8 and T9 Â and their supporting text (paragraphs 5.39-5.46 should be deleted from the Plan.
5.41	399017	Mr Andrew Hall		103	Objecting	Given the plan to expand the Wincheap site, this is unnecessary and a blight of a conservation area, impacting not only the immediate area but Chartham Hatch and all local roads around it.	A decision to drop this ridiculous idea!
5.41	776221	Ms Dominic Harbinson		593	Objecting	Strongly objects to Faulkners Lane site being considered as a park and ride site. It would destroy orchards, is in a conservation area, on grade 1 agricultural land, next to a primary school and close to the historic sites of Bigbury and Harbledown. It will have a massive impact on the landscape and result in increased traffic.	The site should under no circumstance be considered suitable for a Park & Ride facility.
5.41	777046	Miss Jane Gallimore		660	Objecting	To develop and area of High Landscape Value that borders a Conservation area, when there are other more suitable sites, that have the infra structure in place would irrevocably damage the Character and Historical beauty of the Landscape setting that Canterbury rests in. This will have a negative effect on Tourism and is miss use of the Land when there are more suitable sites, such as existing Park and Rides, that could be expanded.	
5.41	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4008	Objecting	Park & rides (P&R) are not less environmentally damaging they do not decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT). User survey showed most use was by car, only 10% public transport abstraction. The P&R's have not reduced congestion. Studies show that P&R's increase VMT. The parking policy is outdated and needs scrutiny. If P&R's are retained modify them in line with research. Improve public transport to make P&R's less attractive. 800 extra spaces not needed, reduce spaces use sustainable transport.	Policies T6, T7,T8 and T9 Â and their supporting text (paragraphs 5.39-5.46 should be deleted from the Plan.
5.41	780838	Miss E J Nevell		4543	Objecting	Object to Policy T5, Harbledown Park and Ride, because: It would be an eyesore and out of keeping; an AHLV; loss of Grade 1 greenfield agricultural land; destruction of views from Golden Hill and Pilgrims Way; impact on conservation area; environmental impacts from runoff and light pollution; increases in parking outside of the site; increased traffic in adjacent villages; need for costly road infrastructure; extend wincheap and build A2 slip.	Delete Policy T5 from the Draft Local Plan, together with all supporting text.
5.41	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6585	Objecting	Object to proposals for a new Park and Ride at Harbledown as it would have a negative effect on modal shift from sustainable transport to the private car, increase traffic, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, and would result in the loss of high quality orchards.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	117506	Mr. A. R. Finn		201	Objecting	I am the owner of the orchard at Faulkners Lane, Harbledown. Gravely concerned about this proposed policy and its implications for the use this orchard as part of a farming enterprise. There has been no contact from the Council regarding this, contrary to the NPPF and its requirements for meaningful engagement and collaboration. I will not be selling the orchard for Park and Ride purposes. Any compulsory purchase will be resisted by me and the Harbledown village community.	
Policy T5	775204	Mr & Mrs Paul & Katrina Roberts		303	Objecting	Object to the possibility of a new park and ride site at Harbledown for the following reasons: this would cause increased traffic through surrounding villages that already suffer considerably because of traffic; loss of high quality productive farmland; destruction of beautiful views, harm to the setting of the Harbledown Conservation Area and view from fort at Bigbury and St Nicholas Hospital; the valley is designated AHLV; and costly new road layouts needed to accommodate buses.	The far less expensive alternative would be to expand the Wincheap park and ride site, all that is needed is to install the much needed missing fourth slip road so that traffic may access it from the A2.
Policy T5	765080	mr matthew willerton		446	Objecting	Objecting the Harbledown Park and Ride. Expand Wincheap!	Expand the current Wincheap Park and Ride
Policy T5	115295	Mrs Gordana Groombridge		452	Objecting	Objects to the park and ride site at Harbledown because it will impact on the beautiful countryside and area of high landscape and increase traffic in Rough Common, Harbledown and Chartham Hatch.	Please remove the option of a new Park and Ride in Harbledown and prioritise the proposal with the most common sense behind it - building the missing slip road from the A2 at Wincheap and expand the Wincheap Park and Ride.
Policy T5	775476	Mr Alex White		461	Objecting	Object to the park and ride site of Canterbury (policy T5) This park and ride will destroy our countryside it is the only footpath & bridleway from Canterbury to Chartham Hatch. You also have the option of the old unused air field behind upper Harbledown or the old garden centre where there currently is a slip road on & off of the A2.	
Policy T5	112665	Mrs Joan Johnson		462	Objecting	Objects to the park and ride in Harbledown because it will exacerbate an already dangerous traffic situation and Rough Common Road will become a rat run.	PLEASE DO NOT create a 4th Park and Ride at Harbledown.
Policy T5	405563	Mrs J L Cotterill		463	Objecting	I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the seemingly interminably tired and discredited proposal to overrun Harbledown with a Park and Ride scheme this time around put forward in the so called Local Plan under proposal Policy T5. The proposal Policy T5 is just plain wrong. I urge you to delete this historically and environmentally inappropriate, unnecessarily expensive and inessential proposal from the Local Plan with all haste.	I urge you to delete this historically and environmentally inappropriate, unnecessarily expensive and inessential proposal from the Local Plan with all haste. Delete Policy T5.
Policy T5	405432	Mr & Mrs RW & J Pepper		464	Objecting	I object to the earmarking of pear orchards at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown for a 4th Park and Ride site (policy T5). There is a viable (cheaper?) alternative i.e. build a fourth slip road off the A2 at Wincheap and if need be construct a multi-storey car/coach park on the current Wincheap site.	
Policy T5	775409	Mr Craig Perrott		466	Objecting	Objects to park and ride in Harbledown because it already suffers from high speed traffic, Church Road is narrow and there will be accidents.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	117519	Fred and Olive Saunders		467	Objecting	Strongly objects to Harbledown park and ride because: Additional park is not necessary, Traffic in Chatham hatch is already unsustainable, The road layout can't be reconfigured, Loss of agricultural land, Contamination of water aquifers, It is an AHLV, It could be at Wincheap with an A2 slip.	
Policy T5	775602	Dr & Mrs Davies		476	Objecting	We strongly object to a park & ride at Harbledown, this proposal because of its impact on the natural environment surrounding the historical village of Harbledown, with its unique relationship to the Pilgrim's Way and Canterbury Cathedral. It seems totally unnecessary to undertake such a destructive act of vandalism on a beautiful area of orchard when there is clearly a much more logical solution.	
Policy T5	405194	Mr Julian Parker		480	Objecting	I am writing to you 'once again,' to express my utter disbelief and horror that this appalling scheme is being considered yet again. The desecration of ancient orchards and beautiful, and ancient landscapes such as we have in Harbledown. Also has been declared "greenfield farmland," with amazing, ancient fruit orchards, which would be obliterated under a sea of tarmac should this odious scheme come to pass!	
Policy T5	112731	Mr E. W. Golding		485	Objecting	I object to Policy T5. It will be a visually intrusive in the countryside. It is located within the Area of High Landscape Value that surrounds Canterbury. It is within Harbledown Fruit Belt identified within the Canterbury Landscape Appraisal. The proposal is not a suitable location for a Park & Ride	The answer is to cancel the proposed site at Faulkners Lane for a Park & Ride.
Policy T5	775810	Mr & Mrs Mark & Katherine Thatcher		508	Objecting	We both would like to strongly object to the councils proposal (Policy T5) for the a park & ride at Harbledown. The plan would inevitably lead to increased traffic in the Harbledown, Upper Harbledown, Rough Common and Chatham Hatch areas. Also yet further loss of productive "greenfield" farmland and destruction of the wonderful and historic views over beautiful Kentish country side including the North Downs Way / Pilgrim's Way, we feel this would be totally unacceptable.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	127115	B.J. Gore		512	Objecting	Policy T5 - Proposed Park and Ride site at Harbledown We do not consider there is a need for a fourth Park and Ride site. Peoples' transport methods are changing now more more quickly than before, with new proposals are coming forward which may alleviate the traffic congestion in and around Canterbury. Even if a fourth site was necessary, the Grade 1 productive agricultural land proposed is entirely the wrong location.	The following sites should also be considered for potential park & ride sites : A joint site with Swale Borough Council at Brenley Corner which could provide Park and Ride for both Canterbury and Faversham. We understand Swale BC would be prepared to discuss this with our Council, but we have heard nothing further. P and R buses from Brenley to Canterbury would get there in 5 mins, and could off-load and take on passengers at the Bus Station similarly to what happens at present. There is a site at the top of Gate Hill on the Dunkirk side which is in private ownership, and which is already degraded by power lines going through it. It would be inexpensive to develop and, being next to the A2 on level land, slip roads on and off for cars and buses would be straightforward to construct. The return journey from Canterbury would be on the London bound side of the A2, around Brenley roundabout and back to the site.
Policy T5	775199	Mr Russell Blyth		558	Objecting	Object to a park and ride at Harbledown. Unhappy about increased traffic on Bigbury Road; there is already congestion, safety and access problems.	
Policy T5	405563	Mrs J L Cotterill		587	Objecting	I object to the proposal for a Park and Ride at Harbledown. It will destroy the beauty of the countryside. There is no road layout or infrastructure to support this development. It will mean increased traffic in both Harbledown village and Chartham Hatch, neither road being safe for more traffic. The site is between the historic area of Harbledow with St Nicholas Hospital and the Bigbury Fort site. The Harbledown Valley is recognised as Area of High Landscape Value.	
Policy T5	122800	Mr & Mrs Hixson		589	Objecting	Object to proposals for a Park and Ride at Harbledown for the following reasons. The loss of Grade A agricultural land; the creation of a huge junction at the A2 slip road; and increased traffic passing through the nationally important site of Bigbury Camp.	
Policy T5	775218	Mrs C L Sullivan		590	Objecting	Object to proposals for a Park and Ride at Harbledown for the following reasons. Loss of farmland, in a conservation area, increased traffic and congestion to Chartham Hatch and other local villages.	
Policy T5	776221	Ms Dominic Harbinson		594	Objecting	Strongly objects to Faulkners Lane site being considered as a park and ride site. It would destroy orchards, is in a conservation area, on grade 1 agricultural land, next to a primary school and close to the historic sites of Bigbury and Harbledown. It will have a massive impact on the landscape and result in increased traffic.	The site should under no circumstance be considered suitable for a Park & Ride facility.
Policy T5	405192	Mr Brian Allen		595	Objecting	Objects to the park and ride at Harbledown. It ignores increased traffic, which is already a problem with the school run. The Wincheap park and ride should be extended it would be cheaper. Raises concerns about KCC and the police as well.	Put a 4 th Park & Ride at an extended Wincheap parking site

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	776448	Ms Susan Booth		601	Objecting	Object to the proposals for a Park and Ride at Harbledown for the following reasons. Increased traffic flow will result in more accidents; and an irreversible loss of highly productive greenfield farmland and an Area of High Landscape Value.	
Policy T5	117570	Ms Mary Murdoch		604	Objecting	Object to proposals for a Park and Ride at Harbledown for the following reasons. In an Area of High Landscape Value; loss of greenfield agricultural land; adjacent to the Harbledown Conservation Area; and increased traffic through local villages.	
Policy T5	404876	Mr George Dobre		626	Objecting	Object to proposals for a Park and Ride at Harbledown as it would increase traffic in Harbledown and Rough Common; and be very costly to implement. No evidence that the proposal would help traffic in Canterbury.	
Policy T5	776134	P Rogers & K Pepper		676	Objecting	Proposed park and ride at Harbledown (Policy T5). As a local residents,we must register our total opposition to this scheme. Not because we are residents, but because of the potential ruination to what is currently an area of high landscape value.	
Policy T5	776134	P Rogers & K Pepper		677	Objecting	Proposed park and ride at Harbledown (Policy T5). As a local residents,we must register our total opposition to this scheme. Not becausewe are residents, but because of the potential ruination	
Policy T5	776921	Mr Robert Kimpton		681	Objecting	I wish to object to POLICY T5 in the draft Canterbury District Local Plan.	
Policy T5	777165	Ms Sandra Baker		686	Supporting	I think a park and ride at Harbledown is a brilliant idea.All traffic from this end of town has no choice but to drive right through the middle of Canterbury to get to a park and ride, or anywhere else in town. I am a Harbledown resident saying YES we do want a park and ride, but we also still need the slip road at Wincheap.	
Policy T5	777170	Mr Peter Zerfahs		689	Objecting	I strongly object to Policy T5, construction of Harbledown Park & Ride. The traffic will increase in Rough Common and Palmars Cross Hill by people from the coast using the above roads as a rat run to access the planned Park & Ride.Heavy vehicles are already banned from those roads. There are no traffic calming measures to slow speeding traffic down to the legal limit.	
Policy T5	777171	Mr Robin Baker		691	Objecting	Policy T5 - I write to object to the proposal in the draft local plan of using the pear orchards in Harbledown as the site of a Park and Ride terminus. The Harbledown valley is considered by Canterbury City Council, as an Area of High Landscape Value. To destroy it scenically and environmentally with the Park and Ride would be, in my view, both contradictory of the Council's own policy and an irresponsible act.	
Policy T5	777246	Dr Melanie Caiazza-Robinson		715	Objecting	I object to the pear orchards at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown for a fourth park and Ride site for Canterbury. I propose that an additional slip road be constructed in Wincheap, as an alternative plan, so that traffic can access the park and ride site there from the A2. This seems a more sensible option from a conservation and cost perspective. Please carefully consider the landscape value of our Harbledown area before it is too late! I strongly oppose this proposal.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	777253	Mr David Lurcock		718	Objecting	My objections to Policy T5: 1. Increased traffic through Rough Common and other villages. 2. The the construction cost of a substantial new road layout and cost of the construction of the Park & Ride facility. 3. A Park & Ride facility in a lovely area changing fields and orchards into concrete beggars belief. Build the 4th slip road at Wincheap not a 4th park & ride at Harbledown	
Policy T5	777430	Sir Cedric Delves		758	Objecting	Proposed "Park and Ride", to be sited at Faulkner's Lane: Policy T5. it will impact traffic flow of the A2, the A2050, and of course the residential areas of Harbledown/Rough Common. The safe option must be an expansion of the existing and successful Wincheap Park and Ride, with the added bonus that this would offer a much needed additional slip road from the A2 [a good thing in itself], relieving the pressure on the A2050,	
Policy T5	777527	Dr Noel Bridge		762	Objecting	Expansion of the Wincheap park and ride is much preferable to destruction of the greenfield site. Rough Common Road would probably suffer further congestion if a park and ride is built at Faulkner's Lane.	Rule out the Faulkner's Lane alternative!
Policy T5	775218	Mrs C L Sullivan		772	Objecting	Object to proposals for a Park and Ride at Harbledown	
Policy T5	111377	Miss D. R. Manley		800	Objecting	I oppose the inclusion in the local plan of a park and ride site at Faulkner's Lane. It is not necessary, as the Wincheap Park and Ride site could be expanded and made accessible from the A2. The pear orchards are beautiful and productive farmland, and once lost they will be gone forever. The Harbledown Valley is already recognised as an area of high landscape value, and a park and ride will destroy this.	
Policy T5	777426	J M Chapman		811	Objecting	Pear orchards at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown for a forth Park and Ride site for Canterbury (Policy T5) and object strongly to the proposal: Apart from increased traffic, there will also be irreversible loss of 'greenfield' farmland. - there will also be the need for an extensive and costly new road layout to accommodate large Park and Ride buses and the destruction of historical views which will harm the Harbledown conservation area.	
Policy T5	405197	Mr & Mrs Cook		813	Objecting	Object to possibility of a Park and Ride at Harbledown. Damage to the villages of Harbledown and Rough Common will be intolerable. Concerned about the following: oncrease in traffic, loss of farmland, damage to the Harbledown Valley recognised as AHLV and damage and loss of land from new roads and parking areas. Rough Common is already a rat race and this will become an impossible situation. The road is not suitable or safe.	
Policy T5	111645	Mrs B Golding		817	Objecting	Strong personal objection to development of a Park and Ride at Harbledown. My reasons are several and based on protecting the integrity of my village. However this particular point is most important and fundamental, over-riding all other issues: it would iniquitous to obliterate land and this is grade 1 farmland of which there will be eventually a shortage. Land, for growing food or biofuel in oucountry will become far more valuable than the commerce gained by accessibility for motor traffic.	Please withdraw this mistaken item from The Plan.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	776708	Mr & Mrs T Richardson		818	Objecting	We feel strongly against a new Park and Ride, being built, at Faulkner's Lane Harbledown. Reasons below. 1. Far too much of our lovely countryside being used for building. 2. Far too much traffic going through small villages, which are not able to cope with extra traffic. 3. If a new Park and Ride is needed, why was it not proposed to use the Old Barracks instead of houses.	If a new Park and Ride is needed, why was it not proposed to use the Old Barracks instead of houses.
Policy T5	122972	Mr. Norman Evans		819	Objecting	I object to planning proposal T5 on the following grounds. There is an objective to build A2 slips at Wincheap. Journey from Harbledown to Wincheap is 2 minutes which will make Harbledown obsolete. It would mean 3 park and ride sites accessible from A2 and only Sturry to serve Herne Bay and Whitstable - unbalanced. Waste of taxpayers money, unnecessary and motorists will not want to sit on a bus negotiating Rheims Way. Object to loss of agricultural land and blighting of Conservation Area.	
Policy T5	114986	Terry and Maureen Smith		820	Objecting	I would like to raise an objection to the proposed park and ride at Harbledown. Policy T5. Due to increased traffic, loss of one of the orchards would spoil the whole of an area which sits on the North Downs Way, the route of ancient pilgrims. There is an alternative if more room has to be made for parking, and that is at Wincheap, where there is already a park and ride, and also has easy access to the A2.	
Policy T5	777387	Dr C W Watson		824	Objecting	I am writing to object strongly to the proposal to develop a "Park and Ride" scheme in Harbledown. The proposal if it goes ahead will ruin an area of great natural beauty and adversely affect a landscape the existence of which enhances the quality of life of people who live in the surrounding area.	
Policy T5	777368	Mrs Vicky Balfour		829	Objecting	I vehemently oppose the proposal to build a 4th Park & Ride at Harbledown. The orchards in Hospital Farm are part of a farm which has been there for 1000 years since the foundation of the Hospital at St Nicholas Church. The farm is prime farming land. The farm is part of the Conservation area around the village. The park and ride would generate more traffic through the village. It would impact on the air quality for the children and staff at the school. The o	I implore you to alter this element of the plan (delete Polcy T5) and preserve a historic part of the area. Ironically, the orchards you plan to destroy are featured in the tourist brochure promoting Canterbury!
Policy T5	776866	Dr Rogerio De Lemos		832	Objecting	Objects to Harbledown Park and ride site because it will increase traffic in Highfield Close when people miss Rough Common Road. Drivers doing silly manoeuvres put the kids playing on the road at risk.	
Policy T5	777236	Mr & Mrs R J Taylor		833	Objecting	Object to Policy T5 because 1. The site is in a rural setting next to a school 2. It will mean crossing a busy junction, passing through Harbledown, or a new road layout 3. It will increase traffic in Harbledown, Rough Common and Chartham Hatch 4. It will spoil views 5. Is there a need for a 4th park and ride which is a waste of money. Consider other options at Dunkirk or Wincheap	We feel there are two less destructive options: a) Liaise with Swale Council to develop the disused air strip on the A2 at Dunkirk. b) Install a slip road off the A2 into the Wincheap Park and Ride and expand the existing site.
Policy T5	121925	Mr & Mrs D Meehan		838	Objecting	Object to Policy T5 it will increase traffic and buses in the villages, cost a lot for rerouting of roads, destroy farmland and views. The development could be done at Wincheap.	There is space in Wincheap for the park and ride and the only necessary change is the addition of a much needed 4th slip road that would actually relieve traffic from the A28 and Canterbury itself.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	777370	Mr Alistair Balfour		840	Objecting	I oppose to the proposal to build a fourth Park and Ride on the orchards at Hospital Farm in Harbledown. In my opinion the overwhelmingly obvious solution is to build a second slip road off the A2 at Wincheap, enabling drivers to use the existing Park and Ride scheme at Wincheap. Stop the destruction of prime farming land. Prevent the destruction of the conservation area and a valley in a Area of High Landscape Value.	
Policy T5	777568	Mr Mansell Jagger		864	Objecting	Development of this site would be unsustainable and conflict with the NPPF; with other Policies of the Local Plan and with adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance. The Council has produced no evidence to demonstrate an over-riding need that would outweigh the fundamental planning objections. There is no need to 'safeguard' this site since the Council would not give planning permission for any other development. Any allocation would need to be done in a Review of the Local Plan.	Delete Policy T5
Policy T5	85312	Mrs Janet Larkinson	Harbledown and Rough Common Parish Council	872	Objecting	I wish to object the strongest possible terms to Policy T5. In my view there is no justification for providing a park and ride site at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown. It is greenfield Grade 1 agricultural land. It adjoins the Harbledown Conservation area. The village is internationally known as part of Chaucer's pilgrim route to Canterbury and the site of the 11th century leper church of St Nicholas. A better solution is to increase the size of the Wincheap site and exit a new A2 slip road.	I ask that the park and ride scheme at Faulkner's Lane be removed from the draft Local Plan.
Policy T5	405428	Mrs Jane Edred Wright		873	Objecting	Object to Park and Ride at Harbledown. I remember when the old A" went through the village. causing accidents and preventing villagers crossing safely. Appalled the council would want to ruin beautiful countryside and direct traffic through a peaceful village. Areas of natural beauty are becoming scarcer and the P & R is not vital as it could be avoided by installing the fourth slip road to connect the Wincheap P & R.	
Policy T5	777705	Mr & Mrs R Bostock		877	Objecting	We object to the proposal for a park and ride in Harbledown. This seems to most unliking site to choose, causing the total unnecessary uproar for the following reasons: It is a greenfield site of farmland. The whole Conservation area in under threat. Cost incurred for a new road layout system and development of site. Increased traffic in Harbledown, Chartham, Rough Common and Blean. Expand the Wincheap park & ride and create a fourth slip road off the A2.	
Policy T5	777690	Mr Tim Burge		882	Objecting	Park and ride in Harbledown. The Westgate Tower scheme turned Rough Common into a rat run, and the traffic now is greatly increased ,coming exactly where you propose to complicate the junction at the bottom of Palmers Cross Hill. A 4th slip road at the Park and ride in Wincheap is the answer, and much cheaper. The 3rd slip has freed Wincheap from lorries coming from Ashford. The orchards are the epitome of the beauty that Kent has to offer and turning them into a car park is sacrilege	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	777701	Mr & Mrs D Gregory		883	Objecting	We oppose the keeping of the potential new park and ride site in Harbledown, in the Local Plan. A park and ride site here would have a significant detrimental effect on all of the three villages of our parish. If the park and ride is not needed now, then this proposal should be dropped entirely. I urge you to remove this policy from the Local Plan.	I urge you to remove this Policy T5 from the Local Plan.
Policy T5	777967	Mr Sidney Denham		888	Objecting	The need for a park and ride site in Harbledown has not been properly demonstrated and even if this need is proven, the Faulkners Lane is site is unsuitable because of the impact on the poor access roads through Harbledown and Chartham Hatch. The possible adverse health impact caused by siting a busy car park next to a school seems to have been ignored and the permanent destruction of Grade 1 farming land in a designated area of high landscape value is not acceptable.	The expansion of the Wincheap site and the construction of the additional slip road from the A2.
Policy T5	777525	Miss Lydia Jackson		910	Objecting	Objects to policy T5 . The park and ride would increase traffic in a village where traffic speeds already make it unsafe for children and dog walkers. Bus frequencies should be increased. The conservation area and Harbledown Valley should be respected and preserved.	Increase the frequency of buses instead making it easier for people to get to work without cars.Â
Policy T5	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1047	Objecting	POLICY T5: I object most strongly to safeguarding land at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown for a Park and Ride site. The land is Grade 1 agricultural land with highly productive pear orchards. It would damage the landscape (Area of High Landscape Value), and harm the setting of the Harbledown Conservation Area. It would result in significant increases in traffic flows through residential areas.	
Policy T5	777481	Mr John Murphy		1085	Objecting	Please register my objection to Policy T5.	
Policy T5	778435	D T Standen		1102	Objecting	I strongly object to your Policy T5 in the Draft Local Plan for the Park and Ride in Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown.	
Policy T5	778067	Mr Rory Kehoe		1158	Objecting	Object to proposals for a Park and Ride at Harbledown	In no particular order, why can't some of these ideas be adopted? 1. Convert the old garden centre in Upper Harbledown into a small P&R. 2. Build an underground car park under the Victoria Road playing field. 3. Work with UKC to share/expand parking on their campus, which is already well served by buses 4. Build an A2/B2068 slip road and put in P&R at the end of Merton Lane on the site of the scrap yard. 5. Build a small A2 P&R on the site of the burned out diner, adjacent to the Texaco filling station.
Policy T5	778042	Ms Carol Bolton		1168	Objecting	Object to 4th Park and Ride site at Faulker's Lane, Harbledown.I am appalled that consideration is being given to establishing a Park and Ride facility on a prime greenfield site located in an area of outstanding beauty when extending the existing Wincheap Park and Ride site is the most obvious solution.Spending money creating new road layouts for a Park and Ride site at Harbledown when public opinion for years has shown demand for a new slip road at Wincheap is ludicrous.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	778044	Ms Rosemary Flower		1171	Objecting	Object to park and ride site at Harbledown for the following reason: loss of viable orchard; proximity to Harbledown Conservation Area and Bigbury ironage fort; impact on views from Pilgrims Way; bus journey from the wincheap site is half that from the proposed site at Harbledown; volume of traffic will not be reduced (much of it is school traffic) and there will be an increase in traffic through Rough Common and Harbledown.	
Policy T5	777484	Mr Ivan Phillips		1430	Objecting	A park and ride in Harbledown will lead to more congestion on rural roads.This is a very traditional Kentish area and the historic views from North Downs Way, Pilgrim's Way and Golden Hill must be preserved. The Harbledown valley is an Area of High Landscape Value.	
Policy T5	121858	Ms A Knight		1433	Objecting	I am writing to object to Policy T5 in the draft Canterbury District Local Plan. The very special features of the Harbledown area are an asset to Canterbury and will be ruined if this misguided plan goes ahead. Any Park and Ride scheme should be based on a brownfield site.	
Policy T5	405195	Mr John Earl		1449	Objecting	I am writing to object to Planning Policy T5 - Proposed fourth Park & Ride site at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown. There would be an irreversible loss of highly productive 'greenfield' farmland. An unacceptable increase in traffic in Rough Common, Upper Harbledown and Chartham Hatch. Costly new road layout.The Harbledown valley is currently in an Area of High Landscape Value.	
Policy T5	122883	Ms Cynthia Short		1453	Objecting	I am writing to record my objections to the proposal to build a fourth Park and Ride site in Faulkner's Lane in Harbledown. I dread the increased traffic such a scheme will bring. I deplore the destruction of first class agricultural land in Harbledown to build a parking site.	
Policy T5	777544	Robin Ross-Hunt		1457	Objecting	There is a far better site than Faulkner's Lane and that is to expand Wincheap Park and Ride and build the missing slip road on the A2. The resulting damage done to historic Harbledown if this should go ahead escapes me. The infrastructure already exists at Wincheap.	
Policy T5	777644	Ken & Margaret Griffin		1462	Objecting	We strongly object to the proposal for a new Park and Ride scheme at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown. It will cause ever more congestion. It would destroy highly productive greenfield farmland, spoil historic beautiful views and would be harmful to the Harbledown Conservation Area. We believe that expanding the Wincheap Park and Ride site would be less expensive even when installing a fourth slip road for access from the A2 - this latter is long overdue anyway.	
Policy T5	777645	Ms Gayle Collins		1487	Objecting	I strongly object to the proposed park and Ride threat in Harbledown. The country lanes are already busy enough. I fear the Park and Ride would destroy habitat for wild animals and birds.	
Policy T5	777646	Irene & John Robson		1489	Objecting	We very strongly object to the proposal to a fourth park and ride at Harbledown. The Harbledown valley is in an Area of High Landscape Value. Irreversible loss of highly productive greenfield farmland. Costly new road layout Increased traffic. The site adjoins the Harbledown Conservation Area.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	117506	Mr. A. R. Finn		1492	Objecting	I wish to object to the proposed Park and Ride at Harbledown on the following grounds:- 1. This is a greenfield site and the soil in this field is Grade 1 which is the best category of soil in the UK and very rare. 2. It is an area of high landscape value incorporating traditional East Kent orchards surrounded by woodland. 3. The roads from Rough Common, Upper Harbledown and Chartham Hatch are not up to the increased traffic levels that will ensue.	
Policy T5	777988	Mr & Mrs E Turner		1496	Objecting	We have a very strong objection to a Park and Ride in this area as it will increase vehicles plus pollution and make life even more intolerable. We therefore object to Policy T5 100%+	
Policy T5	778350	Dr David Clarke		1576	Objecting	Re: Harbledown Park and Ride. Policy T5. I would like to object to the above proposal. The obvious sequelae of increased traffic in Harbledown coupled with the loss of grade 1 agricultural land and the destruction of beautiful historic views will make Canterbury, and Harbledown in particular, a less attractive place to live.	
Policy T5	778189	Mr Geoffrey Bolton		1586	Objecting	I object to the proposed park and ride scheme to be sited at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown. This site is totally in the wrong place on many counts, the two most important being: The proposed site is on prime agricultural land in an area of outstanding natural beauty. It is totally in the wrong place geographically being too far removed from the city centre.	
Policy T5	124149	Mr. Christopher Date		1608	Objecting	Objects to policy T5 Harbledown Park and ride site because: it is prime agricultural land; there is no case for a 4th park and ride; the new road layout will compromise the quality of the landscape, conservation area and historic sites; build an A2 slip and increase the park and ride at Wincheap.	Build an A2 slip and increase the park and ride facilities at Wincheap
Policy T5	778482	Mr & Mrs T J & A Pearce		1619	Objecting	Object to policy T5 Harbledown park and ride because: of the unspoilt rural AHLV; an alternative site at Wincheap; destruction of historic views; light pollution; loss of high quality land; traffic impacts on Rough Common, Upper Harbledown, Harbledown and Chartham Hatch.	Add the slip road off the A2 at Wincheap and expand the current Park and Ride Site.
Policy T5	778479	Mr & Mrs Alan Antill		1623	Objecting	Object to Policy T5 Harbledown park and ride because: Rough Common is a rat race with speeding traffic; would be surplus as passengers would hardly sit down; Brenley corner would be a better location and not take traffic through Rough Common.	Brenley corner would be a better option.
Policy T5	122808	Ms Angela Graham		1653	Objecting	I have concerns regarding a 4th park-and-ride at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown. It would mean the cost of sacrificing highly productive farmland and destroying a unique piece of countryside which is part of the historic landscape. I am concerned about the impact of increased traffic. The proposed site is also adjacent to a boarding school for primary age children and bringing large numbers of strangers close to the school as well as the lighting, traffic etc. is unacceptable and dangerous.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	415836	Ms Gillian Wright		1666	Objecting	I object to Policy T5 for the following reasons: the increased traffic in the villages close to the proposed 4th Park & Ride site (Harbledown, Rough Common, Upper Harbledown and Chartham Hatch) will be both detrimental and dangerous to the residents the cost of the extensive new road layout required to get traffic into and buses out of the site, especially as the current projected costings are at least five years out of date the irreversible destruction of a large area of	
Policy T5	423648	Mrs G L Jagger		1677	Objecting	I strongly object to Policy T5 for the following reasons :1. There is no evidence to demonstrate that a further park and ride site will be needed in Canterbury within the Plan period 2. It would be unsustainable and conflict with Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. 3. It would conflict with previous planning decisions and the Council's own adopted SPG4. The Council has produced no evidence of need. 5. There is no need to 'safeguard' this site.	Delete Policy T5 from the draft local plan, together with all the supporting text.
Policy T5	117495	Mr Leonard Rea		1689	Objecting	I wish to record my objections to Policy T5: (i) Creation of chronic traffic (ii) Destruction of valuable and highly productive farmland. (iii) Costly new road layout, congestion (iv) Desecration of historical landscape (v) The proposal would result in the entrapment of foul air pollution (vi) Be contrary to the grounds which led to the creation of the Harbledown Conservation Area. (vii) Unnecessarily duplicate the 4th, westbound slip road, off the A2 n (viii) Add to congestion on the Rheims Way	
Policy T5	778404	Mr & Mrs PW & IM Sayer		1904	Objecting	Objects to park and ride at Harbledown because: Loss of Grade 1 farmland see article on food supplies; more traffic in Upper Harbledown, Harbledown, Chartham Hatch and Rough Common; buses would require significant improvements to road system; loss of scenic value, landscape and history. Put in the new slip road and park and ride at Wincheap.	Increase the size of the Wincheap Park & Ride site and construct the "slip road" instead.
Policy T5	114813	Mrs D Swann		1954	Objecting	Objection to Policy T5 for the following reasons : This land is a highly productive Greenfield farmland, which would be completely lost.The Harbledown Valley is in an Area of High Landscape Value. Increased traffic in ALL surrounding areas. Also the cost of any new road layouts would surely be considerable?	
Policy T5	422103	Mr and Mrs Stuart and Gill Smith		1988	Objecting	We wish to object to Policy T5 on the following grounds: 1. Destruction of very valuable and increasingly rare Grade 1 agricultural land.2. Destruction of landscape heritage close to a medieval village and an ancient historical site. 3. Costly new road 4. Previous planning applications have been refused 5. No evidence that more park & ride capacity needed. 6) The effect of light and air pollution on the adjacent schools.7.Increase traffic and pollution for the residents of the wider Canterbury.	
Policy T5	122957	Ms Joan Cuthbert		2033	Objecting	I object to Policy T5.In Faulkner's Lane, there is a nursery and primary school, which will be close to cars moving in the area, and fumes from engines. There is productive 'greenfield' land for farming, required for today, in the future and should be preserved.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	779313	Prowse Michael		2069	Objecting	The most frustrating un-user-friendly way of submitting comments I have ever seen. Is it deliberately designed to make commenting virtually impossible? In summary the proposal is unsuitable for the site identified, which is a great historic, visual and productive amenity, that provides employment and enjoyment to the local area. There is no proven or demonstrable need for the facility. Any need for more parking should be met by a small expansion of existing sites and an E-bound A2 Wincheap slip	The proposal should be deleted from the local plan and a statement made that it is "off the table" for any future plans. Any increase in P&R should be on existing sites and a new slip road east-bound from the A2 should be built at Wincheap to facilitate this
Policy T5	121447	K P Poole		2217	Objecting	I suggest that Policy T5 be abandoned, for the following reasons: the land is of high grade agricultural value, and ought to be preserved; would encourage growth of traffic along the residential Rough Common Road and the road from Chartham Hatch which are unsuitable for heavy use; it would also detract from an area of high landscape value; widening of Faulkner's Lane would be necessary, together with junction alterations and traffic lights; more traffic congestion at London Road and Rheims Way.	Thought might, if need be, be given to constructing a new park and ride site on the road between Canterbury and Whitstable, from which at the present time there is no convenient access to an existing site.
Policy T5	778766	Mr & Mrs J H & M A Shaw		2263	Objecting	We object to Policy T5 due to further increase in traffic within the area, degradation of the historic Kent countryside and the views across the valley from Golden Hill and loss of prime agricultural land. The aims and objectives of protecting the AONB and the conservation area disagree with the consequences of building a Park and Ride at Harbledown.	We propose that Policy T5 is removed from the CDLP Preferred Option Draft Consultation 2013.
Policy T5	778710	Jean & Alan Thomas		2283	Objecting	Object to Policy T5 because: 1. Increase in traffic to Rough Common 2. Better, cheaper sites available. 3. Expensive road layout changes. 4. Upgrade Wincheap park and ride and additional slip road is more sensible solution.	Upgrade Wincheap park and ride and additional slip road
Policy T5	778690	Dr William Carey		2305	Objecting	Objects to Harbledown Park and Ride because: it is a beautiful, historic area with small roads; it will cause excessive traffic; building additional roads. It would be better to expand the Wincheap one.	Expand Wincheap park and ride.
Policy T5	778755	Mr Richard Williams		2311	Objecting	I do not accept that there is a need for a park and ride at Harbledown. I am concerned about impact on traffic and also because the site is right next to Vernon Holme school. Also concerns over conservation are and loss of agricultural land.	
Policy T5	778659	Ms Sarah Watson		2312	Objecting	Objects to Harbledown Park and Ride on green belt when there are brownfield sites. Alternatives include; Building the A2/A28 slip road at Wincheap; the garden centre at Upper Harbledown; the old airfield by the gate services; under Victoria Rd playing fields; at UKC, Merton Lane at the scrap yard, Adjacent to Texaco Filling Stn on A2. Agrees with Parish Council's objection.	Alternatives include; Building A2/A28 slip road at Wincheap; the garden centre at Upper Harbledown; the old airfield by the gate services; under Victoria Rd playing fields; at UKC, Merton Lane at the scrap yard, Adjacent to Texaco Filling Stn on A2.Â
Policy T5	778651	Ms Margaret Wilson		2316	Objecting	Objects to policy T5 because: will destroy orchards; is an AHLV, near and iron age hill fort and Pilgrims Way; increased traffic through Harbledown, Chartham Hatch and Rough Common; the cost would escalate; not thought about lighting and security. Extend Wincheap park and ride and A2 slip.	Extend Wincheap park and ride and A2 slip.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	777993	Ms A Finn		2318	Objecting	Objects to policy T5 because: there is no evidence that it is needed; use of grade 1 agricultural land; is by Kent College junior school; no environmental study has been carried out on Cranbourne stream; it is near, Pilgrims way, Bigbury, Golden Hill and St Nicholas Church and the conservation area; ruin views and AHLV; there is already heavy traffic through Harbledown, Upper Harbledown, Chartham Hatch and Rough Common; Is a retrograde step; Install missing slip and Wincheap and use this site.	Install missing slip and Wincheap and use this site.
Policy T5	778802	Mr B Church		2350	Objecting	I say NO to Park and Ride in Harbledown All roads this side of the proposed site are already cut throughs and Bigbury road would be most unsuitable to large vehicle traffic. Beautiful views would be lost for ever and as we have to put up with foreign lorries that have lost their way we are totally against POLICY T5.	
Policy T5	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2445	Objecting	Spokes does not support this policy and wants it removed. Reason: Park and Rides increase car use in the district nor do they help walking and cycling. Park and Rides also generate more cross city journeys contrary to Policy T1. Also:LTP 2006-2016 is almost out of date. Thinking has altered post 2007/8. 2. P&Rs and car parks are under used; 3. Much of the congestion is caused by commuters and the school run, tending not to use the P&R; 4. It would cost less to improve cycling facilities.	
Policy T5	779144	Mr V King		2457	Objecting	Objects to Harbledown park and ride in Harbledown. The wrong place and unnecessary.	
Policy T5	778864	Mr & Mrs Oscar & Edna Ring		2486	Objecting	We wish to object to the proposed site for the Harbledown park and ride. Users of the P&Ride would have to cut up Hatch lane/Bigberry Lane for access. These lanes are too narrow to accommodate passing of two vehicles in opposite directions and lorries/tractors frequently get stuck. We object to loss of productive farmland and destruction of historical views. Finally, these roads frequently become impassable during heavy snow making the P&R inaccessible to local people which defeats the object!	It would make far more sense to insert the missing 4th slip road at Wincheap so traffic can access via A2.
Policy T5	778953	Mr Neil Fenn		2508	Objecting	Object to proposals for a Park and Ride at Harbledown as it will increase traffic and result in more accidents.	
Policy T5	779093	Mrs J M Bradley		2517	Objecting	Object to proposals for a Park and Ride at Harbledown as minor roads around Chartham Hatch are not suitable for heavy traffic.	
Policy T5	778874	Mrs Elaine Harrington		2541	Objecting	I object to the Draft Local Plan earmarking the pear orchard at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown, for a fourth Park and Ride site for Canterbury (Policy T5) To install the long awaited 4th slip road at Wincheap would undoubtedly be the less destructive and preferred option. to use the existing Park and Ride, reducing the further impact of traffic and pollution in Harbledown, Rough Common, Chartham Hatch, London Road and the surrounding area.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	778882	Mr Chas Harrington		2544	Objecting	This proposal would seriously increase general traffic through the rural areas of Chartham Hatch, Harbledown, Rough Common, and also include Reims Way and London road. Along with all the additional buses that would be needed to serve the proposed Park and Ride this would considerably add to the air pollution. Installing a the slip road and expanding the Wincheap P&R would mean no need for more buses on our local roads, and traffic would be kept to a minimum through our rural areas.	
Policy T5	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2577	Objecting	What we do need in Canterbury are: A way to remove traffic from the centre of town - I wonder if making the junction to the A2 at Harbledown 4-way (i.e. You could leave canterbury to travel in the dover direction and you could leave the A2 from the dover direction to exit for Canterbury) would relieve the town of some traffic. Those people who would typically come from S Canterbury to get to the north (the uni, blean, sturry road, whitstable), could then exit the A2 at Harbledown and vice versa	
Policy T5	778858	Mrs & Mr Norma & Cyril Brooker & Burley-Balfour		2592	Objecting	We object to Policy T5 - park & ride at Harbledown	
Policy T5	779128	Mr Neil Morris		2657	Objecting	I object to a Park and Ride facility on orchard land at Faulkner's Lane Harbledown. It is an Area of High Landscape Value, it would also blight the views and 'feel' of the final miles of the North downs Way long distance footpath and inflict its presence upon the nearby Iron-Age Hillfort at Bigbury.	
Policy T5	124129	Ms Erica Dowse		2689	Objecting	Have all City Council Members visited the proposed Park and Ride site and surrounding areas and not observed that this one if of Outstanding Natural Beauty in Kent. It is adjacent to the conservation area which adds to the permanent destruction and disfigurement of our beautiful countryside.I add my name to all those who object most strongly to this Park and Ride Proposal.	Please find and use your powers with determination and integrity to find an alternative site that will not cause profound unhappiness to the residents.
Policy T5	779346	Glenda Flanagan		2795	Objecting	Object to proposals for a Park and Ride at Harbledown. It would increase traffic though the surrounding villages; and result in the loss of agricultural and greenfield land.	
Policy T5	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2876	Objecting	Policy T5 provides for a safeguarding with regard to a possible additional P&R site at Harbledown. No logical plan is proposed in respect of the purpose of the P&R sites, the relative weight to be afforded to each in respect of the purpose they serve, the gravity of traffic inbound to the City. It is unclear why this safeguarding is a better solution to the provision of P&R than the expansion of existing sites, where the cost of bus related infrastructure is already expended.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	780297	Mr Paul McKeen		3075	Objecting	Objects Harbledown park and ride because: the area is an AONB, a clam rural village; A park and ride would ruin the feel of the place, increasing traffic and pollution; the historic Pilgrims Way route; need soemthing to help traffic in Canterbury but not a 4th park and ride; it is only 1 junction to Wincheap where there is already a scheme; come and see the orchard with its stream and wildlife; the site needs to be maintained unspoilt; please do not ruin thie piece of timeless countryside.	
Policy T5	779916	Mrs Gillian Smith		3247	Objecting	I am writing regarding my objection and concerns regarding the proposal for a 4th Park and Ride at Harbledown. If the Park and Ride goes ahead the volume of traffic will be increased in Rough Common and the surrounding area. The cost of building this will be very expensive and will blight the area for ever with the loss of historic views and will harm the setting of the Harbledown Conservation Area.	A far better less destructive alternative, if deemed necessary, would be to expand the Wincheap Park and Ride site and to build the fourth missing slip road so that traffic can access it from the A2.
Policy T5	408268	Ms Beatrice Shire		3249	Objecting	I wish to object to the continuing mention of an 'additional' P&R site at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown (PolicyT5). The site is utterly unsuitable for P&R for many reasons - proximity to infant and junior school; loss of agricultural land; runoff into the Cranbourne; proximity to Conservation Area; air pollution; encourage rat-running through Rough Common and Chartham.A Park and Ride in Harbledown would cause environmental destruction in a conservation area and in surrounding villages.	An alternative is a better/cheaper bus service for local people and for tourists the expansion of the existing Wincheap P&R with access from the A2 using a 4th slip road at Wincheap, much cheaper and simpler to build than a P&R in Harbledown.
Policy T5	121765	Mr & Mrs Loane		3305	Objecting	I write to express our strongest objections to the proposal for a fourth Park and Ride, at Faulkener's Lane, Harbledown, for the following reason - loss of pear orchard and farmland; impact on Blean Woods, historic sites and Conservation Area; traffic congestion. Already have a Park & Ride operational in the area.	
Policy T5	117499	Mr A Cooke		3308	Objecting	I wish to object to planning policy T5 - loss of farmland; destruction of habitats; increased pollution and traffic. The ideal place for this park and ride is at the Wincheap site, and the building of a "missing" slip road.	The ideal place for this park and ride is at the Wincheap site, and the building of a "missing" slip road. The council should opt for that option.
Policy T5	780456	Mr Rory White		3353	Objecting	Sturry/Broad Oak railway crossings - The building of a bridge over the railway line (part of a by-pass plan for over 60 years) would be a welcome development, however, but as an addition to, not a replacement for, the two crossings at Sturry and Shelford.	
Policy T5	121820	Mrs IVD Baker		3422	Objecting	Delete policy T5 because; no evidence 800 spaces are needed in any documentation; plan provides extra spaces with expansion to existing sites; no evidence an alternative site is needed; would cause harm to grade 1 farmland, historic views, pilgrims Way, an AHLV, listed buildings and a scheduled monument, by hard surfacing, light, traffic, noise, pollution; apply same criteria as Whitstable P&R, scores low; alternative sites not considered; unsound; don't safeguard do via planning application.	Please delete Policy T5 from the Plan, as it is unsound and unjustified.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	780828	Mr Jeremy D I Baker		3426	Objecting	Delete policy T5 because; no evidence 800 spaces are needed in any documentation; plan provides extra spaces with expansion to existing sites; no evidence an alternative site is needed; would cause harm to grade 1 farmland, historic views, pilgrims Way, an AHLV, listed buildings and a scheduled monument, by hard surfacing, light, traffic, noise, pollution; apply same criteria as Whitstable P&R, scores low; alternative sites not considered; unsound; don't safeguard do via planning application.	Please delete Policy T5 from the Plan, as it is unsound and unjustified.
Policy T5	121830	Mr MJR Baker		3427	Objecting	Delete policy T5 because; no evidence 800 spaces are needed in any documentation; plan provides extra spaces with expansion to existing sites; no evidence an alternative site is needed; would cause harm to grade 1 farmland, historic views, pilgrims Way, an AHLV, listed buildings and a scheduled monument, by hard surfacing, light, traffic, noise, pollution; apply same criteria as Whitstable P&R, scores low; alternative sites not considered; unsound; don't safeguard do via planning application.	Please delete Policy T5 from the Plan, as it is unsound and unjustified.
Policy T5	780827	Mr M P J Baker		3429	Objecting	Delete policy T5 because; no evidence 800 spaces are needed in any documentation; plan provides extra spaces with expansion to existing sites; no evidence an alternative site is needed; would cause harm to grade 1 farmland, historic views, pilgrims Way, an AHLV, listed buildings and a scheduled monument, by hard surfacing, light, traffic, noise, pollution; apply same criteria as Whitstable P&R, scores low; alternative sites not considered; unsound; don't safeguard do via planning application.	Please delete Policy T5 from the Plan, as it is unsound and unjustified.
Policy T5	780740	Mr Chris Lambert		3431	Objecting	Object to policy T5a 4th Park and Ride Faulkner's Lane. Object to the impact on local area eg an increase in traffic, disruption and huge costs required to road infrastructure. Devt on greenfield site, loss of habitat to wildlife, destruction of the beautiful area and views of the North Down; proximity to school; need additional slip road at Wincheap for London traffic. Has there been any survey of delivery numbers to Wincheap estate. Need new slip and extended P&R at Wincheap	
Policy T5	780651	Mr Kevin Bown	Asset Manager Area 4 (Kent) Highways Agency	3539	Supporting	This policy seek to safeguard land for Park and Ride facilities. The HA welcomes measures such as Park and Ride provided that they do not have an unacceptable impact on the safety and reliability of the SRN. The HA will therefore require information in the transport evidence base and Infrastructure Plan as to the potential impact, individually and cumulatively, of any proposed or expanded Park and Ride provision on the SRN, and the delivery of any necessary mitigation.	The HA will therefore require information in the transport evidence base and Infrastructure Plan as to the potential impact, individually and cumulatively, of any proposed or expanded Park and Ride provision on the SRN, and the delivery of any necessary mitigation.
Policy T5	406328	Mr Daniel Smith		3568	Objecting	Object to proposals for a Park and Ride at Harbledown because: the idea has been democratically rejected by residents in the past and the reasons for this remain valid; it is grade 1 agricultural land; additional P&R spaces would be better catered for by improving existing facilities at Wincheap (including access from A2); it will damage an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and RSPB woods; and destroy a tourist attraction (Harbledown approach is mentioned in the Canterbury Tales).	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	121368	Ms Helen Williams		3744	Objecting	Object to proposals for a Park and Ride at Harbledown because; it is next to a conservation area; the infrastructure costs would outweigh any benefit; and there is an alternative solution nearby - the Wincheap Park and Ride.	
Policy T5	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4019	Objecting	Object to Harbledown park and ride because: speculative safeguarding blights an area; no identified need; goes against Council policy; would create pollution, noise & light; grade 1 agricultural land; north kent plain/fruit belt; AHLV; conservation area adjacent; apply assessment criteria; previous applications have been refused due to impact on landscape. Delete policy and text.	Delete Policy T5
Policy T5	781005	Mrs A Stevens		4077	Objecting	Policy T5 - To build a park and ride site in Harbledown is ridiculous. This eyesore is to be built adjoining a conservation area. The fertile, rich soil there would be lost forever. Also a new junction would cause more traffic problems within the area.	
Policy T5	122929	Prof. Thomas Sears		4091	Objecting	I completely oppose Policy T5. In particular it will destroy the tranquillity of the unique views from both the Iron Age Bigbury Fort and from one of the only two surviving Lepers' Churches in England, at St.Nicholas's Hospital. Moreover valuable Grade1 farmland would inevitably and irreversibly be destroyed by a development. It would also cause additional traffic problems in the area.	
Policy T5	780981	Mr David Adley		4237	Objecting	I believe that building a fourth park and ride on the pear orchards at Faulkner's Lane will yet again further destroy our beautiful countryside and place a blot on the landscape for local residents and tourists who frequent the North Downs Way. It will also constitute a further loss of our farmland. What I fail to understand is why the Wincheap park and ride site cannot be expanded and the missing fourth slip road installed to allow motorists entering Canterbury to access this site from the A2.	
Policy T5	781011	Richard & Elaine Caraccio		4290	Objecting	We strongly object to Policy T5. We are opposed to the building of the 4th Park and Ride in Harbledown.	
Policy T5	781051	Mrs J E Batchelor		4305	Objecting	I strongly object to the proposed fourth Park and Ride site being Faulkner's Lane. Harbledown, for the following reasons: 1. The increase in traffic to Rough Common Road would be disastrous. It is bad enough now and would be just another rat run. 2. The cost for new road layout is not acceptable, which as rate payers we do not need. 3. Loss of countryside and greenfields.	
Policy T5	781166	Pamela & Michael Harvey & Woods		4310	Objecting	A Park and Ride site in Faulkner's Lane would desecrate an area of outstanding natural beauty as well as destroying acres of grade 1 agricultural land. I find it incredible that the City Council can even contemplate such destruction in a conservation area just outside the city boundaries. Public meetings have revealed passionate objections from residents of Harbledown, Upper Harbledown, Blean, Chartham Hatch and Rough Common. The current proposals are unacceptable.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	780849	Mr Michael Watts		4312	Objecting	I am writing to object to and express my deep concern at the proposals to site a further Park and Ride car park at this location, because of its impact on an area of high landscape value. The only sensible location for additional parking facilities on the western / south-western perimeter of the city, should they indeed be warranted, is on the Wincheap Industrial Estate.	The only sensible location for additional parking facilities on the western / south-western perimeter of the city, should they indeed be warranted, is on the Wincheap Industrial Estate.
Policy T5	122979	Ms Joanna Fassum		4473	Objecting	Object to Park and Ride at Harbledown. Is it actually required? It would increase traffic in Rough Common, Harbledown, Upper Harbledown, and Chartham Hatch, widening roads would spoil the villages, agricultural land should be kept for agricultural use, would ruin beautiful and historic views. It is shocking the Council deem it appropriate to put a Park & Ride adjoining the Harbledown Conservation Area and visible from both the 11th Century Church at St Nicholas Hospital and the Iron Age Fort.	
Policy T5	781317	R A Heart		4519	Objecting	The conception of a Park and Ride in Harbledown is appalling. The extra traffic in the countryside would greatly harm the living of many residents and greatly affect a very special conservation area.	
Policy T5	780838	Miss E J Nevell		4526	Objecting	Object to Policy T5, Harbledown Park and Ride, because: It would be an eyesore and out of keeping; an AHLV; loss of Grade 1 greenfield agricultural land; destruction of views from Golden Hill and Pilgrims Way; impact on conservation area; environmental impacts from runoff and light pollution; increases in parking outside of the site; increased traffic in adjacent villages; need for costly road infrastructure; extend wincheap and build A2 slip.	Delete Policy T5 from the Draft Local Plan, together with all supporting text.
Policy T5	781407	Chris & Maggie Smith		4582	Objecting	Object to proposals for a new Park and Ride at Harbledown because it would result in the loss of prime agricultural land, the Vernon Holme Junior School is nearby and already on a hazardous road, the conclusion of a public enquiry (1988) was to prevent any increase in traffic that would use Faulkner's Lane, the site is within an AONB of which the North Downs Way is a tourist attraction and it would impact on the wellbeing on adults, children, pets and village life.	Firstly, I would like to offer another much much more realistic and less expensive option that makes perfect sense to any of the people I've mentioned it to. It would involve your council negotiating with the University of Kent but surely a venture that is jointly 'town and gown' could be nothing but valuable to Canterbury as a whole. There is a huge need on campus for additional parking for staff and even the possibility of paid parking for those students who travel in by car. The usage of a car park on campus would be heavy during the week but non-existent at the weekends. The majority of car parking need in Canterbury is at weekends and less so in the week. There is untold car parking space on the University of Kent campus at weekends which could easily be used by those visitors to Canterbury. Also, if it is desirable to have all week parking, an additional car park is put on campus there it could be shared by the university and as a park and ride for Canterbury. How many people visiting Canterbury ever get to see the beauty of the campus on the hill and that fantastic view.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
							This could be a totally positive addition to the whole area. Secondly, I have seen in the city of Perpignan a wonderful underground car park in the city which caters for many cars and above it is a social, community space for the city to have events. Difficult to conceive of where this could be placed in a walled city like Canterbury but maybe using one of the existing car parks, it would be possible to dig underneath, this is a much more expensive option but could be put to excellent use in the future. Thirdly, could more land be purchased or built on at Hall Place, part of the Canterbury Christchurch University campus. Again, there is an obvious need for more car parking for them, judging by the number of staff and student cars parked opposite Hopebourne on the road in Harbledown during term time. Again, such a car park could be shared by the University and the City. It seems to me that cooperation is the answer to this problem.
Policy T5	781020	Ms Cathy Sales		4619	Supporting	A park and ride to the north of the city at Harbledown for visitors coming from London and at the new development site on the A257 would also be useful. There is little benefit in building a second park and ride on the A2 as the train stations and road to London are in other parts of the city.	
Policy T5	781034	Mr John Charter		4632	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for a new Park and Ride at Harbledown because it would destroy the route into Canterbury that has historic associations with the 'Pilgrim's Way' as well as being in an Area of High Landscape Value.	
Policy T5	781039	Mrs Margaret King		4635	Objecting	Object to the development proposals for a new Park and Ride at Harbledown because it will increase traffic in Rough Common, Harbledown and Chartham Hatch, result in the loss of prime agricultural land and historic views of the North Downs Way and Pilgrim's Way, have an impact on an Area of High Landscape Value and the setting of the Harbledown Conservation Area, and be expensive to deliver.	
Policy T5	121960	Dr A Teresa Hankey		4654	Objecting	Object to development proposals for a new Park and Ride at Harbledown because it would result in the loss of greenfield and prime agricultural land in an Area of High Landscape Value, impact on the setting of the Harbledown Conservation Area, entail a longer bus service into the Canterbury, require expensive and extensive modifications to the existing road layout to carry the extra cars and buses and increase traffic passing the Vernon Holme School as well as through Rough Common	
Policy T5	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4716	Objecting	Policy T5 We take issue with the fact that a new P&R is needed at Harbledown, which is within one mile of another P&R designed to serve the same inflows of traffic, coming from the London direction on the A2. It is also inappropriately located next to a school and a conservation area.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	124122	Mrs. V Gore		4720	Objecting	I am also against the Park and Ride possibility at Harbledown, for the following reasons: a) It is agricultural land Grade 1. and the above explanations against using such land, apply again here. b) With a slip road put into place at Wincheap, only a very short distance away, there would be absolutely NO Reason for a site at Harbledown even if land were found which is not good quality agricultural land.	
Policy T5	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4885	Objecting	Unconvinced of the need to retain the reserve Park and Ride site at Harbledown for Canterbury; given that the other three existing facilities all have the capacity to expand. This alongside the potential to arrest an ever growing demand for parking by implementing a more integrated transport system should introduce a degree of stability in Canterbury's demand for parking.	
Policy T5	781927	Ms Ruth Harling		4921	Objecting	I wish to object to proposed Harbledown Park and Ride. It is obvious that eventually the fourth slip road will have to be built, so why not use the money to do it now and then use the existing Park and Ride at Wincheap. This works very efficiently, and there wouldn't be so many extra buses needed as when creating a new site. It would ruin the approach to Canterbury on the A2 side, and tourists won't want to visit Canterbury if you take away its charm. Unhappy if the fields were concreted over.	
Policy T5	781934	Mrs Janette Edis		4926	Objecting	Object. The proposal to put a Park and Ride at Harbledown can only spoil a beautiful area of highly productive farmland which has been here for centuries. At present the views across the orchards are unique and this is an Area of High Landscape Value. A much better alternative would be to make the slip road off the A2 at Wincheap and extend the present Park and Ride. This would be a much cheaper option and would upset the smallest number of the public.	
Policy T5	781042	Mr David Shire		4932	Objecting	Object to the proposals for a new Park and Ride at Harbledown because it would result in the loss of prime agricultural land and a historical approach to the city, the approach roads would not be able to cope with the additional traffic, it fails to 'provide a less environmentally friendly alternative to the private car' as in order to get a cheap bus ride the public need to get into their cars first; and the whole consultation processes has been a farce.	
Policy T5	782031	Dr P W L Clough		4964	Objecting	Object to Park and Ride at Harbledown. The misuse of the work 'safeguarding' is indicative since it would destroy the local environment. It would remove valuable orchards; be incompatible with aim of maintaining sensitive landscape area; would destroy enrie environment of Harbledown; Incare traffic flows in Harbledown, Rough Common and Chartham Hatch and be unnecessarily expensive given there are alternatives including expansion of Wincheap Park and Ride.	
Policy T5	781938	Ms Vicky Whiting		4998	Objecting	I am writing to strongly voice my objection to the proposed Park & Ride in Harbledown. Tarmac over an ancient pear orchard in an area of outstanding natural beauty?? There are alternative including the derelict car park at Upper Harbledown and also I believe Wincheap.	There are alternative including the derelict car park at Upper Harbledown and also I believe Wincheap.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	781946	Kerstin & Helmut Zahn		4999	Objecting	Strongly object to the planned Park and Ride in Harbledown -increased traffic flow in all the surrounding villages -irreversible loss of greenfield farmland - costly new road layout -destruction of historical North Downs/Pilgrims way - visible from conservation area with highly important historical value -Area of High Landscape Value Besides all this there is a far better alternative - expand the Wincheap Park and Ride and finally install the fourth slip road for traffic to access from the A2.	
Policy T5	782045	Ms K Slade		5021	Objecting	Object to Park and Ride at Harbledown. I do not believe that Canterbury City Council has seriously explored brownfield sites or other industrial areas within the city as reasonable alternatives, if indeed a further Park and Ride is actually required. Orchards should be protected. We are in danger of homogenising the county with too many carparks and roads and losing those elements that give Kent its identity. Parking and traffic would mar the approach to the City from the west.	I would ask CCC to remove this proposal from the Local Plan.
Policy T5	780849	Mr Michael Watts		5044	Objecting	I am writing to object to and express my deep concern at the proposals to site a further Park & Ride carpark at this location, on grounds of landscape, loss of views.The only sensible location for additional parking facilities on the western/ south-western perimeter of the city is on the Wincheap Industrial Estate. This would be by creation of a multi-storey car park at the existing Wincheap Park & Ride site or by constructing a new one altogether on the Wincheap Industrial estate.	The only sensible location for additional parking facilities on the western / south-western perim eter of the city, should they indeed be warranted, is on the Wincheap Industrial Estate. This would be by creation of a multi-storey car park at the existing Wincheap Park & Ride site or, preferably, by constructing a new one altogether on the Wincheap Industrial estate.
Policy T5	405592	Mr. Ronnie Nevell		5048	Objecting	I appreciate that the immediate threat of producing a park and ride in Harbledown Park has been lifted by the very sensible decision to have a slip road off the A2 and expand Wincheap. However, I am dismayed that you are wishing to retain the right to install a park and ride in Harbledown Park if you see fit. It will increase the traffic in local villages; sacrifice a productive orchard; impact on landscape and views and archaeological interest.	Even if you still believe that there just has to be a park and ride on this side of Canterbury, there are other alternatives better than this one in Faulkners Lane.
Policy T5	782437	Mr C Chaston		5064	Objecting	I am writing to object against the council's suggestion of providing a 4th Park and Ride site at Faulkner's Lane Harbledown. The rationale behind my objection is as follows: 1) Cost.2) The loss of Greenfield site, and all that is beautiful in that area.3) increase in local traffic and extra management costs in making that route effective. Developing / expanding an existing site without loss of Green Field land is cost effective and makes sense.Focus should be on Wincheap Park and Ride.	Developing / expanding an existing site without loss of Green Field land is cost effective and makes sense.Focus should be on Wincheap Park and Ride.
Policy T5	781734	Mr Chris Lowe		5114	Objecting	The proposals to expand Park and Ride will not achieve the objective of supporting the change towards more sustainable modes of transport. All the historic evidence from Canterbury and elsewhere shows that Park & Ride does not reduce the overall vehicle miles travelled; and the most recent research confirms that the total vehicle miles travelled are increased, not reduced.	Delete Policies T5 - T8

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5234	Objecting	I object to land at Faulkner's Lane being used for a Park and Ride site. The land is Grade 1 agricultural, and it could lead to increased traffic flows in nearby residential areas and on roads unsuitable for large amounts of vehicles. I believe it would be highly damaging to the landscape and harm the setting of the Harbledown Conservation Area.	
Policy T5	784485	Dr Christopher Dawson		5259	Objecting	Rough Common Road has become a substantial part of the road infrastructure of Canterbury. I feel that more attention needs to be given to the residents of this road. There is insufficient car parking for the residents and the bays are not full width so that parked cars partly stick out into the traffic stream. A park and ride will increase traffic and to keep this traffic flowing the road should be kept clear of obstacles.	One possibility would be to offset the road and to provide full-width parking bays. Another would be to purchase land and to build an off-road parking area. If another Park and Ride is to go ahead, perhaps the costs of road improvements in Rough Common Road could be included in the proposal?
Policy T5	421077	Mr N Flanagan		5312	Objecting	Object to a park and ride at Faulkner's Lane. If slip road was constructed at Wincheap this would reduce the traffic congestion in the city and on the ring road. Faulkner's lane involves the loss of grade 1 agricultural land. City Council refused permission for a golf course here some years ago so is being inconsistent proposing this for a park and ride.	
Policy T5	784581	Lyvie De Haan		5323	Objecting	I am writing to object to Policy T5 and the safeguarding of this land. The City Council has provided no evidence to demonstrate that a further park and ride site is needed in Canterbury within the Local Plan Period. It is totally unclear as to why the alternative option of a Park and Ride site at Wincheap is not the preferred option. I submit that the safeguarding of the land (T5) should be withdrawn from the Plan.	I submit that the safeguarding of the land (T5) should be withdrawn from the Plan.
Policy T5	784582	Mr Justin Terry		5324	Objecting	I am writing to object to Policy T5 and the safeguarding of this land. The City Council has provided no evidence to demonstrate that a further park and ride site is needed in Canterbury within the Local Plan Period. It is impossible to see why this land has been safeguarded when the preferred alternative option of a Park and Ride site at Wincheap is available. I submit that the safeguarding of the land (T5) should be withdrawn from the Plan.	I submit that the safeguarding of the land (T5) should be withdrawn from the Plan.
Policy T5	781736	Martina Klimperova		5325	Objecting	Objects to Policy T5, is strongly opposed to the Park and Ride at Harbledown, because: it would spoil this beautiful peaceful and calm country side environment; increased traffic, pollution, noise and all associated problems. To destroy the orchard would be bad for the local ecosystem and create a terrible eyesore on a priceless typical English landscape. Park and Ride seems like a very expensive solution that does not have proven results.	
Policy T5	781700	Emma & Mark Barrett Palmer		5326	Objecting	Object to the proposed Harbledown Park and Ride because of: increased traffic to our beautiful Parishes; irreversible loss and destruction of greenfields, areas of natural beauty and historical significance; need for new and expensive road layout. The less destructive and more effective alternative would be to extend the existing Wincheap Park and Ride and install a 4th slip road so that traffic can access it from the A2.	Extend the existing Wincheap Park and Ride and install a 4th slip road so that traffic can access it from the A2.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	781695	Mr Nevell		5329	Objecting	Object to park and ride at Harbledown because: it will be an eyesore and not in keeping; it will change the area; the village has seen little development; it is in a Conservation Area; will be seen from Golden Hill; AONB; increased traffic in local villages; environmental impacts on stream and wildlife; light pollution; noise; increased parking outside of the park and ride; Loss of Grade 1 agricultural land. Reject scheme.	I respectfully request that the Council reject this proposal for a Park & ride Scheme
Policy T5	404730	Ms Jane Arnott	Land Use Planning Advisor National Trust	5330	Objecting	As owners of Golden Hill they Object to policy T5 on three grounds: 1 Landscape and visual impact on unspoilt countryside that provides a landscape setting to city. In AONB. Effects can't be mitigated, contrary to policy LB2. 2 Agricultural land - site is grade 1 land the development of which conflicts with para 112 of NPPF. 3 Conservation Area and Impact on Heritage Assets - it will have an unacceptable impact on conservation area so is inconsistent with policy HE6 (which accords with NPPF)	
Policy T5	781629	Kathryn Nevell	Canterbury Student Lets	5331	Objecting	The Park and Ride in Harbledown is very unpopular and I am pleased to see in Policy T5 that it is not highlighted and the additional slip road at Wincheap and the enlargement of current Park and Rides are the favoured option. The Northern Approach Park and Ride located on The Victoria Hotel/ The Red House Nursing Home on the corner of the A2050 and London Road. This is walking distance from the city centre and would require only minimum road changes.	One possibility for a Northern Approach Park and Ride could be to relocate The Victoria Hotel and/or The Red House Nursing Home from the corner of the A2050 and London Road. This would utilize a brown field site and would be in walking distance to the City Centre and would require only minimal road changes.
Policy T5	784621	John & Lorraine Hamilton-Box		5462	Objecting	Object to policy T5, because: unwanted scheme; within conservation area with links to historic sites; the A2050 was constructed to take traffic away from the village and now you want to bring it back; site is close to a school, safety concerns, health risks from pollution; green space and greenbelt; part of the Garden of England is being ripped up for a statistic.	
Policy T5	406391	Mr Alan Best	Swale Borough Council	5502	Objecting	Note the intention for Park and Ride at Wincheap, while retaining a reserve site at Harbledown. While recognising the benefits to Swale residents, we wish to highlight that existing bus services between Faversham and Canterbury have seen considerable improvements in their frequency. Before the P+R proposal is implemented work should be undertaken to ensure existing services are not compromised and that those without access to a car are not disadvantaged by any reductions to the bus service.	Before the P+R proposal is implemented work is undertaken to ensure that these existing Faversham-Canterbury bus services are not seriously compromised and that those without access to a car do not find themselves disadvantaged from any reductions.
Policy T5	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5589	Supporting	The mooted Park and Ride at Harbledown is to be commended.This proposal should be brought forward.	
Policy T5	784614	Mr Brian Dillon		5759	Objecting	I am writing to register my strong opposition to the plans for a park-and-ride facility in Harbledown. The site proposed is a productive agricultural one and a historic part of the local landscape. Park-and-ride, which is historically a stop-gap relic from the failure of post-war transport policies, is an outdated and anomalous way of reducing traffic into the city.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	784615	Naomi De Haan		5760	Objecting	I am writing to object to Policy T5 and the safeguarding of this land. The City Council has provided no evidence to demonstrate that a further park and ride site is needed in Canterbury within the Local Plan Period. It is totally unclear as to why the alternative option of a Park and Ride site at Wincheap is not the preferred option. I submit that the safeguarding of the land (T5) should be withdrawn from the Plan.	I submit that the safeguarding of the land (T5) should be withdrawn from the Plan.
Policy T5	781577	Mrs G M Dodds		5792	Objecting	I write to raise my strong objections to the threat of a proposed Park and Ride (Policy T5) set-up at Harbledown pear orchards at Faulkner's Lane, and speaking purely from a Chartham Hatch resident's point of view, there would only be one way to the site from the A28 and that is up Hatch Lane, along Town Lane and Bigbury Road. None of these roads were built for heavy traffic, and the noise, pollution and danger to pedestrians (no pavements) would be intolerable.	
Policy T5	779388	Mrs Angela Hencher	Bursar Kent College	5834	Objecting	I write on behalf of the Governors of Kent College, Canterbury to object in the strongest terms to the proposed Park and Ride site at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown, on grounds of traffic congestion; possible impact on the Junior School; unclear whether it is needed; loss of farmland. Park and Ride on Faulkner's Lane would be detrimental to the lives of those that live at Vernon Holme and other less invasive alternatives should be selected such as improvements to the existing Park and Ride sites.	Park and Ride on Faulkner's Lane would be detrimental to the lives of those that live at Vernon Holme and other less invasive alternatives should be selected such as improvements to the existing Park and Ride sites.
Policy T5	407921	Dr Felicity Dunworth		5843	Objecting	Object to proposed park and ride at Harbledown: it would increase the traffic through Rough Common Road; noise pollution; irreversible transformation of a beautiful landscape, light pollution and further noise pollution; it is not needed - there is a perfectly good existing infrastructure involving railways; will diminish Canterbury as a place to visit - Harbledown and the link between the City and countryside is so important.	
Policy T5	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5861	Objecting	Policy T5 safeguards land at Falkener's Lane, Harbledown for a Park and Ride site. However, KCC believe that it would be more advantageous to expand the existing Park and Ride sites at Wincheap and South Canterbury, both of which will be directly served from the A2, and which are more easily served by bus priority schemes.	
Policy T5	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6152	Objecting	Park and ride policy is neither honest nor consistent.	Be honest that the park and ride for people from the NE has been abandoned for all practical purposes. Use some of the resources saved for a park and ride in Whitstable to help alleviate traffic and parking problems there.
Policy T5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6397	Objecting	Without a considered Transport Modelling Report how can it be determined that this is going to be in the right place? Why is there no mention of the criteria in Policy T9?	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T5	422969	Mr David Frost	Parish Clerk Harbledown and Rough Common Parish Council	6539	Objecting	The Harbledown & Rough Common Parish Council strongly objects to Policy T5 and requests that this Policy be deleted from the Local Plan, for following reasons. No evidence that a further P&R site will be needed; this site conflicts with NPPF, LP Policies DBE1, DBE3, DBE11, DBE13, HE1, HE6, HE13, LB2, LB4, LB8, LB10 and LB16; conflict with previous planning decisions and adopted SPD; no evidence that needed in this location; no need to safeguard site as CCC would not permit any other development.	Delete allocation for P&R at Faulkner's Lane Harbledown
Policy T5	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6586	Objecting	Object to proposals for a new Park and Ride at Harbledown as it would have a negative effect on modal shift from sustainable transport to the private car, increase traffic, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, and would result in the loss of high quality orchards.	
Policy T5	784819	Mr & Mrs G Scarfe		6705	Objecting	Object to Policy T5 Harbledown park and ride, because: unnecessary; 1 minute to Wincheap P&R if there was a slip rd; build 4th slip and expand Wincheap P&R; Current congestion proves access to existing P&R is inadequate; unsustainable development; AHLV; impact on conservation area; loss of orchards; impact on views from Golden Hill; use of taxpayer money. remove proposal.	Please register our objection and remove the proposal from the local plan.
5.42	399017	Mr Andrew Hall		102	Supporting	Excellent idea - given the new access/exit points to the A2	
5.42	776448	Ms Susan Booth		477	Objecting	I am objecting to the area in Harbledown being safeguarded for additional/alternative capacity for a Park and Ride site. I support the plans for increasing capacity at Wincheap and building the A2 slip. I live on Rough Common Road and there is already a high level of traffic. To add to this there will be an irreversible loss of highly productive greenfield farmland, the need for another new road system and the destruction of beautiful historic views.	build the 4th slip road at Wincheap and expand the park and ride there
5.42	776221	Ms Dominic Harbinson		588	Supporting	Supports the plan to expand the Park & Ride at Wincheap.	
5.42	777046	Miss Jane Gallimore		663	Supporting	Expanding the existing Wyncheap Park and Ride and providing a new slip road from the A2 will be good as the area is already industrial so wont be aesthetically damaged by this proposal and all the infra structure is already in place, so this should be economically the most viable proposal.	
5.42	778650	Mrs. Rebecca Smith		1393	Objecting	The Wincheap Park and Ride should also service Canterbury West Train Station making an alternative for commuters traveling to the Canterbury West Train Station.	The Wincheap Park and Ride should also service Canterbury West Train Station making an alternative for commuters traveling to the Canterbury West Train Station, leaving early in the morning (6:30-7am) to provide services for London Commuters
5.42	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4009	Objecting	Park & rides (P&R) are not less environmentally damaging they do not decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT). User survey showed most use was by car, only 10% public transport abstraction. The P&R's have not reduced congestion. Studies show that P&R's increase VMT. The parking policy is outdated and needs scrutiny. If P&R's are retained modify them in line with research. Improve public transport to make P&R's less attractive. 800 extra spaces not needed, reduce spaces use sustainable transport.	Policies T6, T7,T8 and T9 and their supporting text (paragraphs 5.39-5.46 should be deleted from the Plan.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.42	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6398	Objecting	With so much reference to Wincheap - Industrial/retail park, Park and Ride, Traffic Management Scheme and A2 slip road it would be clearer if everything came together in an appendix/indicative map. This is a good example of the need for an index.	
Policy T6	775204	Mr & Mrs Paul & Katrina Roberts		304	Supporting	Object to park and ride at Harbledown. The far less expensive alternative would be to expand the wincheap park and ride site, all that is needed is to install the much needed missing fourth slip road so that traffic may access it from the A2	
Policy T6	115295	Mrs Gordana Groombridge		453	Supporting	The best option is to expand the park and ride at Wincheap. It will reduce traffic into Canterbury and protect Harbledown.	
Policy T6	775602	Dr & Mrs Davies		479	Supporting	We support the construction of a fourth slip road from the A2 at Wincheap and the expansion of the existing Park and Ride site.	
Policy T6	405194	Mr Julian Parker		482	Supporting	The expansion of the Wincheap Park and Ride, with the construction of the "forth slip road." This, is the way forward,...not the desecration of ancient orchards and beautiful, and ancient landscapes such as we have in Harbledown.	
Policy T6	112731	Mr E. W. Golding		486	Supporting	There is a far better, less destructive alternative to the proposed Harbledown park & ride(if required) -expand the existing Wincheap Park & Ride site (which can be seen from the bridge over the By Pass at Faulkners Lane!). All that is needed is to install the missing "fourth slip road" (A2 Dover bound), so that traffic can access it from the A2!	
Policy T6	775810	Mr & Mrs Mark & Katherine Thatcher		510	Supporting	Please reconsider (Policy T5)and opt for the less destructive alternative, expansion of the current Wincheap Park & Ride and install the missing 'fourth' slip road at Wincheap so that traffic coming from the M2can access it from the A2.	
Policy T6	775199	Mr Russell Blyth		568	Supporting	I object to Policy T5 and the possibility of a park & ride at Harbledown. it seems ridiculous to spend such a large amount of money when it must be less costly to extend the existing Wincheap park & ride. It would only be one more 'junction further on.	Please forget the idea of building at Harbledown and use the money to build a slip road at Wincheap & develop the park & Ride there.
Policy T6	775218	Mrs C L Sullivan		591	Supporting	Support proposals for Park and Ride extension at Wincheap with new slip road from A2.	
Policy T6	776221	Ms Dominic Harbinson		592	Supporting	Supports the plan to expand the Park & Ride at Wincheap.	
Policy T6	776448	Ms Susan Booth		602	Supporting	Support proposals for Park and Ride extension at Wincheap.	
Policy T6	122800	Mr & Mrs Hixson		603	Supporting	Support proposals for Park and Ride extension at Wincheap with new slip road from A2.	
Policy T6	117570	Ms Mary Murdoch		607	Supporting	Support proposals for Park and Ride extension at Wincheap	
Policy T6	776134	P Rogers & K Pepper		678	Supporting	A far better option to Harbledown park & ride would be further development of Wincheap park and ride, incorporating an off slip from the A2 coastbound, with signage directing trafficapproaching from thenorth west.	
Policy T6	777170	Mr Peter Zerfahs		690	Supporting	There is already a perfectly good Park and Ride at Wincheap which requires an access road only which will be far cheaper than constructing a Park & Ride and its considerable infrastructure at Harbledown.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T6	777430	Sir Cedric Delves		759	Supporting	I object to the proposed "Park and Ride", to be sited at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown. The safe option must be an expansion of the existing and successful Wincheap Park and Ride, with the added bonus that this would offer a much needed additional slip road from the A2, relieving the pressure on the A2050, most evident during the morning 'rush'.	
Policy T6	775218	Mrs C L Sullivan		773	Supporting	Support proposals for Park and Ride extension at Wincheap	
Policy T6	127115	B.J. Gore		775	Supporting	Support for an enlargement/redevelopment of the existing Park and Ride site at Wincheap. It would also limit construction of the new road to an already despoiled and urban area, rather than putting a new link road in Harbledown in open countryside.	
Policy T6	111377	Miss D. R. Manley		801	Supporting	Wincheap Park and Ride site could be expanded and made accessible from the A2.	
Policy T6	777426	J M Chapman		812	Supporting	A less destructive alternative to the proposed harbledown park & ride would be to expand the Wincheap Park and Ride site and install a 'fourth slip road' so that traffic can access it from the A2!	
Policy T6	114986	Terry and Maureen Smith		821	Supporting	I believe that there is an alternative to the proposed Harbledown park & ride, if more room has to be made for parking, and that is at Wincheap, where there is already a park and ride, and also has easy access to the A2.	
Policy T6	777236	Mr & Mrs R J Taylor		834	Supporting	Expand Wincheap Park and Ride site.	
Policy T6	121925	Mr & Mrs D Meehan		837	Supporting	There is space in Wincheap for the park and ride.	
Policy T6	85312	Mrs Janet Larkinson	Harbledown and Rough Common Parish Council	875	Supporting	I wish to object to the Harbledown park and ride. A better solution would be to increase the size of the Wincheap site so that traffic could exit a new slip road off the A2.	
Policy T6	777705	Mr & Mrs R Bostock		879	Supporting	Why cannot the Wincheap park and ride service site be expanded.	
Policy T6	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		918	Supporting	I welcome the proposal for a new junction on to the A2 and the extension of the Park & Ride at Wincheap. This is an essential prerequisite for the much needed redevelopment of the Wincheap area.	
Policy T6	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1050	Supporting	Once the fourth slip road has been built at Wincheap, enlarging the existing Wincheap Park & Ride at Wincheap, is a much more sustainable option	
Policy T6	778042	Ms Carol Bolton		1169	Supporting	I am appalled that consideration is being given to establishing a Park and Ride facility on a prime greenfield site located in an area of outstanding beauty when extending the existing Wincheap Park and Ride site is the most obvious solution. This latter site would not entail the loss of agricultural land. Spending money creating new road layouts for a Park and Ride site at Harbledown when public opinion for years has shown demand for a new slip road at Wincheap is ludicrous.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T6	778044	Ms Rosemary Flower		1172	Objecting	The construction of the "missing" 4th slip road at Wincheap - accepted as needed in terms of traffic management - with an extension of the existing parking facility at Wincheap, if necessary, solves two projects in one and must be more economic.	
Policy T6	121858	Ms A Knight		1434	Supporting	Any Park and Ride scheme should be based on a brownfield site and not use a unique Greenfield site. For example the Wincheap Park and Ride site could be expanded.	
Policy T6	405195	Mr John Earl		1451	Supporting	There is an alternative, far less destructive alternative to Harbledown park and ride, if required, and that would be to expand the Wincheap Park & Ride Site.	
Policy T6	122883	Ms Cynthia Short		1454	Supporting	Harbledown Park & ride - this objective could be achieved much more satisfactorily by expanding the present Park and Ride site in Wincheap and building a new slip road.	
Policy T6	777544	Robin Ross-Hunt		1458	Supporting	There is a far better site than Faulkner's Lane and that is to expand Wincheap Park and Ride and build the missing slip road on the A2. The infrastructure already exists at Wincheap. So on cost alone it must be logical.	
Policy T6	777644	Ken & Margaret Griffin		1463	Supporting	We believe that expanding the Wincheap Park and Ride site would be less expensive even when installing a fourth slip road for access from the A2 - this latter is long overdue anyway.	
Policy T6	777646	Irene & John Robson		1490	Supporting	Clearly there is a far better and less destructive alternative if a fourth Park and Ride site is required. Build the fourth slip road at Wincheap and expand the existing Park and Ride site or if necessary, build a multistorey car park on the Wincheap site.	
Policy T6	778189	Mr Geoffrey Bolton		1587	Supporting	A far better alternative to harbledown park and ride is located at Wincheap. The Highways Agency has, I believe, agreed that a slip lane is needed on the southbound A2 at Wincheap giving ready access to this area. Wincheap is much nearer and being largely already concreted over and would therefore have far less environmental impact. The close proximity of this area to the city centre would reduce journey times for the users coupled with greatly reduced costs to the o	
Policy T6	124149	Mr. Christopher Date		1609	Supporting	Build a fourth slip road off the A2 at Wincheap and increase the current 'Park and Ride' facilities there.	
Policy T6	778482	Mr & Mrs T J & A Pearce		1618	Supporting	A less destructive alternative to Harbledown park and ride would be to add the slip road off the A2 at Wincheap and expand the current Park and Ride Site.	
Policy T6	122808	Ms Angela Graham		1654	Supporting	If there is a need for additional parking then this could be provided without such disruption by extending existing car parks such as the Wincheap park and ride site or negotiating with other organisations for access to their car parks at times of pressure.	
Policy T6	415836	Ms Gillian Wright		1667	Supporting	Expanding the Wincheap Park & Ride and putting in the 4th slip road will be quicker and cheaper than Harbledown park & ride.	
Policy T6	778404	Mr & Mrs PW & IM Sayer		1906	Supporting	Increase the size of the Wincheap Park & Ride site and construct the "slip road".	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T6	422103	Mr and Mrs Stuart and Gill Smith		2017	Supporting	Increasing the capacity of the present Park and Ride at Wincheap would have a less dramatic and destructive effect on our countryside. The Public transport for this site is already established.	
Policy T6	122957	Ms Joan Cuthbert		2066	Supporting	Wincheap Park and Ride site is available for a 'fourth slip road', and traffic access it from the A2.	
Policy T6	778766	Mr & Mrs J H & M A Shaw		2264	Supporting	The Wincheap park and ride site could be substantially extended. This scheme would remove the cost of altering the road layout on the A2050 and building a new site at Harbledown. It is possible that extending the Wincheap site would be cheaper than building a new Park and Ride. Additionally, it would directly capture the vehicles from the A2.	
Policy T6	778710	Jean & Alan Thomas		2285	Supporting	Objects to Policy T5 but supports the upgrading of the Wincheap park and ride with the necessary additional slip roads as the most sensible solution.	
Policy T6	778651	Ms Margaret Wilson		2315	Supporting	Objects to policy T5. Extend Wincheap park and ride and A2 slip instead.	
Policy T6	778755	Mr Richard Williams		2320	Supporting	I feel that with better use and expansion of the existing Park and Ride sites ie expanding Wincheap and using the spare capacity in Sturry Road there is no real need for the Harbledown Park and Ride. I believe that planning permission has already been granted for slip road of the A2 at Wincheap.	
Policy T6	777993	Ms A Finn		2321	Supporting	Objects to policy T5. Install missing slip and Wincheap and use this site.	
Policy T6	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2446	Objecting	Spokes does not support this policy and wants it removed. Reason: Park and Rides increase car use in the district nor do they help walking and cycling. Park and Rides also generate more cross city journeys contrary to Policy T1.	
Policy T6	779093	Mrs J M Bradley		2518	Supporting	Support proposals for Park and Ride extension at Wincheap	
Policy T6	778882	Mr Chas Harrington		2545	Supporting	The common sense solution would be to install the slip road at Wincheap so that access would be gained direct from the A2 and use the existing facilities by expanding the parking. There would be no need for more buses on our local roads, and traffic would be kept to a minimum through our rural areas.	
Policy T6	779128	Mr Neil Morris		2658	Supporting	The alternative to Harbledown, which doesn't destroy any high-grade agricultural land or ruin a landscape that hasn't already been blighted, is an extension of Wincheap Park and Ride.	
Policy T6	779346	Glenda Flanagan		2797	Supporting	Support proposals to expand the existing Park and Ride at Wincheap.	
Policy T6	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2878	Objecting	Logic for safeguarding land at Wincheap - to facilitate expansion to serve the A2 from the west, is in conflict with Policy T5. There seems to be a double-counting of policy, where the demand from the A2 west is to be safeguarded in two different ways. Whilst such resilience may be laudable in terms of the contingency planning, the lack of logic or evidence or clarity to the priority to be placed on these sites related to their purpose means that the Council's preferred intention is unclear.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T6	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3086	Objecting	We are however concerned regarding the level of direct impact that this policy will have on the AS27 Ashford to Fordwich LWS. We are unsure how much of the infrastructure is already present but if this is to be new development we would have serious concerns regarding the individual and in-combination impacts of the proposed development on the ecology within the LWS.	
Policy T6	780740	Mr Chris Lambert		3437	Supporting	The obvious solution (if more space is required) is to install the missing slip road into Wincheap from the London direction and to upgrade the Park & Ride car park to accommodate more vehicles (perhaps by multi storey if necessary).	
Policy T6	780651	Mr Kevin Bown	Asset Manager Area 4 (Kent) Highways Agency	3540	Supporting	This policy seek to safeguard land for Park and Ride facilities. The HA welcomes measures such as Park and Ride provided that they do not have an unacceptable impact on the safety and reliability of the SRN. The HA will therefore require information in the transport evidence base and Infrastructure Plan as to the potential impact, individually and cumulatively, of any proposed or expanded Park and Ride provision on the SRN, and the delivery of any necessary mitigation.	The HA will therefore require information in the transport evidence base and Infrastructure Plan as to the potential impact, individually and cumulatively, of any proposed or expanded Park and Ride provision on the SRN, and the delivery of any necessary mitigation.
Policy T6	406328	Mr Daniel Smith		3569	Supporting	Support proposals for Park and Ride extension at Wincheap	
Policy T6	121368	Ms Helen Williams		3745	Supporting	Support proposals for the expansion of Wincheap Park and Ride.	
Policy T6	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4010	Objecting	Park & rides (P&R) are not less environmentally damaging they do not decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT). User survey showed most use was by car, only 10% public transport abstraction. The P&R's have not reduced congestion. Studies show that P&R's increase VMT. The parking policy is outdated and needs scrutiny. If P&R's are retained modify them in line with research. Improve public transport to make P&R's less attractive. 800 extra spaces not needed, reduce spaces use sustainable transport.	Policies T6, T7,T8 and T9 Â and their supporting text (paragraphs 5.39-5.46 should be deleted from the Plan.
Policy T6	122929	Prof. Thomas Sears		4094	Supporting	The Wincheap site with its domestic retail and light industrial facilities is surely an optimal location, a prime site already enhancing its utilitarian use by those entering from the eastern coastal routes via the A2.	
Policy T6	780981	Mr David Adley		4238	Supporting	What I fail to understand is why the Wincheap park and ride site cannot be expanded and the missing fourth slip road installed to allow motorists entering Canterbury to access this site from the A2. This, I would suggest, is a far more sensible and less destructive alternative than a fourth Parks and Ride at Faulkners Lane.	
Policy T6	781051	Mrs J E Batchelor		4307	Supporting	An increase to Wincheap Park and Ride would be a much better and cheaper fourth Park and Ride.	
Policy T6	122979	Ms Joanna Fassum		4479	Supporting	Is a 4th park & ride site actually required? If so, why can't the council put in the missing slip road at Wincheap and expand the current Park & Ride site there, much less destruction of a conservation area.	
Policy T6	781317	R A Heart		4521	Supporting	What we really need is an extension of the Wincheap Park and ride.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T6	780838	Miss E J Nevell		4544	Objecting	Instead of the Faulkners Lane site, expand the Wincheap park and ride and install the missing 4th slip road. The park and ride will need to be extended when the slip is built anyhow giving people access to the city and shopping at Wincheap, this would then make the site at Faulkners Lane redundant.	Delete Policy T5 from the Draft Local Plan, together with all supporting text.
Policy T6	781034	Mr John Charter		4633	Supporting	Support proposals to expand the existing Park and Ride at Wincheap.	
Policy T6	781039	Mrs Margaret King		4638	Supporting	Support development proposals to expand the existing Park and Ride at Wincheap.	
Policy T6	121960	Dr A Teresa Hankey		4659	Supporting	Support proposals to expand the existing Park and Ride at Wincheap.	
Policy T6	781934	Mrs Janette Edis		4927	Supporting	Object. The proposal to put a Park and Ride at Harbledown can only spoil a beautiful area of highly productive farmland which has been here for centuries. A much better alternative would be to make the slip road off the A2 at Wincheap and extend the present Park and Ride. This would be a much cheaper option and would upset the smallest number of the public.	
Policy T6	782031	Dr P W L Clough		4965	Supporting	It is notable within the Plan that other Park and Ride schemes are currently operating at under-capacity. Therefore, instead of a fourth Park and Ride, the Council should do more to promote existing schemes, including consideration of reducing the fees. And in terms of increasing Park and Ride capacity, if needed, the expansion of the Wincheap Park and Ride is a superior option.	
Policy T6	781734	Mr Chris Lowe		5115	Objecting	The proposals to expand Park and Ride will not achieve the objective of supporting the change towards more sustainable modes of transport. All the historic evidence from Canterbury and elsewhere shows that Park & Ride does not reduce the overall vehicle miles travelled; and the most recent research confirms that the total vehicle miles travelled are increased, not reduced.	Delete Policies T5 - T8
Policy T6	421077	Mr N Flanagan		5313	Supporting	I am pleased to note that the Draft Local plan also considers expanding the existing wincheap park and ride facility and would urge the Council to adopt that strategy instead.	
Policy T6	781700	Emma & Mark Barrett Palmer		5327	Supporting	Object to the proposed Harbledown Park and Ride because of: increased traffic to our beautiful Parishes; irreversible loss and destruction of greenfields, areas of natural beauty and historical significance; need for new and expensive road layout. The less destructive and more effective alternative would be to extend the existing Wincheap Park and Ride and install a 4th slip road so that traffic can access it from the A2.	Extend the existing Wincheap Park and Ride
Policy T6	406391	Mr Alan Best	Swale Borough Council	5504	Objecting	Note the intention for Park and Ride at Wincheap, while retaining a reserve site at Harbledown. While recognising the benefits to Swale residents, we wish to highlight that existing bus services between Faversham and Canterbury have seen considerable improvements in their frequency. Before the P+R proposal is implemented work should be undertaken to ensure existing services are not compromised and that those without access to a car are not disadvantaged by any reductions to the bus service.	Before the P+R proposal is implemented work is undertaken to ensure that these existing Faversham-Canterbury bus services are not seriously compromised and that those without access to a car do not find themselves disadvantaged from any reductions.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T6	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5722	Supporting	More specific positives:â€¢ Policy TC6 e-improving Wincheap Park and Ride site	
Policy T6	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5748	Supporting	Wincheap is the key to unlock the city's traffic congestion. The provision of slip-roads in all directions and a Park & Ride that is significantly larger, is a strategic necessity and key to unlocking the city's traffic congestion.	
Policy T6	781577	Mrs G M Dodds		5793	Supporting	Surely it would be far better and cheaper to enlarge the Wincheap Park and Ride Site - far less destructive all round I would have thought. (Harbledown P&R object).	
Policy T6	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5862	Supporting	Policy T5 safeguards land at Falkener's Lane, Harbledown for a Park and Ride site. However, KCC believe that it would be more advantageous to expand the existing Park and Ride sites at Wincheap and South Canterbury, both of which will be directly served from the A2, and which are more easily served by bus priority schemes.	
Policy T6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6399	Objecting	Only to be expected. Why is there no mention of the criteria in Policy T9?	
Policy T6	784819	Mr & Mrs G Scarfe		6714	Supporting	The missing fourth slip road should be constructed at Wincheap so that traffic can access it directly from the A2. This would keep traffic bound for the existing park and ride at Wincheap away from the city, relieving congestion along the A290 and A28. Congestion proves current park and ride at Wincheap inadequate.	
5.43	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		662	Objecting	There may be spare capacity at the Sturry Road Park and Ride but there is not spare capacity in Sturry for the traffic generated by the Hersden development. A full Sturry bypass is needed before this development can be considered.	Acknowledgement that a Sturry bypass is needed before the capacity at the Sturry Road Park and Ride can be increased.
5.43	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4011	Objecting	Park & rides (P&R) are not less environmentally damaging they do not decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT). User survey showed most use was by car, only 10% public transport abstraction. The P&R's have not reduced congestion. Studies show that P&R's increase VMT. The parking policy is outdated and needs scrutiny. If P&R's are retained modify them in line with research. Improve public transport to make P&R's less attractive. 800 extra spaces not needed, reduce spaces use sustainable transport.	Policies T6, T7,T8 and T9 Â and their supporting text (paragraphs 5.39-5.46 should be deleted from the Plan.
5.43	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6400	Objecting	'Development at ...Hersden and Broad Oak/Sturry'. Do residents of Sturry Parish already make good use of the Sturry Road Park and Ride? Where is the evidence? Can it be guaranteed that it will be well used as a result of the new proposed road, a complete bus lane & a faster journey? What is the time saving to be? Why no mention of bus fare incentives as for Bridge?	
Policy T7	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2447	Objecting	Spokes does not support this policy and wants it removed. Reason: Park and Rides increase car use in the district nor do they help walking and cycling. Park and Rides also generate more cross city journeys contrary to Policy T1.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T7	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3090	Objecting	We are however concerned regarding the level of direct impact that this policy will have on the AS27 Ashford to Fordwich LWS. We are unsure how much of the infrastructure is already present but if this is to be new development we would have serious concerns regarding the individual and in-combination impacts of the proposed development on the ecology within the LWS.	
Policy T7	780651	Mr Kevin Bown	Asset Manager Area 4 (Kent) Highways Agency	3542	Supporting	This policy seek to safeguard land for Park and Ride facilities. The HA welcomes measures such as Park and Ride provided that they do not have an unacceptable impact on the safety and reliability of the SRN. The HA will therefore require information in the transport evidence base and Infrastructure Plan as to the potential impact, individually and cumulatively, of any proposed or expanded Park and Ride provision on the SRN, and the delivery of any necessary mitigation.	The HA will therefore require information in the transport evidence base and Infrastructure Plan as to the potential impact, individually and cumulatively, of any proposed or expanded Park and Ride provision on the SRN, and the delivery of any necessary mitigation.
Policy T7	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4012	Objecting	Park & rides (P&R) are not less environmentally damaging they do not decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT). User survey showed most use was by car, only 10% public transport abstraction. The P&R's have not reduced congestion. Studies show that P&R's increase VMT. The parking policy is outdated and needs scrutiny. If P&R's are retained modify them in line with research. Improve public transport to make P&R's less attractive. 800 extra spaces not needed, reduce spaces use sustainable transport.	Policies T6, T7,T8 and T9 Â and their supporting text (paragraphs 5.39-5.46 should be deleted from the Plan.
Policy T7	781734	Mr Chris Lowe		5116	Objecting	The proposals to expand Park and Ride will not achieve the objective of supporting the change towards more sustainable modes of transport. All the historic evidence from Canterbury and elsewhere shows that Park & Ride does not reduce the overall vehicle miles travelled; and the most recent research confirms that the total vehicle miles travelled are increased, not reduced.	Delete Policies T5 - T8
Policy T7	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5723	Supporting	More specific positives:â€¢ Safeguarding land for expansion of Sturry Park and Ride - policy T7	
Policy T7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6401	Objecting	Only to be expected. Why is there no mention of the criteria in Policy T9?	
5.44	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4013	Objecting	Park & rides (P&R) are not less environmentally damaging they do not decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT). User survey showed most use was by car, only 10% public transport abstraction. The P&R's have not reduced congestion. Studies show that P&R's increase VMT. The parking policy is outdated and needs scrutiny. If P&R's are retained modify them in line with research. Improve public transport to make P&R's less attractive. 800 extra spaces not needed, reduce spaces use sustainable transport.	Policies T6, T7,T8 and T9 Â and their supporting text (paragraphs 5.39-5.46 should be deleted from the Plan.
5.44	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6402	Objecting	'...by 2014'. Assuming the Plan and Policy SP3 - Site 1 are adopted, when would the required A2 improvements be in place?	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T8	304601	Mr Eric Parkinson		1497	Objecting	Objects to the park and ride at south Canterbury because it encourages car use and traffic growth, increases reliance on cars, provides cheap out of town parking for customers of Canterbury shops, increases global temperatures and environmental degradation, undermines low energy transport. focus development on expansions nodes with rail based spokes, will reduce traffic, road infrastructure and car parks on countryside.	
Policy T8	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1799	Objecting	This park and ride is in the setting of the KDAONB and its development will impact on the views from the AONB and the dark night skies in this area. For this reason the KDAONB request that T8 includes criteria similar to those set out in T9 and as augmented below. This will then inform the design issues that need to be addressed in the development brief.	Provision will be made adjacent to a new A2 interchange near Bridge for the relocation and expansion of the New Dover Road Park and Ride. The Council will require any future proposals for the park and ride will be included in a development brief for the strategic allocation at South Canterbury and meet the criteria as set out below: a) Minimise the visual impact in respect of the location, layout and design of the development. The design should include significant areas of landscaping and tree planting around the boundaries and between parking bays to afford shade* and provide for the reduction of visual impact on the KDAONB. b) Ensure that the development will not have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of local residents; c) Development which would materially harm scientific or nature conservation interests, either directly, indirectly or cumulatively is mitigated and any impacts can be adequately compensated; sufficient Blue and Green Infrastructure should be provided to ensure links between existing and proposed habitats. d) Any proposals will be expected to meet the aims of design policies DB3 and DBE13 * to address future issues of climate change. The choice of species should take into account the future increase in temperatures and which species will afford the best shading.
Policy T8	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2448	Objecting	Spokes objects to this policy and wants it removed. Reason: This will encourage greater car use and not benefit walking and cycling.	
Policy T8	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2879	Objecting	It is not clear how this relocation is to be funded - it is notable that no mention of this being an infrastructure requirement on the South Canterbury allocation is made in Policy SP3a. This implies that the relocation of the P&R is NOT required as a provision for that allocation - which is in conflict with the approach that the existing P&R sites will be the first local transport hubs (5.36).	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T8	780651	Mr Kevin Bown	Asset Manager Area 4 (Kent) Highways Agency	3543	Supporting	This policy seek to safeguard land for Park and Ride facilities. The HA welcomes measures such as Park and Ride provided that they do not have an unacceptable impact on the safety and reliability of the SRN. The HA will therefore require information in the transport evidence base and Infrastructure Plan as to the potential impact, individually and cumulatively, of any proposed or expanded Park and Ride provision on the SRN, and the delivery of any necessary mitigation.	The HA will therefore require information in the transport evidence base and Infrastructure Plan as to the potential impact, individually and cumulatively, of any proposed or expanded Park and Ride provision on the SRN, and the delivery of any necessary mitigation.
Policy T8	408497	Mr C Mills		3790	Objecting	I object to the new / improved A2 junction provision at Bridge. The cost will be prohibitive and as such its use to justify large scale housing in South Canterbury to extract the levy from the developer does not ring true.	
Policy T8	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4015	Objecting	Park & rides (P&R) are not less environmentally damaging they do not decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT). User survey showed most use was by car, only 10% public transport abstraction. The P&R's have not reduced congestion. Studies show that P&R's increase VMT. The parking policy is outdated and needs scrutiny. If P&R's are retained modify them in line with research. Improve public transport to make P&R's less attractive. 800 extra spaces not needed, reduce spaces use sustainable transport.	Policies T6, T7,T8 and T9 Â and their supporting text (paragraphs 5.39-5.46 should be deleted from the Plan.
Policy T8	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4252	Objecting	This policy is flawed insofar as it envisages a new grade separated interchange on the A2 near Bridge. This would require an investment of Â£50 to Â£60 million for which no obvious source of funding is available or is likely to be available in the future.	
Policy T8	780987	Jo Cope		4308	Objecting	I am particularly concerned about more roadbuilding ruining the quality of life for local residents and causing more pollution. This does not prevent traffic problems but just adds to the traffic.	
Policy T8	781734	Mr Chris Lowe		5117	Objecting	The proposals to expand Park and Ride will not achieve the objective of supporting the change towards more sustainable modes of transport. All the historic evidence from Canterbury and elsewhere shows that Park & Ride does not reduce the overall vehicle miles travelled; and the most recent research confirms that the total vehicle miles travelled are increased, not reduced.	Delete Policies T5 - T8
Policy T8	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5864	Supporting	Policy T5 safeguards land at Falkener's Lane, Harbledown for a Park and Ride site. However, KCC believe that it would be more advantageous to expand the existing Park and Ride sites at Wincheap and South Canterbury, both of which will be directly served from the A2, and which are more easily served by bus priority schemes.	
Policy T8	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6403	Objecting	Only to be expected. Why is there no mention of the criteria in Policy T9?	
Policy T8	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6907	Supporting	It is hoped that the proposed enlargement of the New Dover Road Park & Ride will have the positive effect of encouraging fewer cars to use Old Dover Road.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.45	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		664	Objecting	Park and Ride sites and bus routes are not necessarily in direct competition. A bus route serves well those living within 1 mile of the route. Those living more than this distance from the bus route would be well served by the provision of parking at strategic points along the route so that the existing service can be used as a Park and Ride by those living at a distance from the routes.	Consider the inclusion of smaller Park and Ride facilities along the route of the existing bus services.
5.45	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4016	Objecting	Park & rides (P&R) are not less environmentally damaging they do not decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT). User survey showed most use was by car, only 10% public transport abstraction. The P&R's have not reduced congestion. Studies show that P&R's increase VMT. The parking policy is outdated and needs scrutiny. If P&R's are retained modify them in line with research. Improve public transport to make P&R's less attractive. 800 extra spaces not needed, reduce spaces use sustainable transport.	Policies T6, T7, T8 and T9 and their supporting text (paragraphs 5.39-5.46 should be deleted from the Plan.
5.45	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5581	Objecting	It is totally unacceptable to rule out the provision of P&R facilities on the Whitstable and Sandwich side of Canterbury because of the potential adverse impact on the patronage of the existing Triangle and Diamond bus routes! Has the Council given the bus operator certain monopolistic pledges on this front already? Having P & R facilities on these routes will substantially reduce car flows into the city centre and therefore carbon emissions. It would also create competition and reduce fares..	
5.45	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5633	Objecting	Whitstable The provision of a Park and Ride facility on the edge of the town is essential to ease summer grid-lock.	
5.45	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6404	Objecting	'A290 ... A257 ...bus routes ...considerable investment not considered appropriate at this time'. Why is the A257 Sandwich route into Canterbury mentioned under the heading Park and Ride for Whitstable? How does this decision meet the problems in Whitstable as described in para 5.7? What about Air Quality, road safety and parking issues?	
5.46	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	929	Objecting	The need for a Whitstable Park and Ride is underlined by the Corporate plan. The site (end South View RD alongside Thanet Way) would usefully serve as a strategic car park for the town and providing in addition: 1. Marshalling area for emergency services 2. Safe drop off point for foreign student coaches 3. Coach park for the town 4. Site for blood donor sessions, health screening etc 5. Showground at off peak times for commercial events eg bootfairs, exhibitions etc	5.46 should read "The Council will use its best endeavours to progress towards a park and ride facility for Whitstable with a view to mitigating traffic congestion in the town, providing facilities to coaches and to serving the strategic needs of the locality"
5.46	778640	Ms Daphne Ellis		1648	Supporting	Whitstable Park & Ride, which we really do need, I work in the centre of Whitstable High Street, and the congestion is horrendous,	
5.46	778382	Ms Suzanna Steward		1870	Supporting	The Whitstable Park and Ride is long overdue as the situation in summer and weekends is becoming unbearable for residents. The matter should be progressed urgently.	
5.46	778932	Ms Mary Lerigo		2534	Supporting	Support proposals to investigate a Park and Ride for Whitstable.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.46	780271	Councillor Alison O'Dea	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3293	Objecting	A Park and Ride for Whitstable (5.46) is long overdue and this is needed not just for the summer months. Contrary to what is stated a viable site has already been identified and this should be progressed.	
5.46	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4017	Objecting	Park & rides (P&R) are not less environmentally damaging they do not decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT). User survey showed most use was by car, only 10% public transport abstraction. The P&R's have not reduced congestion. Studies show that P&R's increase VMT. The parking policy is outdated and needs scrutiny. If P&R's are retained modify them in line with research. Improve public transport to make P&R's less attractive. 800 extra spaces not needed, reduce spaces use sustainable transport.	Policies T6, T7,T8 and T9 Â and their supporting text (paragraphs 5.39-5.46 should be deleted from the Plan.
5.46	780807	Mrs & Mr Judith & Norman Ames		5488	Supporting	A park and ride must be included in the local plan at the top of Borstal Hill to be implemented with the next two years.	A park and ride must be included in the local plan at the top of Borstal Hill to be implemented with the next two years.
5.46	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5634	Objecting	Whitstable The absence of a Park and Ride on the north side of Canterbury for folk travelling from Whitstable has been highly unfortunate.	
5.46	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6405	Objectingsummer Park and Ride. What are the cost implications?	
Policy T9	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	921	Objecting	The need for a Whitstable Park and Ride is underlined by the Corporate plan. The site (end South View RD alongside Thanet Way) would usefully serve as a strategic car park for the town and providing in addition: 1. Marshalling area for emergency services 2. Safe drop of point for foreign student coaches 3. Coach park for the town 4. Site for blood donor sessions, health screening etc 5. Showground at off peak times for commercial events eg bootfairs, exhibitions etc	Allocate land at end South View RD alongside Thanet Way as a site for Park and Ride at Whitstable.
Policy T9	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1016	Objecting	Why no park and ride proposals for Herne Bay?	Why no park and ride proposals for Herne Bay?
Policy T9	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2449	Objecting	Spokes objects to this policy and wants it removed Reason: Park and Rides do not decrease car use and do not help to get more people walking and cycling.	
Policy T9	780651	Mr Kevin Bown	Asset Manager Area 4 (Kent) Highways Agency	3544	Supporting	This policy seek to safeguard land for Park and Ride facilities. The HA welcomes measures such as Park and Ride provided that they do not have an unacceptable impact on the safety and reliability of the SRN. The HA will therefore require information in the transport evidence base and Infrastructure Plan as to the potential impact, individually and cumulatively, of any proposed or expanded Park and Ride provision on the SRN, and the delivery of any necessary mitigation.	The HA will therefore require information in the transport evidence base and Infrastructure Plan as to the potential impact, individually and cumulatively, of any proposed or expanded Park and Ride provision on the SRN, and the delivery of any necessary mitigation.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T9	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4018	Objecting	Park & rides (P&R) are not less environmentally damaging they do not decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT). User survey showed most use was by car, only 10% public transport abstraction. The P&R's have not reduced congestion. Studies show that P&R's increase VMT. The parking policy is outdated and needs scrutiny. If P&R's are retained modify them in line with research. Improve public transport to make P&R's less attractive. 800 extra spaces not needed, reduce spaces use sustainable transport.	Policies T6, T7,T8 and T9 and their supporting text (paragraphs 5.39-5.46 should be deleted from the Plan.
Policy T9	781734	Mr Chris Lowe		5118	Objecting	Policy T9 is otiose if T5 - T8 are deleted - as per the following comments: The proposals to expand Park and Ride will not achieve the objective of supporting the change towards more sustainable modes of transport. All the historic evidence from Canterbury and elsewhere shows that Park & Ride does not reduce the overall vehicle miles travelled; and the most recent research confirms that the total vehicle miles travelled are increased, not reduced.	Policy T9 is otiose if T5 - T8 are deleted, otherwise the first sentence of T9 should be amended to read: The Council will require any proposals for park and ride to meet the criteria as set out below :
Policy T9	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6156	Objecting	Unnecessarily promoted conditions as the entirety of the park and ride policy for Whitstable in sharp contrast to that for Canterbury	Remove discrimination against the site already indentified near Long Reach and proposed in detail; making requirements no different to Canterbury park and rides which have no special list of requirements in this plan despite plans for expansion . Explicitly state the option of the site on the south side just east of Long Reach roundabout
Policy T9	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6406	Objecting	Why is this site the only one to have criteria relating to visual impact, adverse effect on the amenity of local residents,environmental considerations etc?. If these are important for a 'summer only' site then they should be included for PoliciesT3,4,5,6,7,and 8 which relate to permanent sites as well.	
5.47	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1786	Supporting	Council Policy needs to be realistic when it comes to the number of cars households own and hence parking requirements. It is all very well trying to reduce the reliance on cars, but public transport needs to be affordable, reliable and regular otherwise it will not be a viable option we would suggest.	
5.47	780823	S Suti		3395	Objecting	Canterbury needs to deal with its congestion and parking problems. Safeguard city car parks for the use of short-term shoppers, business people, trades people and residents. If there is no parking, shoppers drive elsewhere or go online, shops close and the city loses jobs, visitors and a raison d'etre.	Safeguard the existing city car parks for the use of short-term shoppers, business people, trades people and even residents
5.47	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5366	Objecting	Car: a) Parking on new developments should be at edge for an annual fee, which goes into a fund for sustainable transport measures b) Car-clubs to reduce need for car ownership on new developments & throughout the existing central/inner city c) Robust support for car-sharing measures/kentjourneyshare should be promoted at new developments d) No. of car parking spaces/unit on new developments should be less than 1/household. e) office devt should have minimum parking and should charge employees	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T10	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		385	Supporting	This policy will need to be reworded to make it technically accurate.	Clarification that SPG4 applies for cycle parking levels regardless of land use class. As currently worded SPG4 would not need to be applied to residential developments in respect of cycle parking provision.
Policy T10	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	777	Objecting	If car parking standards are to apply to development in Canterbury these should be set out in the local plan. It is inappropriate and contrary to the NPPF to defer to supplementary planning documents to set policy that imposes requirements on development.	
Policy T10	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	932	Objecting	Kent County Council's residential parking standard is totally unrealistic and bordering on irresponsibility. many modern developments end up with parking over the access roads and on footpaths. This is just bad planning for which there can be no excuse. Many one and two bedroomed properties require two spaces (double the standard) and there needs to be provision for trades and visitors. Paragraph 39 of the NPPF make reference to taking into account 'local car ownership levels' etc.	Accordingly and until the KCC policy have been thoroughly reviewed Policy T 10 should read " The City council will apply paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework "
Policy T10	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2451	Objecting	Policy T10 Spokes supports this policy with the following changes. The City Council will apply Kent County Council's residential parking standard IGN3 or any subsequent guidance with the aim of reducing car parking places. Adequate Cycle parking will be provided in new developments and will be convenient safe, secure, covered and where possible complemented by showering and changing facilities. Reason: To encourage cycle use over the car.	
Policy T10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3983	Objecting	Generally support this Policy, but the final sentence should be re-worded as follows: 'Cycle parking should be provided, and will be convenient, secure, covered and where possible complemented by showering and changing facilities for cyclists.'	Reword final sentence: 'Cycle parking should be provided, and will be convenient, secure, covered and where possible complemented by showering and changing facilities for cyclists.'
Policy T10	406848	Mr Graham Norton	Land and Planning Director Strategic Land Kent	5587	Objecting	Such standards, as per the guidance in the new national policy document (NPPF) should be included in the Local Plan and not in a supplementary planning document.	Include car parking standards in plan.
Policy T10	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6159	Objecting	No practical parking spaces standard in practice and especially not for the special problems of Whitstable. No ability for the public to comment as the standards are not published or accessible	A parking policy for Whitstable that requires full parking provision for users/resident/visitors for all classes of development and re-development.
Policy T10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6407	Objecting	Should Policy T9 criteria be included here also?	
Policy T11	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2452	Supporting	Spokes requires clarification on the scope of this policy but in principle does not object to restricting car parking for retail, office and commercial sites.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T11	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6054	Objecting	This is the wrong policy for Whitstable.	Maximum parking for all new and re-modelled development in CT5 is essential and the new central government policy on parking will support our view .
Policy T11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6408	Supporting	Seems reasonable, but what is 'multi-model access'?	
5.48	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		386	Supporting	I fully support this and believe that it is admirable for Canterbury City Council to lead by example.	
5.48	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3984	Objecting	Amend to make stronger, it is a key policy area, presumption should be implementation for all, query Council officers not paying for parking. Amend text saying that a organisational levy will be introduced with Council leading the way by charging staff for car parking at work.	Proposed amended text: 'An area-wide workplace parking levy will be investigated in the future, building on the work of organisations in Canterbury who are already charging their staff and/or visitors to park in conjunction with promotion of alternatives as part of their travel plans. The City Council will set an example and amend its Travel Plan in order to reduce car use and the number of single occupancy car journeys made by staff. Options will include increasing the incentives to travel more sustainably, as well as the removal of free car parking at the Military Road offices.'
5.48	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6409	Objecting	An Area-wide workplace parking levy could be investigated Is this deliverable? How would it be enforced? Is it a cost effective measure? Would not a 'congestion charge' be easier to administer and fairer for all?'	
5.48	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6909	Supporting	We wholeheartedly welcome and encourage the proposal set out in Â§5.48 to investigate an area-wide workplace parking levy. During each day of the working week a significant number of cars drive into the city centre to park in private car parks. They make a sizeable contribution to the congestion on the main arteries leading to the city centre. The proposed levy would help to reduce this practice and encourage greater Park and Ride usage.	
5.49	778536	Ms Patricia Marsh	Committee Member Wincheap Society	4623	Objecting	Current proposed use of Wincheap industrial estate for retail is a waste of opportunities for site. It is preferable to locate employment related B uses here as its close to Cant East station, bus station, P&R. Existing units have a floor area of 71,000sqm suggesting it would be feasible to provide an amount of office devt equivalent to that proposed for Barton Farm.	
5.49	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6587	Objecting	Unconvinced that Wincheap is "the most suitable location for meeting retail capacity for the City"; and existing plans that it cater for "more bulky goods and large mass market retailers and leisure operators" (Cpt 4) is a waste of its position close to major public transport hubs. Its situation would be better served by it being developed as the high skill 'knowledge economy' development currently proposed for Little Barton Farm and/or for some residential development.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.50	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		387	Objecting	The A2 off-slip will only introduce more traffic and is contrary to the hierarchy of transport modes since pedestrians and cyclists will not benefit from this. The gyratory system could provide a road environment which actively discourages walking and cycling. The identified pedestrian / cycle links with Castle Street are particularly important on safety grounds.	Removal of A2 off-slip, Park & Ride expansion at Wincheap, and Wincheap gyratory systems from the considerations. Provision of the pedestrian / cycle links as detailed and also bus lanes in Wincheap through the removal of on-street car parking spaces.
5.50	778536	Ms Patricia Marsh	Committee Member Wincheap Society	4625	Objecting	There's no mention of building a new tunnel under the railway line to take traffic directly out from the industrial estate via a new road joining up with St Andrew's Close & a new roundabout at the junction with the ring road. This will be vital for resolving Wincheap's congestion and air pollution. If traffic is merely diverted round the estate and then brought up Simmonds Rd to rejoin Wincheap and again exit onto the r/about under the bottleneck of railway bridge this solves nothing in area.	
5.50	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4709	Objecting	While there is much to recommend, there are some transport proposals that concern us and which we are certain could be much improved. Thus we would take issue with the large new traffic interchange on the Bridge side of Canterbury, which is neither necessary or an optimal use of resources. Also, there are no policies in this chapter to address vehicle produced-air pollution; the Council has failed to produce a Transport Strategy and the supporting documentation on transport is very dated.	
5.50	781629	Kathryn Nevell	Canterbury Student Lets	5334	Objecting	Another way of relieving the pinch point of traffic at Wincheap would be to create a short tunnel under the railway between Simmonds Road and St Andrews Close. As has been demonstrated by closing the Westgate Towers, stopping traffic flowing at one point can cause problems, conversely opening up a new flow of traffic can considerably ease congestion.	Create a short tunnel under the railway between Simmonds Road and St Andrews Close
5.50	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6410	Objecting	Where is the evidence? Can it be guaranteed that it will be well used as a result of the new proposed road, a complete bus lane & a faster journey? What is the time saving to be?	
5.50	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6598	Objecting	Resources would be better spent on sustainable transport measures. Add the following bullet points to paragraph 5.50: i) 'fast' bus links (15 min) that serve Chartham into the city and Thanington Without; ii) bus priority measures and bus lanes through Wincheap and through the industrial estate; iii) creation of off-street parking through multi-level parking on the industrial estate to enable the removal of on-street parking on Wincheap; iv) the vigorous promotion of car sharing ...	Add the following bullet points to paragraph 5.50: i) 'fast' bus links (at least every 15 minutes) that serve Chartham into the city and Thanington Without; ii) bus priority measures and bus lanes through Wincheap and through the industrial estate; iii) creation of off-street parking through multi-level parking on the industrial estate to enable the removal of on-street parking on Wincheap; iv) the vigorous promotion of car-sharing and car clubs in Thanington Without/Chartham and for commuters from Ashford.
Policy T12	766829	Mr Stuart Field		106	Supporting	Prior to ANY development in South Canterbury the road infrastructure needs to be looked at as a priority. A new 'exit' road needs to be built off the southbound A2 at Wincheap	
Policy T12	115295	Mrs Gordana Groombridge		454	Supporting	Installing the missing slip road into Wincheap will reduce the number of cars on the ring road.	Please prioritise the proposal with the most common sense behind it - building the missing slip road from the A2 at Wincheap and expand the Wincheap Park and Ride.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T12	775602	Dr & Mrs Davies		478	Supporting	We support the construction of a fourth slip road from the A2 at Wincheap and the expansion of the existing Park and Ride site.	
Policy T12	405194	Mr Julian Parker		481	Supporting	The expansion of the Wincheap Park and Ride, with the construction of the "forth slip road." This, is the way forward,...not the desecration of ancient orchards and beautiful, and ancient landscapes such as we have in Harbledown.	
Policy T12	112731	Mr E. W. Golding		487	Supporting	There is a far better, less destructive alternative to the proposed Harbledown park & ride(if required) -expand the existing Wincheap Park & Ride site (which can be seen from the bridge over the By Pass at Faulkners Lane!). All that is needed is to install the missing "fourth slip road" (A2 Dover bound), so that traffic can access it from the A2!	
Policy T12	775810	Mr & Mrs Mark & Katherine Thatcher		509	Supporting	Please reconsider (Policy T5)and opt for the less destructive alternative, expansion of the current Wincheap Park & Ride and install the missing'fourth' slip road at Wincheap so that traffic coming from the M2 can access it from the A2.	
Policy T12	775204	Mr & Mrs Paul & Katrina Roberts		606	Supporting	Object to park and ride at Harbledown.The far less expensive alternative would be to expand the wincheap park and ride site, all that is needed is to install the much needed missing fourth slip road so that traffic may access it from the A2	
Policy T12	117570	Ms Mary Murdoch		632	Supporting	Support proposals for a new slip road from the A2 at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	776134	P Rogers & K Pepper		679	Supporting	A far better option to Harbledown park & ride would be further development of Wincheap park and ride, incorporating an off slip from the A2 coastbound, with signage directing traffic approaching from the north west.	
Policy T12	777165	Ms Sandra Baker		687	Supporting	I am a Harbledown resident saying YES we do want a park and ride, but we also still need the slip road at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	777171	Mr Robin Baker		692	Supporting	I write to object to the proposal in Harbledown as the site of a park & ride. It is difficult to see that a viable economic case can be made for T5 compared to a fourth slip road at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	777246	Dr Melanie Caiazza-Robinson		717	Supporting	I propose that an additional slip road be constructed in Wincheap, as an alternative plan to the Harbledown park & ride proposal, so that traffic can access the park and ride site there from the A2. This seems a more sensible option from a conservation and cost perspective and I would be willing to see any draft as to how this is a feasible option, or not.	
Policy T12	777253	Mr David Lurcock		719	Supporting	BUILD THE 4th SLIP ROAD AT WINCHEAP NOT A 4TH PARK & RIDE AT HARBLEDOWN. Surely that is the most sensible option. I just cannot understand why any organisation would propose to build a Park & Ride at Harbledown it does not make any sense it is madness.	
Policy T12	777430	Sir Cedric Delves		760	Supporting	I object to the proposed "Park and Ride", to be sited at Faulkner's Lane, Harbledown.The safe option must be an expansion of the existing and successful Wincheap Park and Ride, with the added bonus that this would offer a much needed additional slip road from the A2 , relieving the pressure on the A20S0, most evident during the morning 'rush'.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T12	775218	Mrs C L Sullivan		771	Supporting	Support proposals for a new slip road from the A2 at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	127115	B.J. Gore		774	Supporting	Support for an enlargement/redevelopment of the existing Park and Ride site at Wincheap. This site would be far more suitable than the Harbledown one. It would also limit construction of the new road to an already despoiled and urban area, rather than putting a new link road in Harbledown in open countryside.	
Policy T12	111377	Miss D. R. Manley		805	Supporting	Wincheap Park and Ride site could be expanded and made accessible from the A2.	
Policy T12	777426	J M Chapman		814	Supporting	A less destructive alternative to the proposed harbledown park & ride would be to expand the Wincheap Park and Ride site and install a 'fourth slip road' so that traffic can access it from the A2!	
Policy T12	405197	Mr & Mrs Cook		816	Supporting	We wish to object most strongly to the possibility of a 4th Park and Ride at HARBLEDOWN as set out in Policy T5. We think the better alternative would be to build the essential 4th Slip Road from the A2 at Wincheap where there are already Park and Ride facilities and NOT at Harbledown	
Policy T12	777236	Mr & Mrs R J Taylor		835	Supporting	Install a slip road off the A2 into Wincheap.	
Policy T12	121925	Mr & Mrs D Meehan		836	Supporting	Add the much needed 4th slip road, relieving traffic from the A28 and Canterbury.	
Policy T12	777368	Mrs Vicky Balfour		839	Supporting	The obvious solution is to build a second slip road off the A2 at Wincheap, enabling drivers to use the existing Park and Ride scheme at Wincheap instead of the proposed Harbledown park & ride site.	
Policy T12	777370	Mr Alistair Balfour		841	Supporting	In my opinion the overwhelmingly obvious solution, instead of the proposed Harbledown park & ride, is to build a second slip road off the A2 at Wincheap, enabling drivers to use the existing Park and Ride scheme at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	405428	Mrs Jane Edred Wright		874	Objecting	This new Park and Ride is not vital as its construction could be avoided by installing the fourth slip road to connect with the Wincheap Park and Ride.	
Policy T12	85312	Mrs Janet Larkinson	Harbledown and Rough Common Parish Council	876	Objecting	I wish to object to the Harbledown park and ride. A better solution would be to increase the size of the Wincheap site so that traffic could exit a new slip road off the A2.	
Policy T12	777705	Mr & Mrs R Bostock		880	Supporting	Why cannot a fourth slip road be created to allow access from the A2 ?	
Policy T12	777690	Mr Tim Burge		884	Supporting	Building the 4th slip road at the park and ride in Wincheap is the answer and much cheaper, the 3rd slip appears to have freed Wincheap from lorries from Ashford.	
Policy T12	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		922	Supporting	I welcome the proposal for a new junction on to the A2 and the extension of the Park & Ride at Wincheap. This is an essential prerequisite for the much needed redevelopment of the Wincheap area.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T12	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1054	Supporting	Policy T12: I fully support this policy (which is also covered in SP3).once the fourth slip road has been built at Wincheap, enlarging the existing Wincheap Park & Ride at Wincheap, is a much more sustainable option.	
Policy T12	778435	D T Standen		1109	Supporting	An cheaper and far better answer would be the making if the fourth slip road at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	778067	Mr Rory Kehoe		1161	Supporting	Support proposals for a new slip road from the A2 at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	778042	Ms Carol Bolton		1170	Supporting	I am appalled that consideration is being given to establishing a Park and Ride facility on a prime greenfield site located in an area of outstanding beauty when extending the existing Wincheap Park and Ride site is the most obvious solution. This latter site would not entail the loss of agricultural land and a new slip road off the A2 at Wincheap would also be of great benefit to the existing Park and Ride and would go a long way to ease Canterbury's traffic problems in general in that area.	
Policy T12	778044	Ms Rosemary Flower		1173	Objecting	The construction of the "missing" 4th slip road at Wincheap - accepted as needed in terms of traffic management - with an extension of the existing parking facility at Wincheap, if necessary, solves two projects in one and must be more economic.	
Policy T12	777484	Mr Ivan Phillips		1431	Supporting	I gather that a well investigated solution instead of a park and ride at Harbledown is available involving the building of a fourth slip road at Wincheap. Every effort must be directed in this direction. This would appear to provide a successful solution which will receive the approval of most of the population.	
Policy T12	405195	Mr John Earl		1452	Supporting	There is an alternative, far less destructive alternative to Harbledown park and ride, if required, and that would be to expand the Wincheap Park & Ride Site. That would require the installation of the missing link to the A2 Canterbury bypass.	
Policy T12	122883	Ms Cynthia Short		1455	Supporting	Harbledown park and ride -this objective could be achieved much more satisfactorily by expanding the present Park and Ride site in Wincheap and building a new slip road.	
Policy T12	777544	Robin Ross-Hunt		1459	Supporting	There is a far better site than Faulkner's Lane and that is to expand Wincheap Park and Ride and build the missing slip road on the A2. The infrastructure already exists at Wincheap. So on cost alone it must be logical.	
Policy T12	777644	Ken & Margaret Griffin		1486	Supporting	We believe that expanding the Wincheap Park and Ride site would be less expensive than Harbledown, even when installing a fourth slip road for access from the A2 - this latter is long overdue anyway.	
Policy T12	777646	Irene & John Robson		1491	Supporting	Clearly there is a far better and less destructive alternative if a fourth Park and Ride site is required. Build the fourth slip road at Wincheap and expand the existing Park and Ride site or if necessary, build a multistorey car park on the Wincheap site.	
Policy T12	778350	Dr David Clarke		1578	Supporting	It seems logical to me to sort out the 4th slip road at Wincheap before disrupting Harbledown.	
Policy T12	778189	Mr Geoffrey Bolton		1588	Supporting	A far better alternative to Harbledown park and ride is located at Wincheap. The Highways Agency has, I believe, agreed that a slip lane is needed on the southbound A2 at Wincheap giving ready access to this area.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T12	124149	Mr. Christopher Date		1610	Supporting	Build a fourth slip road off the A2 at Wincheap and increase the current 'Park and Ride' facilities there.	
Policy T12	778482	Mr & Mrs T J & A Pearce		1616	Supporting	A less destructive alternative to Harbledown park and ride would be to add the slip road off the A2 at Wincheap and expand the current Park and Ride Site.	
Policy T12	122808	Ms Angela Graham		1655	Supporting	Time and money would be better spent on installing the missing 4th slip road from the A2 and improving public transport systems.	
Policy T12	415836	Ms Gillian Wright		1669	Supporting	Expanding the Wincheap Park & Ride and putting in the 4th slip road will be quicker and cheaper than Harbledown park & ride	
Policy T12	778404	Mr & Mrs PW & IM Sayer		1908	Supporting	Increase the size of the Wincheap Park & Ride site and construct the "slip road".	
Policy T12	779262	Mr John Bailey		1972	Supporting	This is a key proposal. 30 years and still counting since it was first proposed.	
Policy T12	422103	Mr and Mrs Stuart and Gill Smith		2028	Supporting	We suggest that the fourth Slip Road be constructed at Wincheap. Once the fourth slip road was in place it would serve a wider area on a superior road network.	
Policy T12	122957	Ms Joan Cuthbert		2120	Supporting	Wincheap Park and Ride site is available for a 'fourth slip road', and traffic access it from the A2.	
Policy T12	121447	K P Poole		2216	Supporting	Pleased that the plan envisages an 'off-slip' from the A2 to provide access to the Wincheap site.	
Policy T12	778766	Mr & Mrs J H & M A Shaw		2265	Supporting	Building the fourth slip road at Wincheap would give direct access to the existing Park and Ride.	
Policy T12	778710	Jean & Alan Thomas		2286	Supporting	Objects to Policy T5 but supports the upgrading of the Wincheap park and ride with the necessary additional slip roads as the most sensible solution.	
Policy T12	778659	Ms Sarah Watson		2313	Supporting	Objects to Harbledown Park and Ride on green belt when there are brownfield sites. Build the missing A2/A28 slip road at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	778651	Ms Margaret Wilson		2314	Supporting	Objects to policy T5. Extend Wincheap park and ride and A2 slip instead.	
Policy T12	777993	Ms A Finn		2322	Supporting	Objects to policy T5. Install missing slip and Wincheap and use this site.	
Policy T12	778755	Mr Richard Williams		2323	Supporting	I feel that with better use and expansion of the existing Park and Ride sites ie expanding Wincheap and using the spare capacity in Sturry Road there is no real need for the Harbledown Park and Ride. I believe that planning permission has already been granted for slip road of the A2 at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2453	Objecting	Spokes objects to this policy and wants it removed. Reason: The A2 Slip road will increase car use as will an A28 Relief road. Neither will help or encourage walking and cycling.	
Policy T12	778864	Mr & Mrs Oscar & Edna Ring		2490	Objecting	We wish to object to the proposed site for the Harbledown park and ride. It would make far more sense to insert the missing 4th slip road at Wincheap so traffic can access via A2.	
Policy T12	779093	Mrs J M Bradley		2519	Supporting	Support proposals for a new slip road from the A2 at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	776448	Ms Susan Booth		2520	Supporting	Support proposals for a new off-slip road at Wincheap	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T12	778874	Mrs Elaine Harrington		2542	Objecting	To install the long awaited 4th slip road at Wincheap would undoubtedly be the less destructive and preferred option. Using the existing Park and Ride at Wincheap would take the traffic closer to the City Centre and the Wincheap Retail Park with minimal impact on the environment. This option would take additional traffic much closer to the City Centre, therefore reducing the necessity of a further seven buses per hour running around our City.	
Policy T12	778882	Mr Chas Harrington		2546	Supporting	The common sense solution would be to install the slip road at Wincheap so that access would be gained direct from the A2 and use the existing facilities by expanding the parking. There would be no need for more buses on our local roads, and traffic would be kept to a minimum through our rural areas.	
Policy T12	779128	Mr Neil Morris		2659	Supporting	The alternative to Harbledown, which doesn't destroy any high-grade agricultural land or ruin a landscape that hasn't already been blighted, is an extension of Wincheap Park and Ride.	
Policy T12	779346	Glenda Flanagan		2800	Supporting	Support proposals for a new slip road from the A2 at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	779274	Mr Graham Duplock	Parish Councillor Parish Councillor Beskesbourne	2822	Objecting	Crucial to the city's economic and cultural development is provision of adequate traffic routing around the city. This will improve traffic management and address quality of life and air pollution issues around the current ring road. This must be provided by completing the A2 Wincheap junction with access from the north going through to a new route under the Victoria - Canterbury East line to the current ring road.	Crucial to the city's economic and cultural development is provision of adequate traffic routing around the city. This will improve traffic management and address quality of life and air pollution issues around the current ring road. This must be provided by completing the A2 Wincheap junction with access from the north going through to a new route under the Victoria - Canterbury East line to the current ring road.
Policy T12	780740	Mr Chris Lambert		3438	Supporting	The obvious solution (if more space is required) is to install the missing slip road into Wincheap from the London direction and to upgrade the Park & Ride car park to accommodate more vehicles (perhaps by multi storey if necessary).	
Policy T12	780651	Mr Kevin Bown	Asset Manager Area 4 (Kent) Highways Agency	3545	Objecting	The policy sets out that the council are seeking to promote the A2 off-slip road at Wincheap, an A28 relief road through the industrial estate and improvements at Wincheap Green. Any development proposals that might prejudice these improvements will be resisted. Contributions towards these infrastructure improvements will be sought from appropriate developments. The HA will require information on the funding and delivery of this scheme.	The policy sets out that the council are seeking to promote the A2 off-slip road at Wincheap, an A28 relief road through the industrial estate and improvements at Wincheap Green. The HA will require information on the funding and delivery of this scheme.
Policy T12	406328	Mr Daniel Smith		3570	Supporting	Support proposals for a new A2 slip at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3704	Supporting	We strongly support Policy T12. Indeed, we would make most of the proposed development in Wincheap dependent on the slip road being put into place first.	
Policy T12	121368	Ms Helen Williams		3746	Supporting	The Park and Ride could be expanded with a simple slip road off the A2 could cater for visitors from A2 as well as from Asford direction.	
Policy T12	122929	Prof. Thomas Sears		4096	Supporting	A fourth slip road would greatly facilitate direct access from the London direction via the A2 and thus further benefit leisure, business and cultural activities.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T12	780981	Mr David Adley		4239	Supporting	What I fail to understand is why the Wincheap park and ride site cannot be expanded and the missing fourth slip road installed to allow motorists entering Canterbury to access this site from the A2. This, I would suggest, is a far more sensible and less destructive alternative than a fourth Parks and Ride at Faulkners Lane.	
Policy T12	781011	Richard & Elaine Caraccio		4293	Supporting	We are in favour of building the 4th Slip Road at Wincheap to the existing Park and Ride site.	
Policy T12	122979	Ms Joanna Fassum		4478	Supporting	Is a 4th park & ride site actually required? If so, why can't the council put in the missing slip road at Wincheap and expand the current Park & Ride site there, much less destruction of a conservation area.	
Policy T12	781317	R A Heart		4522	Supporting	What we really need is a fourth slip road in Wincheap.	
Policy T12	780838	Miss E J Nevell		4546	Objecting	Instead of the Faulkners Lane site, expand the Wincheap park and ride and install the missing 4th slip road. The park and ride will need to be extended when the slip is built anyhow giving people access to the city and shopping at Wincheap, this would then make the site at Faulkners Lane redundant.	Delete Policy T5 from the Draft Local Plan, together with all supporting text.
Policy T12	778536	Ms Patricia Marsh	Committee Member Wincheap Society	4626	Objecting	should be a case for a dedicated bus-way though Wincheap estate as part of redevelopment, helping modal shift from car to bus. If relief road and no measures to reduce road capacity then more trips by car into Canterbury. Therefore support Dr L Slowman's suggestion for a dedicated bus-way.	
Policy T12	781034	Mr John Charter		4634	Supporting	Support proposals for a new 'slip road' at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	781039	Mrs Margaret King		4641	Supporting	Support proposals for a new 'slip road' at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	121960	Dr A Teresa Hankey		4660	Supporting	Support proposals for a new 'slip road' at Wincheap.	
Policy T12	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4721	Objecting	For many years now the Council has had an assumption that the A2 slip roads will prove a solution for many of Canterbury's problems. This is a function of the fact that the highway authorities have said that many of the Council's business and housing proposals should not go ahead without better access to the A2. We are generally of the opinion that none of the A2 slip roads will be beneficial to the city.	
Policy T12	781927	Ms Ruth Harling		4922	Supporting	I wish to object to proposed Harbledown Park and Ride. It is obvious that eventually the fourth slip road will have to be built, so why not use the money to do it now and then use the existing Park and Ride at Wincheap. This works very efficiently, and there wouldn't be so many extra buses needed as when creating a new site.	
Policy T12	781934	Mrs Janette Edis		4928	Supporting	Object. The proposal to put a Park and Ride at Harbledown can only spoil a beautiful area of highly productive farmland which has been here for centuries. A much better alternative would be to make the slip road off the A2 at Wincheap and extend the present Park and Ride. This would be a much cheaper option and would upset the smallest number of the public.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T12	782031	Dr P W L Clough		4966	Supporting	Instead of a fourth Park and Ride ab initio, the Council should do much more to promote existing schemes, including consideration of reducing the fees. And in terms of increasing Park and Ride capacity, if this is really needed, the expansion of the Wincheap Park and Ride is a superior option. A new slip road from the A2 would secure access for traffic travelling from the west towards Canterbury - something which might have happened years ago with proper foresight.	
Policy T12	781700	Emma & Mark Barrett Palmer		5328	Supporting	Object to the proposed Harbledown Park and Ride because of: increased traffic to our beautiful Parishes; irreversible loss and destruction of greenfields, areas of natural beauty and historical significance; need for new and expensive road layout. The less destructive and more effective alternative would be to extend the existing Wincheap Park and Ride and install a 4th slip road so that traffic can access it from the A2.	Install a 4th slip road at Wincheap so that traffic can access it from the A2.
Policy T12	781629	Kathryn Nevell	Canterbury Student Lets	5333	Objecting	The Park and Ride in Harbledown is very unpopular and I am pleased to see in Policy T5 that it is not highlighted and the additional slip road at Wincheap and the enlargement of current Park and Rides are the favoured option.	
Policy T12	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5404	Objecting	New-off slip from the A2 and a relief road for Wincheap will further encourage car use to and from the site, reduce the motivation to use public transport to access the site and/or to commute, increase congestion and worsen air quality. Instead should invest in sustainable transport measures eg fast bus link every 10 mins from Chartham to City; bus priority measures and lanes; multi-level parking on Wincheap to replace on street parking; car sharing/clubs; direct easy cycle and pedestrian routes	
Policy T12	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5724	Supporting	More specific positives:â€¢ Policy T12 re-A2 off-slip road at Wincheap and A28 relief road through Wincheap	
Policy T12	405086	Mr Paul Barrett	Chairman Canterbury for Business	5750	Supporting	Wincheap is the key to unlock the city's traffic congestion. The provision of slip-roads in all directions and a Park & Ride that is significantly larger, is a strategic necessity and key to unlocking the city's traffic congestion.	
Policy T12	781577	Mrs G M Dodds		5795	Supporting	Surely it would be far better and cheaper to enlarge the Wincheap Park and Ride Site with the addition of an extra slip road off the A2 - far less destructive all round I would have thought. (Harbledown P&R Object)	
Policy T12	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6411	Objecting	Is this deliverable? Will the contributions be sufficient?	
Policy T12	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6595	Objecting	A new off-slip from the A2 and a relief system for Wincheap will encourage car use to and from the site, reduce patronage of public transport to access the site and/or to commute, increase traffic congestion and worsen air quality.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T12	784819	Mr & Mrs G Scarfe		6716	Supporting	The missing fourth slip road should be constructed at Wincheap so that traffic can access it directly from the A2. This would keep traffic bound for the existing park and ride at Wincheap away from the city, relieving congestion along the A290 and A28. Congestion proves current park and ride at Wincheap inadequate.	
5.51	775156	Mr David Parish		2538	Objecting	We have the two main parallel streets in Herne Bay (Seafront and High Street). These could provide us with an opportunity to create two one way streets. This would free up space for short stay parking bays, boosting our retail trade, and car parking drop off access to the accommodation on the sea front. The main streets of the town would then have space to be planted up with trees and would be safer for pedestrians and cyclists. This would deal with increasing populations before problems occur.	
5.51	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6413	Objecting	'... development site at South Canterbury'. The site that has it all, apart from supported active living (similar to Franklyn house in Sturry) and provision for vulnerable people in social housing.	
5.51	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6415	Objecting	'Commercial' what? Is a word missing like activity?	
5.51	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6601	Objecting	Amend the following text in paragraph 5.51 "This is for a mixed use development including housing . . ." to read . . . including high density housing . . .	Amend the following text in paragraph 5.51 "This is for a mixed use development including housing . . ." to read . . . including high density housing . . .
5.52	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		665	Objecting	It is not only access from the A2 which is difficult. Access to the City Centre, Canterbury West station and Sturry Road are even more difficult and these issues also need to be addressed before development of this area should be considered.	Deletion of this proposal or credible plans for improving access to the City Centre, Canterbury West station and Sturry Road.
5.52	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		2363	Objecting	A2 Bridge Interchange - the provision of a new grade separated interchange on the nearby A2 among other related transport improvements. What would be the Council's position in the event that it is not possible to: (a) Complete the necessary Highway Orders for the new interchange? or (b) Fund the design and construction of the new interchange through developers' contributions?	
5.52	780823	S Suti		3393	Objecting	Canterbury needs to deal with its congestion and parking problems. Opening up Chaucer Rd and connecting it to Littlebourne Rd will allow traffic flows away from the current bottlenecks. If the eastern bypass is affordable safeguard a bigger link. However, the link needs to go through to the A2 via Barton Business park. A bridge over the railway cutting should be simple.	Link Chaucer Rd, to Littlebourne Rd onto the Barton Business park and the A2.
5.52	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6417	Objecting interchange would be a prerequisite to any significant development'. Will the funding be forthcoming upfront to make this proposal viable? How much housing can be accommodated without the new interchange? How long would the road works take to complete? When would the improvements and changes be in place? Truly reflects the 'chicken/egg' situation which runs throughout this report. It is a continuous circle: problem - no money - solution - no money - problem. Will anything be delivered?	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.53	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		388	Supporting	Support proposed provision with the exception of the new A2 junction and expanded Park & Ride provision.	Remove new A2 junction and Park & Ride expansion from these plans. Use the saved money to provide a dedicated, but physically separated from the main carriageway, in-road bidirectional cycle lane along the New Dover Road alignment to the city centre (at Fenwicks). Spend the remaining money on sustainable transport provision throughout the district.
5.53	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		666	Objecting	Without specific details, the suggestion of a fast track bus service is not credible. It is worth noting that the New Dover Road was not included in the list of routes being proposed for a bus lane so this fast track bus service would appear to be little more than wishful thinking and has no place in a serious planning document.	Delete all reference to a fast tack bus service of detail how it is to be achieved.
5.53	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2881	Objecting	It is far from clear whether the requirements set out as being part of the A2 Bridge scheme - such as bus fare incentives, are actually associated with the South Canterbury allocation. If so, then this list represents a considerable financial and viability burden on the proposed allocation site. It is unclear how the requirements in this section interact with Policy SP3a - Perhaps it can only be interpreted as the entirety of the scheme to be required.	
5.53	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6419	Objecting	'parking controls'. Where?	
5.53	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6602	Objecting	We strongly agree with Dr Sloman's statement that the Local Plan "... should not assume that a grade-separated interchange on the A2 is required in order to develop the site. Such an interchange will increase the proportion of trips that residents make by car, and will also encourage longer distance out-commuting to jobs elsewhere in the county."	In addition to the sustainable transport measures already specified, add the following points to paragraph 5.53: a) The removal of on-street parking that inhibits the provision of a fast service into the city; b) The creation of a segregated cycle route on New Dover Road from the roundabout at the existing park and ride directly into the city.
Policy T13	766238	Mr Mike Sole		24	Objecting	The existing Canterbury city ring road cannot at present cope with current levels of traffic at peak times. Where is the predicted traffic survey and is it not premature to have allocated land for development without considering this in detail. I understand that many £millions will be spent on a new A2 junction. It seems as if this is the justification for the whole development, i.e. we need a new junction so we must have a house to pay for it. I would argue that we do not need a new junction.	Traffic survey and justification for new junction is required
Policy T13	766829	Mr Stuart Field		105	Supporting	Prior to ANY development in South Canterbury the road infrastructure needs to be looked at as a priority. To support the development proposed it is essential that a new full four way on/off junction (as proposed) is constructed on the A2 south of Canterbury. Furthermore the ability to come off the A2 at the current Bridge turn off should be removed so discouraging the large amount of traffic at present using this means via the narrow Bekesbourne Road to gain access to Canterbury.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T13	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	148	Objecting	Whilst some of the major developments in the draft Local Plan do include infrastructure projects, nothing is mentioned about tackling the single most important issue of road traffic queuing on the main feeder roads in and out of the urban centre of Canterbury. By proposing major new growth in Canterbury, and to some extent in Sturry, this problem will worsen. Improvements to the A2 junction south of Canterbury will merely make the congestion nearer the city worse.	
Policy T13	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	213	Objecting	The obviously massive cost of such elements as the remodelling of the A2 junction at Bridge, the construction of the so-called "Eastern Bypass" and the relocation of large and important girls' school is not acknowledged anywhere in the document. The idea that such schemes could simply be funded by development is, frankly, disingenuous. Indeed, it is perhaps significant that no even speculative costings are included.	
Policy T13	772987	Mrs Doreen Louren		307	Objecting	The proposal for a roundabout to improve A2 access is vague and uncoded.	
Policy T13	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		389	Objecting	The provision of the new A2 junction is contrary to the hierarchy of transport modes and will encourage further unsustainable travel patterns. The money would be much more cost effectively spent on sustainable transport provision both in Canterbury and the rest of the district.	No provision of a new A2 junction. Spending of the money on sustainable transport measures across the district instead.
Policy T13	777173	Mr Tim Timpson		750	Objecting	There is no need for new Interchange at Bridge. An existing 4-way junction exists. If this is not up to standard then it is for the Highway Authority to finance a new one. If money from the developers is tight it is far more important to build a relief road from the A2 to A257.	
Policy T13	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1055	Objecting	Policy T13: A2 Bridge Interchange - The cost of this interchange would be somewhere between £20 to 30 million. It would be a staggering waste of money, and cannot possibly be justified. I therefore object most strongly to this policy.	
Policy T13	777570	Mr J K Rishworth		1073	Objecting	The proposed new A2 junction would be an improvement on the existing one, but does not add anything to the routes available into and out of the proposed development.	
Policy T13	777494	Mr Fred Wilson		1509	Supporting	There are good aspects of the Plan, including the improved A2 junction for south Canterbury and road infrastructure improvements to mitigate the current daily gridlock.	
Policy T13	778770	S Thorne		2228	Supporting	A 'new, safer junction on to the A2 at Bridge' is mentioned in the Local Plan to coincide with the 4,000 new properties to be built in south Canterbury. This road will presumably be built from the A2050 to the A2. Traffic from the south Canterbury development will still want to travel east. Therefore, a further link road/bypass should be built east to Littlebourne Road (avoiding Littlebourne whose main street is extremely narrow) to join the Eastern Bypass mentioned above.	Therefore, a further link road/bypass should be built east to Littlebourne Road (avoiding Littlebourne whose main street is extremely narrow) to join the Eastern Bypass mentioned above.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T13	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		2370	Objecting	Policy T13 - the provision of a new grade separated interchange on the nearby A2 among other related transport improvements. What would be the Council's position in the event that it is not possible to: (a) Complete the necessary Highway Orders for the new interchange? or (b) Fund the design and construction of the new interchange through developers' contributions?	
Policy T13	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2454	Objecting	Spokes objects to this policy and wants it removed. Reason: The Interchange will increase car use. It will not encourage walking or cycling. Additionally, the farmland (Grade 1) needs to be retained for food security reasons in line with sustainable development.	
Policy T13	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2571	Objecting	I also object to the provision of a new road interchange at Bridge.	
Policy T13	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2749	Objecting	Proposed Policy T13 sets out 'essential' transport measures required as a pre-requisite of any significant development at 'South Canterbury'. There is no evidence base to demonstrate that this 'essential' strategic infrastructure can be financed or delivered within the plan period.	
Policy T13	775862	Mr Clive Flisher		2776	Objecting	However desirable the A2 and eastern bypass improvements may be, the enabling development proposals are in my opinion too high a price to pay. Other ways should be explored for delivering these, or reduced schemes, such as a minimal south off slip at Renville: the Bridge junction proposal becomes less important once it is accepted that the South Canterbury development proposals are unacceptable.	Other ways should be explored for delivering these, or reduced schemes, such as a minimal south off slip at Renville: the Bridge junction proposal becomes less important once it is accepted that the South Canterbury development proposals are unacceptable.
Policy T13	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2796	Objecting	I do not agree with the A2 Bridge interchange. To spend Â£20-30 million on such a scheme is totally unjustified.	
Policy T13	779274	Mr Graham Duplock	Parish Councillor Parish Councillor Beskesbourne	2820	Supporting	Crucial to the city's economic and cultural development is provision of adequate traffic routing around the city. This will improve traffic management and address quality of life and air pollution issues around the current ring road. This must be provided by a new full access junction on the A2 to replace the current unsafe Bridge junction.	
Policy T13	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2882	Objecting	If 5.53 constitutes the entirety of the scheme deemed to be required then the wording of Policy T13 seems to over-ride Policy SP3a, and requires that the entirety of these essential elements must be provided as part of the development at South Canterbury, as they are an integral part of development. This sets the bar very high in viability terms for the South Canterbury allocation. It will be important to understand how all of these measures will be funded and delivered.	
Policy T13	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3188	Objecting	LANRA objects to the new / improved A2 junction provision at Bridge. The cost will be prohibitive and is used to justify large scale housing in South Canterbury to extract the levy from the developer does not ring true. Costs, along with the highways authority statements, which do not appear to support such a junction, mean that LANRA cannot support this policy.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T13	13751	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Lower Hardres Parish Council	3378	Objecting	The "fast" bus service proposed from the new residential areas will not benefit our Parish. The envisaged interchange near Bridge will cause a major increase in traffic using Bridge Road.	
Policy T13	780651	Mr Kevin Bown	Asset Manager Area 4 (Kent) Highways Agency	3547	Objecting	The policy sets out that council will require the provision of a new A2 interchange near Bridge. Notwithstanding this and the pre-application engagement the HA has had with the Council and promoter, the HA will require further detail and assessment of the interchange in the forthcoming transport evidence base.	
Policy T13	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3705	Objecting	Oppose new A2 Bridge interchange. Proposal for a large number of new houses in S Canterbury is unnecessary, especially in regard to traffic, its unworkable and financially ruinous. The proposed fast-track bus service peters out at the Hospital, will increase congestion in South Canterbury Road, Nunnery Fields and Old Dover Road. Its impact on the roundabout at Riding Gate would be catastrophic. We suggest a greatly reduced housing scheme and new traffic impact study under policy T18.	
Policy T13	408497	Mr C Mills		3770	Objecting	We believe that the building numbers proposed by the council have been arbitrarily chosen to support a long held ambition to upgrade the A2 junction at or near Bridge. I believe that this junction will never be delivered unless it is independently funded outside of developer- led levy money.	
Policy T13	404737	Mr Richard Guest		3828	Objecting	I also object to the provision of a new road interchange at Bridge.	
Policy T13	13752	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Petham Parish Council	3941	Objecting	A proposed new interchange on the A2 near Bridge. Again this will not benefit our Parish but is likely lead to increased traffic using Bridge Road and emerging onto the B2068.	
Policy T13	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3985	Objecting	These policies are dealt with in Part 1 of our response and our general concerns about the spatial strategy of the Plan. In accordance with this, these policies and their supporting text should be deleted.	Delete
Policy T13	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4253	Objecting	This policy needs to be deleted in its entirety until such time as there is any realistic prospect of funding being forthcoming from a combination of public and private sources. It is wholly unrealistic to expect the interchange to be implemented during the Local Plan period.	This policy needs to be deleted in its entirety until such time as there is any realistic prospect of funding being forthcoming from a combination of public and private sources.
Policy T13	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patricbourne Parish Council	4570	Supporting	Support a new multi direction slip road to the A2, at Bridge; the conversion of the current Bridge junction to a local access road only. No development can take place in South Canterbury without this new A2 junction; infrastructure must be in place before any building takes place. A new junction would solve current problems with existing slip road eg accidents, heavy volumes of traffic using local roads to access A2. Existing junction couldn't cope with construction traffic.	
Policy T13	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4722	Objecting	Additionally, the proposed A2 Bridge interchange is unlikely to have sufficient benefits to make it viable. The existence of this interchange is more likely to encourage private vehicle use in the area since it offers a ready access to road travel.	The city Council needs to provide evidence, and state objectively, exactly how all new A2 slip roads will ease the traffic congestion in any parts of the city, especially in the Air Quality Management Areas.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T13	780837	Mrs Margaret Darby		4744	Objecting	An improved A2 junction does not help south Canterbury residents access the Whitstable and Sturry roads or Canterbury West Station.	
Policy T13	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5857	Objecting	The transport implications of the South Canterbury development are the main concern of residents. If the DLP's doubts about proposals like the 4th A2 Slip Road at Wincheap are valid, the drive for the A2 interchange at Bridge seems wholly misplaced. It would also increase the pressure on the two Dover Roads and the Canterbury Ring Road.	
Policy T13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6422	Objecting	Not unreasonable, but is it deliverable? Will there be sufficient funding from developer contributions? What happens if there is a shortfall? Does Policy SP3 need to mention T13?	
5.54	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1017	Objecting	The Council cannot make the mistakes that it made with Altira, Meadow View and Blacksole Bridge. Any relief road needs to happen BEFORE major housing estates are built	The Council cannot make the mistakes that it made with Altira, Meadow View and Blacksole Bridge. Any relief road needs to happen BEFORE major housing estates are built
5.54	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2821	Objecting	The Herne relief Rd is not a by-pass. Concerned about improvements to Bullockstone Rd, as it is not classified, has a 7.5 tonne weight limit, not suitable as an A road, will need compulsory purchase for widening. What information has been sourced? Business will be affected and may be entitled to costs. There is no Memorandum of understanding. More than an understanding is required to ensure road is delivered and is fit for purpose. Residents want by-pass but not if it means more development	
5.54	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3596	Objecting	Several sites are said to have to make a contribution to the so called Herne Link Road/by-pass and a new Sturry rail crossing. If one or more of the promoted sites do not materialise for some years, what provision will be made to make sure the infrastructure is in place.	
5.54	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4766	Objecting	The nature and scale of the proposals is unclear.	
5.54	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5859	Objecting	Paragraphs 5.54 and 5.55 state that, the City Council has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with KCC and relevant developers to deliver the Sturry Bypass and Herne Relief Road. This is not the case and implies a degree of commitment which is not possible to give at this early stage of the CLP process. Should the respective sites that trigger the requirement for these roads be allocated in the CLP, a legal mechanism for their delivery will have to be agreed between the relevant parties.	
Policy T14	769850	Ms Jean White		180	Objecting	As regarding the relief road for Herne, Lower Herne Road is very narrow and together with Bullockstone Road would be a recipe for disaster, a proper bypass is needed if no deaths are to be on your conscience.	
Policy T14	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		390	Objecting	This policy is contrary to the hierarchy of transport modes detailed in paragraph 5.24.	No requirement for provision of a Herne Relief Road. Spending on measures which actively support sustainable travel options instead.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T14	776298	J R Keates		586	Objecting	More thought needs to be given to ensure that the roads are fit for purpose. He has suggested some modifications to improve the road network, avoid accidents and ensure that traffic does not go through Herne Village, as shown on the attached plans. He has proposed more of a diversion with roundabouts.	Study and understand his suggestions for an improved road layout.
Policy T14	778783	A Briant		2342	Objecting	Where are the details of what is planned for Bullockstone Road, from Lower Herne Road to Canterbury Road? I believe this is called Link Road/bypass for instance, how is the road to be brought up to an A road standard?	
Policy T14	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		2372	Objecting	Herne Relief Road - Policy T14 - What would be the Council's position in the event that it is not possible to: (a) Complete the necessary Highway Orders for the new interchange? or (b) Fund the design and construction of the new interchange through developers' contributions?	
Policy T14	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2455	Objecting	Spokes objects to this policy and wants it removed. Reason: The relief road will increase car traffic and not encourage more cycling and walking.	
Policy T14	778883	Mrs F Dingle		2583	Objecting	If you allow a so called Link Road/bypass on this land - how is such a road to be brought up to the legal "A" road standard and who is going to fund it all. There are no proper details set out for Bullockstone Road. No traffic figures have been supplied for before and after the proposed developments + how would the links to the main Canterbury Road & the A249 possibly work.	
Policy T14	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2833	Objecting	The development of Strode Farm is key to the provision of the infrastructure, it is unclear if it is deliverable and it would appear it is regardless of whether it is wanted by local residents or not. They would like a by-pass but not if it means more development. Bullockstone Rd is not an A road and would need widening and compulsorily purchase. Lack of information on what is to be done and funding and no guarantee that it will happen in time.	
Policy T14	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2925	Supporting	Policy T14 requiring an A291 Herne Relief Road is supported although Kitewood has not been provided with sufficient evidence to justify a financial contribution from Land at Hillborough towards this scheme.	
Policy T14	779568	Mr & Mrs Walker		2972	Objecting	As residents of both Herne and Bullockstone, my husband and I are concerned about the impact the proposed development at Strode farm and the upgrading of Bullockstone Road to form a new relief road for Herne Village will have on our area. We are not against future development if it is needed, providing a satisfactory solution is found for a relief road for Herne.	We are not against future development if it is needed, providing a satisfactory solution is found for a relief road for Herne.
Policy T14	779163	Sarah Nops		3322	Objecting	There will be an increase in traffic. There is not sufficient information given for the improvement of existing roads, eg Bullockstone Road.	
Policy T14	780005	K Seed		3373	Objecting	The plans do not refer to what will happen in Bullockstone Road, the proposed 'relief road'. This road already needs careful negotiation as it is narrow and windows. If it is to carry a great deal more traffic it will not be an appropriate road to do so.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T14	780809	Mr J F Day		3510	Objecting	The development will generate a large amount of extra traffic through Herne and there is no indication when the road improvements will be done. The proposals to improve Bullockstone Road are unclear, costly and should be included in the development as no money would be available from central government or KCC.	
Policy T14	777366	G & M Goodfellow		3516	Objecting	No traffic figures supplied. No details of BullockStone Rd improvements from Lower Herne Rd to Canterbury Rd. As elderly pedestrians crossing roads in this already congested area has become a nightmare. Have you considered the amount of traffic these dwellings would generate? Every home considers the car a necessity. Widening Bullockstone Road to become an 'A Road' would be a disaster for us.	
Policy T14	755187	Mrs M E Pottinger		3531	Objecting	The developments would increase traffic through the village via a dangerous junction. Bullockstone Rd developments would be dangerous as road not wide enough, coming into a dangerous corner, making hazardous new junction. New exit onto Eddington Roundabout is also very busy. Other exit roads are too narrow and no suitable for extra traffic. Golf course exits are dangerous and there have been 7 fatal accidents. Promises have not been kept in past.	
Policy T14	755184	Mr Ian Sargent		3559	Objecting	There is only a vague plan for the strode farm site, which leaves unanswered questions re the traffic flow on/off the site. The 'bypass' on bullockstone hill is unworkable, esp the idea of changing the priority on the proposed roundabout at the junction of bullockstone road and Canterbury road. Traffic lights on eddington roundabout junction would see traffic backlogged into Herne Bay and Herne. To the detriment of residents.	
Policy T14	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3566	Objecting	A relief road for Herne will not help reduce traffic here.	
Policy T14	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3572	Objecting	I am opposed to the proposals to a Herne Relief Road, an upgrade of Bullockstone Road. Unless it is planned to totally re-build it, it will not be up to standard to take the proposed amount of traffic. An A road in this rural setting would be detrimental to the Herne Conservation Area.	
Policy T14	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3986	Objecting	These policies are dealt with in Part 1 of our response and our general concerns about the spatial strategy of the Plan. In accordance with this, these policies and their supporting text should be deleted.	Delete
Policy T14	780976	Mr Malcolm White		4276	Objecting	The only passport to further expansion in East Herne Bay is a relief road for Herne. See illustration. This route for a Herne Relief Road would allow Home Farm to survive, would allow some housing within the curve of the new road and Lower Herne Road (with opportunities for bunds), would be a good way from the Hamlet of Bullockstone and be a better arrangement for traffic, with less impact.	I have sketched out what I consider is the best route, tapping into this period of infrastructure spend to speed us out of recession.
Policy T14	781240	Mr & Mrs Mark Kim Kirby		4339	Objecting	Development at Herne and Broomfield. Another concern is the road improvements that will be needed.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T14	781159	Mr D R Budd		4399	Objecting	There are no details of the proposals for Bullockstone Road, from the junction with Lower Herne Road to Canterbury Road, 'the Relief Road'. How is the road to be brought up to the standard of an A road?	
Policy T14	380690	Hollamby Estates		4978	Objecting	HEL's principal concern is the viability of delivering both the construction of the road through the site (from Canterbury Road to Bullockstone Road) and the employment floor space (15,000 sq m). It is our view, that the Council needs to have a 'Strode Farm first' approach to the development of the strategic sites, where Strode Farm is developed and the road is constructed ahead of the release of the other strategic Herne Bay sites at the Golf Course and Altira.	It is our view, that the Council needs to have a 'Strode Farm first' approach to the development of the strategic sites, where Strode Farm is developed and the road is constructed ahead of the release of the other strategic Herne Bay sites at the Golf Course and Altira.
Policy T14	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5134	Objecting	Policy T14 does not meet tests in NPPF (204) as it does not recognise that contributions must be directly related to new development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. If there is sufficient capacity or the roads can run over capacity then sites should not be delayed in coming forward, otherwise DLP will be unsound. Amend policy accordingly.	To the end of Policy T14 add: 'and will be of a scale and kind that is fairly and reasonably associated to the development.'
Policy T14	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6426	Objecting	Not unreasonable, but is it deliverable? Will there be sufficient funding from developer contributions? What happens if there is a shortfall? Does Policy SP3 need to mention T14?	
5.55	765585	Mrs Patricia Papa		2	Objecting	Absolute objection the suggestion that Sturry level crossing should be closed to traffic	Any new routes should be additional to the current roads
5.55	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		391	Supporting	Bus lane welcome. It needs to be continuous into Canterbury to maximise its effectiveness. The proposed bridges must also benefit pedestrians and cyclists with a dedicated path away from traffic. The riverside pedestrian & cycle route must link with this. Traffic-free pedestrian and cycle provision must permeate into the proposed development at Sturry / Broad Oak.	The bus lane must be continuous into Canterbury to maximise its effectiveness. The proposed bridges must also benefit pedestrians and cyclists with a dedicated path away from traffic. The riverside pedestrian & cycle route must link with the above pedestrian / cycle path beside the crossings. Traffic-free pedestrian and cycle provision must permeate into the proposed development at Sturry / Broad Oak. (See attached annotated map)
5.55	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		667	Objecting	The proposed Sturry crossing bypass simply funnels all the traffic into Island Road, Sturry which is inadequate for the proposed increase. If money is to be spent it needs to be spent on a full Sturry Bypass and it also needs to make better provision at the Canterbury end for traffic wishing to use Broad Oak Road as an alternative to Sturry Road.	The plans need to be revised to make provision for a full Sturry bypass. They also need to recognise the proposals for the Richborough connection along a similar alignment.
5.55	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1018	Objecting	Herne Bay developments should fund improvements for Herne Bay and not a relief road for Sturry. This town needs investment, not a massive increase in housing and very little spend in the town to soften the impact	Herne Bay developments should fund improvements for Herne Bay and not a relief road for Sturry. This town needs investment, not a massive increase in housing and very little spend in the town to soften the impact
5.55	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2750	Objecting	With regard to the proposed 'sturry crossing' the proposed local plan fails to recognise the need to cross two rivers and no costing has been provided. The reference in the draft plan regarding a Memorandum of Understanding is not correct. It has not been finally agreed.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.55	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3601	Objecting	Several sites are said to have to make a contribution to the so called Herne Link Road/by-pass and a new Sturry rail crossing. If one or more of the promoted sites do not materialise for some years, what provision will be made to make sure the infrastructure is in place.	
5.55	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4368	Objecting	With 1800 homes planned in Sturry Parish, increasing the population by some 4,500 there are no matching job opportunities locally, so travel to work will be inevitable. Sturry is a very well served transport hub with a railway station and a bus stop in each of 3 directions providing 153 buses a day. This will change under the plan's transport proposals. Bus stops will be relocated and bus frequency from this central point will disappear. The future of a local train service is uncertain.	
5.55	780837	Mrs Margaret Darby		4733	Objecting	The idea that the A28 Sturry Road might need to accommodate increased traffic is an unwelcome thought	
5.55	13753	Mr Jeremy Bellamy	Assistant Parish Clerk Sturry Parish Council	4991	Objecting	Object to developer contributions for Sturry, Herne and Herne Bay being siphoned off to pay for the new by-pass at Sturry in order to make the proposed Local Plan workable.	
5.55	780831	Shelby & Peter Fitzpatrick		5471	Objecting	Cummulative effects of 6 developments will increase traffic into the pinch-point at Sturry. The plans will shift the problems closer to Canterbury, park and ride option not realistic. Why was there no transport study before the consultation, these issues should be resolved at the beginning. No national funding it will all have to come from developers, nothing should be built until the roads are built and in use; closing level crossing will separate residents from shops and services.	
5.55	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5860	Objecting	Paragraphs 5.54 and 5.55 state that, the City Council has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with KCC and relevant developers to deliver the Sturry Bypass and Herne Relief Road. This is not the case and implies a degree of commitment which is not possible to give at this early stage of the CLP process. Should the respective sites that trigger the requirement for these roads be allocated in the CLP, a legal mechanism for their delivery will have to be agreed between the relevant parties.	
5.55	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6434	Objecting	New mixed use development sites ...at Sturry/Broad Oak and Hersden'.An unspecified amount of commercial/business land is indicated, but certainly insufficient to provide employment in close proximity to 1,800 houses on sites which are not self supporting. A considerable increase in traffic is inevitable and this is against Policy T1 a).The scale of development at Sturry/Broad Oak is to help fund the proposed new traffic infrastructure. A true case of what comes first the 'chicken or egg'.	
5.55	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6436	Objecting	.. the Sturry Crossing is delivered at an appropriate point.'. How will the 'appropriate point' be determined. The residents of Sturry, village and Parish, should be told when this is likely to be.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.55	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6437	Objecting	Concerns about the suggested routes. New routes tortuous and narrow. Although traffic will not queue at the level crossing, there will be congestion elsewhere, including the roundabout junction with the A28 and A291 and congestion will worsen further down Sturry Road. The current crossing breaks up the traffic flow and without it there will be more congestion and air quality issues in Casnterbury. 100 park and ride spaces will not help those travelling to the west and south of the city.	
5.55	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6442	Objecting	Any reference to a 'Sturry By-pass' or 'Sturry relief road' and 'infrastructure unlocking' or similar phrases are misleading.This road scheme is NOT a 'bypass' of either Sturry village, or Sturry Parish, neither is it a 'Relief Road'. It is hard to see what it 'unlocks'. It will be an expensive major road requiring significant earthworks due to the contour of the land. The result will be a highly visible, high level rail crossing, which is likely to cause considerable noise and light pollution.	
5.55	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6443	Objecting	A new A28/A291 route will have an impact on how residents go about day to day activity and developer contribution must include their resolution. Easy access for local traffic to amenities must be maintained. Any system which would lead to a reduction in through traffic for Sturry High Street, could lead to its businesses becoming unviable. Closure of the crossing at Sturry is unacceptable, the Broad Oak crossing should be kept open. Foot crossings are well used and if closed should be replaced.	
5.55	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6611	Objecting	Object to the proposal to close the Sturry Crossing. The degree of development here is due, in part, to the need to pay for the by-pass. Developer contributions should be used to provide sustainable transport measures, which would then allow the scale of development to be reduced. The crossing and section of A28 through the village should remain in use with 20mph speed limits, better utilise the remains of the former Chislet Halt Station, and fund major enhancement of bus services along the A28.	
Policy T15	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		15	Objecting	Closure of Sturry Level Crossing. This will destroy what shopping we have left in Sturry. It will sever the link between the two parts of the community. If it goes ahead, maybe Sturry Parish Council should be abolished. We will no longer be able to walk to local shops.	
Policy T15	408032	Mr Stephen Metherell		39	Objecting	I read of closing the Sturry level crossing and building a "relief road" (which must surely create an extraordinarily divided village!?!??!).	
Policy T15	766831	Mr Mark Kennett		51	Objecting	If the existing crossing is closed, a pedestrian, ground level crossing must be maintained because villagers will need access to local services and train passengers will need access to platform 1. A bridge would be unsuitable as this would not be able to be used by people with mobility problems. A subway would attract crime.	
Policy T15	768407	Councillor James Flanagan	Liberal Democrat Group Response	149	Objecting	By proposing major new growth in Canterbury, and to some extent in Sturry, this problem will worsen. Improvements to the rail crossing at Sturry will merely make the congestion nearer the city worse.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T15	776051	Mr Rick Strange		866	Objecting	The Sturry level crossing acts as a choke on the traffic build up in Canterbury, and should be considered beneficial. Without the delays in traffic movement created by the level crossing, the traffic chaos in Canterbury itself would be considerably worse. This would be exacerbated by as many as 4000 or more additional cars from the suggested new developments, and the closure of the Shelford/Shalloak level crossing.	
Policy T15	773168	Mrs Elisabeth Gay		881	Objecting	I was amazed that anyone could think it would be a good idea to close the Sturry level crossing. This would separate the village centre and its amenities from about three quarters of the population of Sturry. What is the use of making proposals to increase job vacancies when this proposal would close down the village centre with the loss of all the jobs? I can see there would be traffic problems if the crossing was kept open, but closing it is short-sighted and lazy way to resolve this.	
Policy T15	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1057	Supporting	POLICY T15: Sturry Crossing. I fully support this policy.	
Policy T15	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1249	Objecting	The closure of Sturry Crossing would isolate the village and its businesses (convenience store, post office, library, pharmacy, dentists, restaurants, carpet shop and pubs) from their customers, directly harm them and create a ghost village. The crossing should not be closed.	
Policy T15	775642	Mr Ian Rogers		1327	Objecting	What is the point of spending millions of pounds in moving a queue of traffic a mile down the road?	Spend the money on sustainable transport, buses and cycling and other measures which reduce air pollution and improve the environment.
Policy T15	777485	Miss Janet Wilson-Sharp		1485	Objecting	Object to closure of Sturry level crossing. It will make it harder for propole to access the doctor, school, dentist, pharmacy post office and shops. Those who drive will be forced into cars. The Fordwich side will become a dead end and essential businesses and services will suffer. Traffic will increase on the other side and people taking short cuts will put children at risk. The bus service will be affected and the train service may be reduced.	
Policy T15	778931	Miss Gemma Avory	Water Resources Planner South East Water	1517	Objecting	The proposals suggested are in close proximity to the proposed Broad Oak reservoir and we would welcome the opportunity to contribute further when more information is available.	Provide further information when available to ensure they do not interfere with the proposed reservoir
Policy T15	779262	Mr John Bailey		1975	Supporting	Bottleneck at present.	
Policy T15	778771	P Kelk		2319	Objecting	Closure of Sturry Broad Oak rail crossing would cut off access even for local traffic. Stopping the bus service through the village if you close the railway access.	
Policy T15	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		2375	Objecting	Sturry crossing -Policy T15 - What would be the Council's position in the event that it is not possible to: (a) Complete the necessary Highway Orders for the new interchange? or (b) Fund the design and construction of the new interchange through developers' contributions?	
Policy T15	778852	Mr John Pye		2408	Objecting	The proposals for Sturry Crossing are unclear, very costly, extremely disruptive and financially not viable as there will be no new money from central government to fund this.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T15	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2456	Objecting	Spokes objects to this policy and wants it removed. Reason: Spokes adopts and seconds the CAST reasons for objecting to this policy. At a massive cost, all this will do is move the queue of traffic trying to get into Canterbury from the level crossing in Sturry to Vauxhall Road. There will be a lot more traffic at this point because the alternative route for most Herne Bay traffic which currently uses Shalloak Road will be closed. The money would be far better spent on bus and cycle lanes.	
Policy T15	777707	Mr Paul Waller		2547	Objecting	Concerned that the proposal to close Sturry level crossing will have an the impact on the No7 bus route - need an assured bus route through Broad Oak village. The crossing needs to be retained for local traffic. Closing the route will significantly worsen congestion with the additional traffic generated - esp in the event of an accident. The proposal relies on developers paying for the infrastructure - there are no guarantees this will happen. The Council has ensure developer liabilities are met.	
Policy T15	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2834	Objecting	The new Sturry crossing will cost a lot. There is no funding except for developer contributions. There is no guarantee that the scheme will be implemented leaving traffic to Canterbury via A28, exacerbating problems. Has CCC got accurate costings? (See John Paynes report)	
Policy T15	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2885	Objecting	This section is extremely light on facts and evidence in the Preferred Draft. It is difficult to comment on the proposal as it stands, as it constitutes little more than a concept. In the absence of this evidence, it is difficult to see how the Preferred Draft can be considered sound, as the deliverability of this infrastructure, which is fundamental to the provision of 30% (4,600) of the homes in the Plan, affects allocations SP3b, SP3c, SP3d, SP3e, SP3f, SP3h.	The Infrastructure Plan and Transport Strategy would be expected to provide the necessary evidence, and also, potentially show how the apportionment of costs to the various allocations identified as contributing to this scheme will be made. This must also include a careful consideration of phasing, and a mechanism that will allow the scheme to be delivered at an appropriate criteria in relation to traffic levels, and not have to wait for all the allocations to come forward to accrue the total contribution necessary to secure it.
Policy T15	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2927	Supporting	Policy T15 confirming the Council's intention to implement a Sturry Crossing is supported as a high priority scheme for demonstrating deliverability of the Plan. However, it is essential that the level of financial contributions sought from developers towards this scheme is taken into account when preparing wider developer contributions and/or CIL policies.	
Policy T15	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3091	Objecting	We are however concerned regarding the level of direct impact that this policy will have on the AS27 Ashford to Fordwich LWS. We are unsure how much of the infrastructure is already present but if this is to be new development we would have serious concerns regarding the individual and in-combination impacts of the proposed development on the ecology within the LWS.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T15	780743	Mr & Mrs E Todd		3449	Objecting	4) Original line of Sturry By Pass from above Popes Lane to waster water treatment works on Sturry Road should be looked at again as I believe that the Land is still available. 5) if both level crossings are closed to traffic this will cut the heart out of the village. Old bypass line would resolve this; 6) Bus routes - if crossing closed this would leave the residences of caravan parks without easy access to Canterbury.	
Policy T15	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3574	Objecting	A new rail crossing near Sturry will not address the congestion on the A28, even if people are encouraged to use the Park & Ride; through traffic has nowhere else to go. I disagree with the route for the new rail crossing, which will destroy Den Grove Wood, which is clearly part of The Blean Woodland Complex.	
Policy T15	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3846	Objecting	Funds raised by this means should be used in the area of the development and not used district wide. The proposal for the Sturry relief road, would seem to be planned with money from Herne Bay and this is unacceptable. I do not see how that scheme will ease congestion - it will just move it from Sturry to nearer the City centre.	
Policy T15	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3987	Objecting	These policies are dealt with in Part 1 of our response and our general concerns about the spatial strategy of the Plan. In accordance with this, these policies and their supporting text should be deleted.	Delete
Policy T15	13719	Mr Steve Moore	Thanet District Council	4155	Supporting	TDC is aware that the A28 suffers traffic congestion in the vicinity of Sturry level crossing. The acknowledgement of this and intension to mitigate and improve the situation including a sturry by-pass through contributions from strategic development sites in the district is to be applauded.	
Policy T15	780272	Councillor Tony Austin	Councillor Canterbury City Council	4156	Objecting	Most unacceptable proposal is the closure of the main level crossing. Most of village infrastructure would be cut off from the main population. New housing would be nearer to Asda than village facilities which would have an impact on them. Could introduce alternative traffic management measures. If bypass built and Broad Oak crossing closed when there is an accident on A28 where will traffic go? How will you ensure bypass is built before or at same time as housing development?	
Policy T15	780982	Mr John Hedington		4240	Objecting	Our serious concerns bout closing the crossing point at Sturry are that: (1) unless a footbridge or subway is built to cross the railway we and others will in walking terms effectively be isolated (2) by car there would be a detour of 1 to 2 miles which is not environmentally friendly (3) retriected in available bus services (4) there would no practical alternative route from Sturry into Canterbury should there be an accident or bad weather. The proposal is inconceived and needs reviewed.	A possible alternative would be to develop a northern link between the proposed new development at Hersden and the proposed Sturry railway crossing by pass and to route traffic this way from Upstreet and Thanet. This would significantly reduce the volume of traffic passing through Sturry and would obviate the need to close the crossing.
Policy T15	483858	Mrs Roche & Ashenden		4254	Objecting	The Council's evidence base does not justify inclusion of the Sturry crossing. The necessary railway and river bridges have not been properly costed and there are serious issues in regard to multiple land ownership.	The Council's evidence base does not justify inclusion of the Sturry crossing.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T15	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4373	Objecting	Intention to build an estate of 1000 homes to fund a 'by-pass' is laughable if it were not so tragic. It will bring 1200 cars onto the roads east of Canterbury. The new road will not be a by-pass, but a conduit through an estate. A bridge will avoid the rail crossing, but only move traffic quickly to a pinch point at Vauxhall Road. Development at other communities will also fund the construction - a by-pass should be separately funded. Further, swapping two routes for one road makes no sense.	
Policy T15	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4374	Objecting	Shalloack Road - At a recent public meeting at Spires Academy the developers admitted that they were unaware of the importance of Shalloack Road to local commuters. Closing this and restricting the Sturry Road will cause more delays, as alternative route options will disappear. These two roads form the only routes into Canterbury and are heavily used, with considerable jams at peak hours. Swapping two routes for one new road makes no sense mathematically or logistically.	
Policy T15	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4376	Objecting	Crossings at Sturry and Broad Oak The proposal to close Broad Oak Road and close the crossing (perhaps partially at Sturry) makes no sense as it will create more transport difficulties for existent residents than it solves. Closure of Milner foot crossing will have little benefit and residents can expect an alternative route. One of the reasons for delays at Sturry crossing is the need for signalling upgrades..	
Policy T15	780528	Patrick & Moira Austin		4542	Objecting	Object to the proposals to partially close the Sturry Crossing because this would result in the village of Sturry being divided in two, affecting local shops and businesses as well as the residents who use them. The construction of a new road to take traffic from both the A28 and the A291 to join Sturry Road further down would only move the congestion.	
Policy T15	780004	Ms Heather Stennett	Secretary The Society of Sturry Village	4579	Objecting	Object to crossing the Sturry level crossing as this would conflict with aim on page 3 of Local plan to protect village centres. Closure would threaten the services in the centre as most of housing is the the north and east. Development at Sturry/Broad Oak is seen as facilitating road construction & satisfying a short term shortage of funding available to local authorities whose fiduciary duty it is to provide it. Costly experiment, impact on local community. Won't solve congestion N of Cant	
Policy T15	779927	Mr R W Hughes		4593	Objecting	As stated in the gazette on 8th august the plans include the closing of sturry crossing, this will cause unbelievable chaos on our roads, if the plan is to build a new road it must be done before any building work starts.	
Policy T15	781017	Mr Gerry Atkin		4608	Supporting	I support the revised road infrastructure at Sturry.	
Policy T15	781033	Ms Hazel Brackley		4814	Objecting	Object to the proposal to close the Sturry Level Crossing. All large vehicles should be re-routed along the new road and traffic islands put in on the Canterbury side of the crossing to allow the existing residents of Sturry, Broad Oak, Westbere and Hersden to access the original hub of the village, with Post Office, Library, Dentist, Church and shops.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T15	13753	Mr Jeremy Bellamy	Assistant Parish Clerk Sturry Parish Council	4989	Objecting	Object to the proposals to close the Sturry & Broad Oak crossings. Sturry village would be split in two with many residents unable to access community facilities i.e. library, post office etc and as such threatening their viability. Similarly, Broad Oak would become a cul-de-sac affecting business as well as severing vital public transport links. Closing both crossings makes the new bypass the only route into Canterbury, funnelling all traffic onto Sturry Road, which is already heavily congested	
Policy T15	780277	Yvonne & Mark Culverhouse & Ford		5057	Objecting	I am told a study has occurred which measured peoples travel patterns NOW. From that study the traffic flow out towards Thanet, Bredlands Lane and into Sturry has been measured. New infrastructure in Broad Oak and Sturry will not ease traffic flow from Site 8 as Ruth feels it will. This study and the thinking behind it concerns us greatly.	
Policy T15	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5135	Objecting	Policy T15 does not meet tests in NPPF (204) as it does not recognise that contributions must be directly related to new development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. If there is sufficient capacity or the roads can run over capacity then sites should not be delayed in coming forward, otherwise DLP will be unsound. Amend policy accordingly.	Add text to the end of the policy - ' and will be of a scale and kind that is fairly and reasonably associated to the development.'
Policy T15	13812	Mr N J Blake		5198	Objecting	Closure of crossing. It is incredible that a Local Authority would even consider such a proposal with its divisive effects upon the existing and enlarged community. There was no mention of the problem of access between the two severed areas which would add 2Km (1.2) miles to the journey from one part to the other. It would be especially disruptive and inefficient for bus journeys from the east through Sturry village.	
Policy T15	13812	Mr N J Blake		5199	Objecting	Sturry By-pass. Draws attention to the problem of not linking the Canterbury part of Broad Oak Road to the intended by-pass. This is a very valid point, as although there is merit in lessening the traffic through Broad Oak, if traffic from the Canterbury side had to all emerge onto Sturry Road it would make the current bottle neck far worse.The increase in traffic will occur as a result of not just the Sturry site but of the several beyond, which will rely upon this area to access the city.	My planÂ B4/2Â shows how this could be remedied. Broad Oak must link to the by-pass
Policy T15	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5387	Objecting	b) CAST opposes the construction of a by-pass and believes that developer contributions be put into sustainable transport measures to reduce/limit traffic. c) The scale of development is due in part to the need to pay for such a by-pass. Not building it would enable the scale of development to be significantly reduced and limit the extent to which the ancient woodland would be affected. d) Level crossing and A28 should remain open for car buses, cycles access to village 20mph, and pedestrians	
Policy T15	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5429	Objecting	It should also be acknowledged that the 4 strategic development sites located at Herne Bay will also increase traffic on the A28. Policy T15 is inadequate in that it will at best move congestion from Sturry to the Sturry Road.	It should also be acknowledged that the 4 strategic development sites located at Herne Bay will also increase traffic on the A28.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T15	780831	Shelby & Peter Fitzpatrick		5475	Objecting	The proposal to close the level crossing implies that the centre of the village with its shops, library, dental surgery, church and offices w m be divided and inaccessible to a great many of the residents. This would be catastrophic for the village as a viable community.	
Policy T15	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5586	Objecting	Does the trumpeted unlocking proposals at Sturry relieve the congestion along routes leading into Canterbury? No! Some would argue that the Sturry railway crossing helps to a limited extent to break up heavily choked traffic flows.	
Policy T15	784704	Mrs D Potts		5779	Objecting	The road layout is ludicrous. Traffic from Herne Bay Rd will meet that from A28 creating a bottleneck. One incident would bring traffic to a standstill with no alternative route. Pollution levels will be unacceptable..	
Policy T15	784475	Mr Roger Mullaley		6219	Objecting	Sturry/Broad Oak is a bottleneck for traffic between Canterbury and the Herne Bay/Thanet. Extra 4600 homes in Sturry/Broad Oak, Hersden and Herne Bay will add substantially to the traffic volume. Any Sturry "bypass"/road changes are essential prerequisites before developments. If not, there will be an increase in the use of existing unofficial bypasses. No agreement with rail/highway authorities about road changes; If close existing crossings reduce journey options for emergency vehicles.	
Policy T15	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6448	Objecting	Why the different wording to T13 and T14 which both say "The Council will require..."? What happens if the search is fruitless? Will there be sufficient funding to result in actual delivery? What happens if there is a shortfall? What will be the consequences as result of building even some of the planned 6,000 houses without this infrastructure? Link with Policy SP3. This Policy does not actually deliver the outcome required to satisfy the proposed developments dependent upon it in Policy SP3.	
Policy T15	784495	P Manser		6969	Objecting	It should also be acknowledged that the 4 strategic development sites located at Herne Bay will also increase traffic on the A28. Policy T15 is inadequate in that it will at best move congestion from Sturry to the Sturry Road.	It should also be acknowledged that the 4 strategic development sites located at Herne Bay will also increase traffic on the A28.
Policy T15	13835	Mr Michael Steed		7005	Objecting	Policy is not clearly expressed. Concerned about effect on bus journey through and to Sturry. Closing the level crossing will split the village in two and stop access to facilities and shops especially for elderly residents. If bypass is built leave level crossing open but use traffic calming measure to discourage use.	If the bypass were built, the level crossing should be left open as it currently is but with additional traffic calming measures such as 20mph speed limit, speed bumps, slaloms and changed traffic priority to discourage the use of Mill Road as a through-route
5.56	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		668	Supporting	This is the only proposal that addresses the real needs of the traffic in Canterbury and required to be expedited as quickly as possible	
5.56	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4436	Supporting	DIO is in support that the need for this link will be investigated further with the landowner and DIO's transport consultants will work closely with the Council in light of our objection to Policy T16.	
5.56	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5726	Supporting	More specific positives:â€¢ Paragraphs 5.56 and policy T16 re-Barracks Link road	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.56	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6459	Objecting	'A short link could remove some A28 traffic, particularly from Tourtel Road and Broad Street'. This is a very long-standing priority, and if the impact on St Martins Hill is acceptable, this should be the first road infrastructure improvement before any of the others, especially if the Council really wants to put people first. Until at least the A28/A257 Barracks link is in place, NONE of the large scale developments north and north/east of Canterbury should go ahead.	
5.56	476233	Mrs Catherine Cantwell		6722	Objecting	The idea of building new housing to fund unnecessary new roads, to the detriment of our environment, makes no sense. New road developments run counter to the policy to reduce travel demands and should be abandoned. Council should follow the strategy to focus on controlling and reducing road traffic. It has been found that the building of new roads increases traffic. Plans for new roads and link road should be abandoned.	
5.57	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		11	Supporting	I note the possibilities of a link from Tourtel Road to the Littlebourne Road and of a link from the A28 by the P+R site to the A2. The idea for the former has been floating around for many years. My recollection, however, is that the bulk of vehicular movements are those doing business in Canterbury, rather than outside. If that is still the case, it may be hard to persuade a cash-strapped KCC to fund new roads. However I would be delighted by a scheme which removed traffic from Fordwich.	
5.57	766840	Ms Sheelagh Deller		50	Supporting	Why is not possible to include the Howe Barracks in this plan. It's not too late to rethink. Building a road out of round Canterbury from there would make a lot of sense and ease congestion throughout the city.	
5.57	766829	Mr Stuart Field		107	Supporting	Prior to ANY development in South Canterbury the road infrastructure needs to be looked at as a priority. Ideally the South Canterbury relief road needs to be revisited now that the Howe Barracks land has become available, connecting the Sturry Road to the A2 south at the new junction proposed south of Canterbury.	
5.57	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	214	Objecting	The obviously massive cost of such elements as the remodelling of the A2 junction at Bridge, the construction of the so-called "Eastern Bypass" and the relocation of large and important girls' school is not acknowledged anywhere in the document. The idea that such schemes could simply be funded by development is, frankly, disingenuous. Indeed, it is perhaps significant that no even speculative costings are included.	
5.57	772987	Mrs Doreen Louren		306	Objecting	The proposal for a potential link road between Littlebourne and Sturry Road is vague and uncosted.	
5.57	777173	Mr Tim Timpson		751	Supporting	Eastern Canterbury By-pass - the whole system would eliminate the vast majority of through traffic that currently passes through the centre of the city. It is too good an opportunity to miss, especially now that the redundant Army land, has made this link possible. (see attached proposed route)	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.57	366511	Mr Tony Couperthwaite		804	Objecting	A new relief road (A28) through south Canterbury, apart from being very expensive to build, will attract more traffic not provide predicted relief. This is borne out by traffic studies (SACTRA 1994). New roads will bring extra traffic and pollution.	
5.57	778045	Councillor Simon Cook	Canterbury City Council	1195	Supporting	The suggested link road between Sturry Road and the new Bridge A2 junction would make a great deal of difference to the district and this should be pushed forward as much as possible.	
5.57	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1257	Objecting	The need to expand detail around the potential for an eastern bypass Paragraph 1.66 (2) details the aspiration of an opportunity for a longer eastern bypass around the city (if the Howe Barracks land becomes available) from the A28 Sturry Park and Ride across MoD land onto the A257, then on to a new junction on the A2. The detail and potential of these items needs to be strengthened for the final submission	
5.57	777494	Mr Fred Wilson		1514	Supporting		
5.57	778770	S Thorne		2227	Supporting	A bypass (Eastern Bypass) is proposed to be built on the Howe Barracks site to link Sturry Road and Littlebourne Road but the bypass is shown as a 'possibility' only. This road should definitely be built as it would divert through traffic from using Fordwich as a diversion (whose roads are too small), and from the centre of Canterbury (Military Road, St. George's Place, etc).	The Canterbury Eastern Bypass should definitely be built.
5.57	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2459	Objecting	Further objection to proposed new roads, bridges and junctions in the area of - Sturry Road, Canterbury and Sturry. At a massive cost, all this will do is move the queue of traffic trying to get into Canterbury from the level crossing in Sturry to Vauxhall Road. There will be a lot more traffic at this point because the alternative route for most Herne Bay traffic which currently uses Shalloak Road will be closed. The money would be far better spent on bus and cycle lanes.	
5.57	406855	Mrs P Kielty		2668	Objecting	The possibility of a new eastern bypass is offered as an incentive to support the housing numbers, but in my view makes the proposed developments in South Canterbury even less attractive. I don't see how 'garden city' principles are consistent with hemming the development inside a fast road which cuts South Canterbury off from the countryside.	
5.57	775862	Mr Clive Flisher		2777	Objecting	The eastern bypass alignment is confusing, retaining A28 traffic through Sturry, Upstreet and Hersden, and A257 through Wingham and Littlebourne, both needing by-passes for many years; the city should work with other agencies, including Dover DC in conjunction with development of Aylesham, toward a link from the Ash by-pass to the A2, to run south of Wingham, then on line with the B2046 to the existing interchange at Barham, thus by-passing Bramling and Littlebourne.	The city should work with other agencies, including Dover DC in conjunction with development of Aylesham, toward a link from the Ash by-pass to the A2, to run south of Wingham, then on line with the B2046 to the existing interchange at Barham, thus by-passing Bramling and Littlebourne. Improvements to the A251, would provide a proper northern alternative for Thanet/Ashford traffic.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.57	779274	Mr Graham Duplock	Parish Councillor Parish Councillor Beskesbourne	2818	Supporting	Crucial to the city's economic and cultural development is provision of adequate traffic routing around the city. This will improve traffic management and address quality of life and air pollution issues around the current ring road. This must be provided by a South Eastern Bypass connecting the A28 to the A2	
5.57	780651	Mr Kevin Bown	Asset Manager Area 4 (Kent) Highways Agency	3548	Objecting	The full eastern by-pass is an aspiration scheme, and is not set out in the formal policies in the document. However, if the development of such a scheme is indeed feasible within the Local Plan period, we would recommend that the council give some consideration to including the scheme in the Infrastructure Plan and also by way of assessment in the accompanying modelling evidence base.	The full eastern by-pass is an aspiration scheme, and is not set out in the formal policies in the document. However, if the development of such a scheme is indeed feasible within the Local Plan period, we would recommend that the council give some consideration to including the scheme in the Infrastructure Plan and also by way of assessment in the accompanying modelling evidence base.
5.57	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3988	Objecting	Object to the signposting and safeguarding of the eastern bypass route from A2 to A28. 'Unlocking the gridlock' states that the proportion of traffic going that way is relatively low, the LP 2006 states that the eastern by-pass would have a significantly damaging effect on the local environment. KCC states most traffic into Canterbury is destination traffic. It is entirely aspirational, no justification is provided and it passes through a SSSI, which is unacceptable.	Delete the eastern bypass
5.57	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4437	Objecting	DIO objects to the need for the eastern Canterbury bypass. The area of search for the land contains retained MOD land which is an environmentally constrained and sensitive landscape, in use currently for recreation and could be considered to be open space of public value.	
5.57	780528	Patrick & Moira Austin		4545	Supporting	A large number of vehicles are passing through Canterbury are en route to other destinations. The only way to reduce the number of vehicles would be the construction of a bypass to divert traffic around the city. Until the problem is addressed in this way, then no more houses (with the probability of two cars per household) should be built.	
5.57	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patixbourne Parish Council	4572	Supporting	The PC would like to see an Eastern by-pass, along the highlighted route shown and this further extended to link with the new A2 junction for south Canterbury. Our villages are already carrying a huge quantity of traffic along our lanes, as they are used as an unofficial 'south Canterbury by-pass'. A by-pass only as far as A257 would increase the use of Bekesbourne Lane as a cut through. Level of development in S Canterbury would affect traffic flow and bypass would relieve some of the strain	
5.57	781398	Mr John Anderson		4594	Supporting	Support for an eastern by-pass because it would reduce traffic congestion in the south and east of the City.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.57	781020	Ms Cathy Sales		4618	Supporting	A road should be built connecting the A2 south of Canterbury to the A257 ideally where St Martins Hospital is situated at present. It should then continue to meet the A28 at Sturry. This would enable easy traffic between the industrial estates at Sturry and Wicheap which could be further developed and would ease the terrible congestion pollution and stifling of trade which is caused by channelling traffic through around the medieval city centre.	
5.57	13812	Mr N J Blake		5196	Objecting	The concept of an Eastern By-Pass is mentioned as an ideal scenario. It is understood that there are many environmental and financial reasons why it may never be constructed. Whilst it would seem to make Canterbury city more "permeable" by removing many journeys from the historic core, there is much past opinion from Councils opposing this contention, and no contrary research in the DLP. It can therefore not be relied upon to deliver any solution to the present or future traffic problems.	
5.57	781556	Mr Russell Page	Canterbury Alliance for Sustainable Transport	5405	Objecting	Eastern By Pass: Evidence from similar bypass schemes in other parts of the country suggest that such a bypass would not provide long-term relief from traffic problems on Canterbury's existing ring road, but would instead result ultimately in accelerated traffic growth. We also understand that the road would go through an existing SSSI site. Such a road would also be extremely expensive. We oppose it.	
5.57	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5592	Supporting	The eastern bypass should be given much higher priority. This proposal should be brought forward.	
5.57	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5774	Objecting	The proposal for an eastern by pass can be seen as a threat to community development, by cutting it into two.	
5.57	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5870	Objecting	Para 5.57 refers to a study into a full eastern bypass linking the A28, A257 and A2. KCC consider that this is not a scheme that would remove a pinch point, in the way that would be the case for a Sturry bypass, but would provide a considerable length of new road which would be likely to alter all of the traffic patterns in the city. This scheme will require detailed traffic modelling and will need to be funded by development.	
5.57	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6461	Objecting	A full eastern Canterbury by-pass. The modelling and necessary decisions should be a matter of urgency.	
5.57	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6614	Objecting	Evidence from similar by-pass schemes in other parts of the country suggests that a by-pass scheme such as that proposed for Eastern Canterbury would not provide long-term relief from traffic problems on Canterbury's existing ring road, but would instead ultimately result in accelerated traffic growth.	
5.57	476233	Mrs Catherine Cantwell		6723	Objecting	The idea of building new housing to fund unnecessary new roads, to the detriment of our environment, makes no sense. New road developments run counter to the policy to reduce travel demands and should be abandoned. Council should follow the strategy to focus on controlling and reducing road traffic. It has been found that the building of new roads increases traffic. Plans for new roads and link road should be abandoned.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T16	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		392	Objecting	The proposed link road would encourage more private motor vehicle journeys. Instead the route should only be open to pedestrians, cyclists, and buses in order to favour these modes in line with the hierarchy of transport modes (paragraph 5.24)	Retain the existing road and restrict access to pedestrians, cyclists, and buses. Do not allow private motor vehicles.
Policy T16	778183	Jo and David Pick		1540	Supporting	The opening and widening of the Barracks link, the road that runs from the Littlebourne Road through the MOD site to the courts/council offices and on to the Sturry Road could significantly improve the flow of the city's traffic.	
Policy T16	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		2054	Objecting	Proposed Barracks Link lacks robust evidence in support and needs to be subject to up to date review in the light of the Visum model, Transport Modelling Options Report, new prospect of availability of MOD land, success of Park and Ride, and continuing long term improbability of an eastern bypass, to determine whether it would be beneficial, and if so what would be the best alignment (both for traffic reasons and for best preservation of and least damage to the AHLV).	Insert at beginning of T16: "Subject to up to date studies to determine whether it would make a materially positive contribution to the transport strategy for Canterbury, and as to the most beneficial route alignment ..." Insert also at beginning of T16: "[and] subject to an assessment of the impact on the Old Park AHLV and possible mitigation measures, including placing it in a cutting and the provision of replacement natural habitat, ..." After "Chaucer Road" insert "or the A28"
Policy T16	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		2055	Objecting	Any new road should be designed to minimise traffic noise and should have safe facilities for cycling and walking.	Add at end of T16: "The design and detailing of the road would be required to minimise environmental effects, including traffic noise, and to provide safe facilities for cycling and walking."
Policy T16	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		2056	Objecting	Any new road should be designed to minimise traffic noise and should have safe facilities for cycling and walking.	Add at end of T16: "The design and detailing of the road would be required to minimise environmental effects, including traffic noise, and to provide safe facilities for cycling and walking."
Policy T16	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2464	Objecting	Spokes objects to this policy and wants it removed. Reason: This will generate more car traffic and not encourage more cycling and walking.	
Policy T16	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3095	Supporting	We have assessed the route proposed for the Barracks link and do not feel that there will be an impact on natural habitat as a result of this scheme. We reserve the right to comment on the Eastern Canterbury Bypass link once more information is available.	
Policy T16	780823	S Suti		3392	Supporting	Canterbury needs to deal with its congestion and parking problems. Opening up Chaucer Rd and connecting it to Littlebourne Rd will allow traffic flows away from the current bottlenecks. However, the link needs to go through to the A2 via Barton Business park.	
Policy T16	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3707	Supporting	We support Policy T16 (Barracks Link - Chaucer Road to A257).	
Policy T16	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4438	Objecting	DIO objects to this policy. DIO will reasonably contribute to transport and infrastructure improvements directly attributable to the redevelopment of the Barracks but believes the text as set out is not in accordance with other policies in the plan and may prejudice the redevelopment of the whole of the barracks, an important new gateway to the City.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T16	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4851	Supporting	Another major opportunity would be to use the Barracks land to make a road connection from the A257 to Military Rd. This would make it possible to remove traffic from Longport and Lower Chantry Lane and to reinstate the urban form of Longport as a long, rectangular market square.	
Policy T16	781629	Kathryn Nevell	Canterbury Student Lets	5335	Supporting	I also think that the Council idea of using the Howe Barracks as a ring road link coming from the New Dover Road to the Sturry Road Park and Ride is an excellent idea.	
Policy T16	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5584	Objecting	Does the trumpeted unlocking proposal at Herne relieve the congestion along routes leading into Canterbury? No	
Policy T16	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5727	Supporting	More specific positives:â€¢ Paragraphs 5.56 and policy T16 re-Barracks Link road	
Policy T16	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6462	Objecting	"The Council will seek..." and not "The Council will require ...". The funding for this is needed as a matter of urgency, but again, will developer funding from the identified sites be sufficient to ultimately deliver the required outcome? There should be linking with Policy SP3.	
5.58	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	241	Supporting	The pressing need to promote rural transport is correctly identified. The City Council should be petitioning the Government for expansion, rather than scrapping, of bus passes.	
5.58	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		669	Supporting	The easiest was to promote public transport in rural areas is to increase the size of the communities that they serve. More of the proposed development should be planned for the villages which are currently too small to sustain a frequent bus service. Chartham is an excellent example of this having been done and done well.	Add. "proposals for discrete well planned developments adjacent to existing villages will be considered if they contribute to the viability of a local school, shops and a continued bus service to the area concerned."
5.58	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1159	Objecting	WPC agrees with the comments in Section 5.58 that "there is a need to maintain and promote public transport in rural areas as it can provide an important service for the community and contributes to the vibrancy and sustainability of the countryside". Bus service 620, operated by Poynters Coaches through Waltham, does not run frequently enough during the day to be an effective alternative to the private car and more detail is needed in the Plan as to how the provision of public transport.	
5.58	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3989	Objecting	We find these paragraphs very weak and they need to be expanded to give more commitment to addressing the transport issues facing the rural area. A Policy should be included setting out the measures that the City Council will take to this end.	A Policy should be included setting out the measures that the City Council will take to this end.
5.58	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5729	Supporting	More specific positives:â€¢ Promotion of public transport in rural areas - 5.58	
5.58	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6464	Objecting	'... maintain and promote public transport'. Being realistic, what influence can Canterbury Council actually bring to bear with independent other bodies (KCC & public transport providers) in respect of these two paragraphs.?	
5.59	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	242	Supporting	The pressing need to promote rural transport is correctly identified. The City Council should be petitioning the Government for expansion, rather than scrapping, of bus passes.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.59	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		401	Supporting	I support this, however I believe a number of additions can be made to the proposals. See my comments in relation to policy T2 and the attached annotated maps.	
5.59	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1160	Objecting	Section 5.59 refers to reducing the dependency on the car in rural areas by encouraging alternative modes of transport, but gives little in the way of detail as to how this might be achieved. Investigating new cycle routes to link rural settlements to the main urban areas is unlikely to be much help to Waltham's parishioners considering the distance of the Parish from Canterbury and the hilly terrain between the two.	
5.59	780327	Mr Robin Townsend	Secretary to the Trust The Crab & Winkle Line Trust	3268	Objecting	This paragraph perfectly describes the potential of the C&W. This potential with a modicum of political will needs to be realized and should be made clear and explicit in the Local Plan. The Crab & Winkle project ticks all the 'Green, Environmental and Sustainable boxes' The C&W opportunity is to translate rhetoric into reality and to herald a revolution that is long overdue!	
5.59	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3990	Objecting	We find these paragraphs very weak and they need to be expanded to give more commitment to addressing the transport issues facing the rural area. A Policy should be included setting out the measures that the City Council will take to this end.	A Policy should be included setting out the measures that the City Council will take to this end.
5.59	779356	Councillor Alan Baldock	Labour Party Councillor for Northgate Ward Canterbury City Council	4884	Objecting	Much can be done to improve Park and Ride in the District, especially for the coastal towns of Whitstable and Herne Bay. There is a lack of strategic view on resolving parking issues with an absence of a firm a location for a much needed facility to serve both coastal towns'.	
5.59	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6466	Objecting	Being realistic, what influence can Canterbury Council actually bring to bear with independent other bodies (KCC & public transport providers) in respect of these two paragraphs.?	
5.6	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		402	Supporting	I support this. These measures will help to make the roads more cycle-friendly and thus enable more sustainable travel patterns.	
5.6	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		670	Objecting	No one uses a rural lane where there is a better road as an alternative. The council should use evidence of overuse of rural lanes as evidence that there is a need for an alternative route. A clear example is the road passing Howletts Zoo which clearly shows the need for a link from the A2 at bridge to the Littlebourne Road.	Revise paragraph to:"The Canterbury District possesses a rich heritage of ancient lanes which are an important feature in the countryside and are of significant landscape, historic and nature conservation importance. The City Council is concerned at the damage and disruption caused by heavy traffic using unsuitable rural roads and will work with the County Council to ensure that there is an adequate road network so that traffic does not see the need to use unsuitable roads.
5.6	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1809	Objecting	Reference should be made to the KCC adopted guidance 'Rural Streets and Lanes; a design Handbook' available on http://www.kentdowns.org.uk/publications/rural-streets-and-lanes-a-design-handbook and from KCC. This provides useful advice and criteria for developers and statutory undertakers.	Add reference to KCC adopted guidance 'Rural Streets and Lanes; a design Handbook' available on http://www.kentdowns.org.uk/publications/rural-streets-and-lanes-a-design-handbook and from KCC.
5.6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6469	Supporting	Welcomed	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T17	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1812	Objecting	Support for the policy as it stands but additional text needs to reflect the importance of improvement of existing routes through innovative design that slows traffic for safe pedestrian and cycle use.	Add 'opportunities will be sought to introduce shared multi-user use through design which encourages safe pedestrian and cycle use'
Policy T17	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2465	Objecting	Spokes agrees with this policy but with regard to nature conservation there is already a higher duty on the Council to have regard to conserving and enhancing biodiversity (s.40 NERC Act 2006) Therefore, this policy should be changed to reflect this higher standard for nature.	
Policy T17	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3096	Supporting	We welcome the preservation of rural lanes within policy T17 as they provide important dispersal and foraging corridors for biodiversity.	
Policy T17	13751	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Lower Hardres Parish Council	3380	Objecting	The proposed South Canterbury development will greatly exacerbate the current situation and encourage traffic to find alternative routes through rural lanes.	
Policy T17	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3667	Objecting	It is important that measures to protect rural lanes do not inadvertently make them more hazardous for equestrians e.g. by preventing horseriders' use of verges, which are a vital safety refuge from motor traffic. The Policy [T17] should be amended to read "Rural lanes which are of landscape amenity, nature conservation, historic or archaeological importance will be protected from changes and management practices which would damage their character or their safety for non-motorised users ..."	Change the wording of Policy T17 to read; "Rural lanes which are of landscape amenity, nature conservation, historic or archaeological importance will be protected from changes and management practices which would damage their character or their safety for non-motorised users , and where possible be enhanced."
Policy T17	780518	Mr Ken Fox & Family		3805	Supporting	Support Policy T17	
Policy T17	13752	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Petham Parish Council	3943	Objecting	The proposed traffic solutions: new road access onto Nackinton Road, fast bus service, new interchange on the A2 and new school site. None of these will benefit the areas to the South but will greatly exacerbate the current situation and encourage traffic to find alternative routes through rural lanes.	
Policy T17	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5430	Objecting	Policy T17 restricts the protection of rural lanes which are of landscape amenity, nature conservation, historic or archaeological importance. Rural lanes are a feature of the Garden of England in Kent and deserve protection. The terms used in T17 are not defined and are open to a very narrow interpretation.	
Policy T17	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6470	Supporting	Welcomed	
Policy T17	784495	P Manser		6970	Objecting	Policy T17 restricts the protection of rural lanes which are of landscape amenity, nature conservation, historic or archaeological importance. Rural lanes are a feature of the Garden of England in Kent and deserve protection. The terms used in T17 are not defined and are open to a very narrow interpretation.	
5.61	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		671	Objecting	The Transport assessment, in so far as it exists, is simply not credible for the South Canterbury development. The idea that a new A2 junction at Bridge and a new slip road at Wincheap is all that is needed to absorb the traffic generated by 4000 homes is absurd.	Remove the proposed South Canterbury development until a credible transport assessment can be prepared.

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.61	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6472	Objecting	Where are the Transport Assessments and Travel Plans for each development site to support the proposals of this Local Plan, which "will generate significant amounts of movement" at each location?	
5.62	780207	Pru Cherry	The Whitstable Road Residents Association	3402	Objecting	We support policy EMP7 requiring the University of Kent to prepare a masterplan for future development on the campus. EMP7 should be more specific about a review of the University's travel plan. The huge number of buses has meant increases in pollution, vibration and congestion. Consider electric buses, a monorail, borris bikes.	d congestion. Consider electric buses, a monorail, borris bikes for trasport to University.
5.62	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3991	Objecting	Amend last sentence to read: 'Canterbury City Council will work in partnership with Kent County Council to target those organisations in the District which are generating high volumes of traffic, especially, but not only, those impacting on the AQMA'.	Amend last sentence to read: 'Canterbury City Council will work in partnership with Kent County Council to target those organisations in the District which are generating high volumes of traffic, especially, but not only, those impacting on the AQMA' .
5.62	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6474	Objecting	'Changes to working practice'. Will the Council set out to influence these for all new business on the Sites identified in SP3?	
Policy T18	775232	Mr Andrew Thomson		302	Objecting	A. Free Park & ride is needed. This would be funded by the developers and by a tax (yes!) in the form of a 50p supplement on every parking ticket within the city. B. I cannot support a Plan that simply has a weak promise to look at each Transport Plan - what if no developer is able to fund the transport that is needed ? Will development be cancelled ?	Provision for FREE Park & Ride before any extra development proceeds. This would be funded by the developers and by a tax (yes!) in the form of a 50p supplement on every parking ticket within the city
Policy T18	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		403	Supporting	I support this. It will be important for there to be a commitment to regular monitoring of the Travel Plans by Canterbury City Council and Kent County Council.	
Policy T18	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		2376	Objecting	Policy T18 - What level of traffic does the Council consider wouldhave significant transport implications?	
Policy T18	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2466	Objecting	Spokes supports this policy. Reason: It will help ensure that sustainable transport modes are prioritised in proposals.	
Policy T18	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2836	Objecting	Although there is a good bus service from Herne to Canterbury a large proportion of people drive, the new developments are going to make it worse. Will 2 buses run one through Herne one through new developments? Few jobs will be provided so people will travel in 2 vehicles per house.	
Policy T18	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3097	Supporting	We also welcome the strategies to reduce travel within Policy T18 as this will reduce emissions and increase the health of natural habitat within the district.	
Policy T18	13751	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Lower Hardres Parish Council	3381	Objecting	The cumulative impact upon the traffic levels on the B2068 is not quantified in the plan. An estimate of it should be given within the plan as the adverse impact of it upon Lower Hardres we forecast will be extremely serious.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy T18	780651	Mr Kevin Bown	Asset Manager Area 4 (Kent) Highways Agency	3549	Objecting	The policy states that development proposals should be accompanied, where appropriate, by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. The policy notes that such documents should set out how transport infrastructure arising from the expected demand will be provided. We would also recommend that reference is made to showing how infrastructure may be funded and delivered.	The policy states that development proposals should be accompanied, where appropriate, by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. The policy notes that such documents should set out how transport infrastructure arising from the expected demand will be provided. We would also recommend that reference is made to showing how infrastructure may be funded and delivered.
Policy T18	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3992	Supporting	Generally support this Policy, but we feel that it should be strengthened. The first sentence be amended to read: 'Development proposals considered by the Council to have significant transport implications are to be supported by a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan.' The Travel Plan will invariably be required, because the City Council has assessed the proposal as having significant transport implications, so a travel plan is needed to reduce those implications.	The first sentence be amended to read: 'Development proposals considered by the Council to have significant transport implications are to be supported by a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan.'
Policy T18	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5728	Supporting	More specific positives: Policy T18 re-Transport Assessments and Travel Plans	
Policy T18	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6475	Objecting	Where are the Transport Assessments considered by the Council for the each of the proposed development sites prior to their inclusion in this Plan? Does this policy need to be cross referenced with SP3?	
5.63	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		404	Supporting	I fully support this. In addition to the transport and air quality benefits this will be an important requirement to developing a knowledge-based economy in our district.	
5.63	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6476	Objecting	'Home working ...'. Gainful employment, as encouraged in para 3.19 is most commendable, but the worry of the potential problems which could be caused by only 6,500 jobs being provided by 15,000 houses just will not go away, but having some 8,500-9,000 people stay at home just so they will not have to travel would not be acceptable either!	
5.64	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		405	Objecting	This paragraph states that the VISUM model is multi-modal. However it is not truly multi-modal since pedestrians and cyclists are not included. Thus it is not possible to properly model the impact that developments will have on pedestrians and cyclists.	The VISUM model should be re-produced to take into account pedestrians and cyclists in addition to the modes which it does cover such that it follows DfT WebTAG guidance and can be relied upon for correctly modelling the impact of developments on all means of sustainable transport.
5.64	778073	Ms Claire Dethier		1545	Objecting	Transport modelling of the County taking into account the proposed growth of all of the Borough's must be a priority and without this information, the plan cannot be considered sustainable. I also understand that Canterbury City Council has recommended these sites without having received the results of their transport modelling. Without these results, the impact of a development of this size cannot have been determined in an informed way, and cannot be assessed in terms of its sustainability.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.64	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2748	Objecting	No transport evidence base provided to demonstrate the impact of the proposed strategic allocations on the highway network. It is clear that the Local Authority does not have a sound evidence base to demonstrate that their proposed strategic allocations are viable or deliverable. None of the results or analysis from the VISUM model are available. KCC are currently running the draft options through the forecast model, which suggests the document is based on assumptions rather than actual assessment	The following information would have been expected to be made available to allow the interrogation of the assessment:Â· The base data used to build the model The Local Model Validation ReportÂ Details of the way that future year models have been derived, Plots of output data that identify the relevant traffic flows and network constraints that the model has identified in the baseline; Trip generation and distribution data for the relevant options that have been tested in the future model; Plots of output data for the scenarios tested, to show the effects of development scenarios; Details of the mitigation measures and infrastructure schemes incorporated into the network to respond to the effects of the proposals, and suitable output data to show that they create an acceptable and manageable situation on the network.
5.64	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2831	Objecting	This section states that CCC and KCC have jointly funded a strategic multi-modal VISUM model for the District. This has NOT been completed and the information on traffic assessments is not available. There is no mention of any discussions with Stagecoach regarding re-routing a bus service to serve the new developments at Strode Farm and the Golf Course.	
5.64	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3993	Objecting	Whilst these paragraphs provide some interest they provide unnecessary descriptive detail and should be deleted.	Delete
5.64	784592	Mr Peter Welch		5322	Objecting	I do not believe the current plan, as offered for consultation, is credible since traffic modelling on the impact of the plan has not yet been done. Expanding an urban boundary without adding new arterial roads (or sufficiently improving existing ones) is unsustainable and asking for trouble. The supporting documents relies on "high frequency fast bus links" to draw residents away from their cars. Such busses will not be fast and, therefore, not high frequency.	
5.64	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6478	Objecting	These paragraphs need to come much sooner in this Chapter, possibly right at the beginning.	
5.64	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6479	Objecting	VISUM model Why have there been delays in releasing the final report? How can such profound decisions have been made without this?	
5.64	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6480	Objecting	Visum Model How reliable is it? As Transport is such a major issue in the District, why were not other detailed reports/studies undertaken as well?	
5.64	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6540	Objecting	Concerned about the degree to which the summary of the Jacobs (2012) Canterbury VISUM Model: Draft Option Testing Report accurately reflects some of the data contained in it. This has serious implications for the evidence base for the Preferred Option.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.64	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6615	Objecting	The findings of the VISUM modelling are not only incorrectly reported in the Jacobs study but totally fallacious with respect to the current Local Plan. It is important therefore to draw to the Council's attention that, based on supporting evidence currently presented, there is no reliable transport information upon which any of the intended developments in the Local Plan can proceed. We will therefore be interested to ascertain what the City Council intends to do about this matter.	
5.65	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		672	Objecting	This section needs to provide a link to the results of this model. If the model has any credibility it will show that the present congestion is severe and all the proposals will only make it worse. It is simply not credible that you can build 4000 houses in South Canterbury and not increase the traffic wanting to use New Dover Road and the Inner Ring Road at peak times.	A link to the results of this model and a discussion of the implications is required.
5.65	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2362	Objecting	The VISUM model that was used to underpin the preferred development options chosen, contrary to WebTAG guidance, did not include walking and cycling in the multi-modal equation. How do both serious omissions square up against the council's assertions, at that cycling and walking are to be the first priority in the development proposals? They don't. The plan is likely result in increasing car use, air pollution, carbon consumption and congestion irrespective of any add on cycle or walking measures	
5.65	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3994	Objecting	Whilst these paragraphs provide some interest they provide unnecessary descriptive detail and should be deleted.	Delete
5.65	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6481	Objecting	...amount of traffic in real-life...'. Regarding real-life data: - What time of year? - Which part of the school year? - Which days? - What times of day?	
5.65	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6616	Objecting	The findings of the VISUM modelling are not only incorrectly reported in the Jacobs study but totally fallacious with respect to the current Local Plan. It is important therefore to draw to the Council's attention that, based on supporting evidence currently presented, there is no reliable transport information upon which any of the intended developments in the Local Plan can proceed. We will therefore be interested to ascertain what the City Council intends to do about this matter.	
5.66	779354	Mr Mike Bodkin	Senior Associate, Planning & Regeneration Peter Brett Associates	2118	Objecting	The only transport evidence support of the preferred option local plan is a draft report published in December 2012. This is inadequate. The proposed allocation at New Thanington should be included by the City Council in the next stage of the Local Plan, due to its sustainable location which accords with the principles in the emerging plan and is considered part of the most sustainable transport solution for the City recommended by the City Council's transport consultants.	Allocation of the proposed development at New Thanington; and Completion and publication of an adequate evidence base to support the plan.
5.66	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3995	Objecting	Whilst these paragraphs provide some interest they provide unnecessary descriptive detail and should be deleted.	Delete
5.66	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5431	Objecting	In order to keep the public informed, it would be beneficial for the Draft Local Plan to include the results of the VISIUM testing for the proposed strategic allocations.	

Summary Chapter 5 - Transport Infrastructure

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
5.66	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6483	Objecting	A number of scenarios. How accurate are the scenarios? For both Sturry and Shelford railway crossing impacts, were all options and all combinations considered? - both open - both closed - both local traffic - Sturry local traffic only - Shelford closed - Sturry local traffic only - Shelford open* - Sturry open - Shelford closed - Sturry open - Shelford local traffic only - Sturry closed - Shelford local traffic only - Sturry closed - Shelford open* * both of these options are probably unlikely?	
5.66	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6617	Objecting	The findings of the VISUM modelling are not only incorrectly reported in the Jacobs study but totally fallacious with respect to the current Local Plan. It is important therefore to draw to the Council's attention that, based on supporting evidence currently presented, there is no reliable transport information upon which any of the intended developments in the Local Plan can proceed. We will therefore be interested to ascertain what the City Council intends to do about this matter.	
5.66	784495	P Manser		6972	Objecting	In order to keep the public informed, it would be beneficial for the Draft Local Plan to include the results of the VISIUM testing for the proposed strategic allocations.	

Comments Summary:

Chapter 6: Tourism and Visitor Economy

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
6.1	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5239	Supporting	I welcome the aim to protect and enhance the appeal of the District to tourists and visitors. Our District is built on its history and heritage, and this remains an important driver for the local economy.	
6.1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6484	Objecting	Concerned that vision worthy ambition will be met. There is an awful lot in this Plan on which to focus, will the Council have the staff and resources to do this effectively? Will this be delivered? Too early to say whether this will prove to be true Apart from Site 1, there are no built in ecofriendly demands set out in Policy SP3 for other development sites.	
6.1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6533	Objecting	A GENERAL COMMENT ABOUT THIS CHAPTER: It does not seem to flow. There is no clear part which is concentrating on Canterbury City and the references to the other areas of the District seem to come at an odd point right at the end.	
6.2	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3708	Supporting	We strongly support this section and the accompanying policies; and we congratulate the Council on several outstanding achievements already. Our concern is that the attractiveness of Canterbury to tourists and visitors will be jeopardised by completely out-of-scale and inappropriate economic and demographic developments. It is not possible to have both. Plans for housing must be scaled down in order to save the city as we and many know and love it.	
6.2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4741	Objecting	6.2 - 6.8 rightly mention the importance of the arts, architecture and music for attracting visitors. The High Speed train is a notable improvement - though it might take visitors away rather than encourage longer stays - and the Visit Kent website and Explore Kent initiatives are valuable. We have been slow, however, to develop and publicise these, by contrast with regions in France, such as Picardy for example.	
6.2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4783	Objecting	Finally, let us build on what does work well such as the Official Website - Visit Canterbury, despite its omissions of some museums, camping facilities, and public transport including national coach services.	

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
6.4	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4784	Objecting	Other ideas for enhancing the tourist experience.	Other ideas for enhancing the tourist experience might include: - A Tourist or City Pass, giving access to a number of attractions - Joint and family tickets for several venues - More free maps, information leaflets and business vouchers - Themed tours related to historical periods, perhaps drawing on the advice of university-based experts - Better-managed civic and green spaces, and a focus on the River Stour as a location for leisure and pleasure - An alternative coach park in Longport, to relieve pedestrian congestion along the river and to increase the numbers of visitors to St Augustine's Abbey. - Creating a more attractive route from Canterbury West station, through the Westgate and up St Peter's Street, for example by extending pavements, adding floral displays, and removing unsightly shop fronts, would release the potential of this historic route into the city.
6.5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6485	Objecting	Opportunities High Speed 1 has brought to East Kent, Canterbury District finds itself...' The early Experian reports in 2006 touching on this were largely ignored. There is almost an element of surprise here. Where is the 'well planned' from para 6.1 ?	
6.6	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4782	Objecting	Little is said in the Local Plan about cooperation between Canterbury Cathedral and other organisations in the city. Yet the Cathedral is the reason why many tourists visit the city and their first port of call. I	t would be good to see a set of policies focused on this issue. For example: â€œDiscussions should take place between the City Council and the Dean and Chapter so that groups of visitors could be encouraged to go on from the Cathedral to visit the museums and galleries in the city; this might be especially relevant for groups of school children â€œReceipts given out in the Cathedral shop should include a reduction on the entry fee for museums, and information about what is available in the city â€œA greater focus on the World Heritage Site might encourage Cathedral visitors to go on to St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's church
6.7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6487	Objecting	'Kent County Council's Vision for Kent 2012-2022.. we must make the most of Kent's natural environment...'. The extensive floor of English Bluebells in Den Grove Woods at Sturry has been famous for more than 150 years. The Sturry/Broad Oak site developers' website informs us that a third of the wood will be lost and although the remaining woodland would be managed and protected, it also says access would be restricted. Will tourists still be welcome?	

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
6.9	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4750	Objecting	6.9 mentions rural tourism and visitor facilities, but with no indication of what these are or might be like. Information is the key here. Canterbury needs a revived Tourist Information Office in a central location, preferably near the cathedral, and perhaps a Pop-Up Shop in the summer season. French websites seek to encourage visitors who have rural or related interests through on-line 'pathways' often linked with accommodation suggestions.	
6.11	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5612	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as the cultural ideas set out in the paragraph.	
6.11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6488	Objecting	'The Council will build upon...'. Too general. How will it build? Where is the detail of this to be found? Are sufficient funds available to support the statement.	
6.14	479400	Dr Doreen Rosman		3389	Supporting	Welcomes the plans recognition of the significance of tourism and the city's historical heritage. However is concerned that the words are not followed up with actions and that recent downgrading of tourist provision is embarrassing and has caused anger and sadness.	
6.14	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6489	Objecting	'...supports over 8,000 jobs'. Where is the analysis of this total? How many are full-time? How many are seasonal? What is the average rate of pay? What is the average number of hours worked? How are they spread across the Canterbury District?	
6.15	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2806	Objecting	The tourist economy should be a major economic driver and therefore we need to rethink, too, the closures of the museums and consider how to use our marketing expertise to improve and expand it.	The tourist economy should be a major economic driver and therefore we need to rethink, too, the closures of the museums and consider how to use our marketing expertise to improve and expand it.
6.16	407690	Mr Harry Macdonald		674	Objecting	If the plan really means what it says then there needs to be a provision for visitors staying in Canterbury more than one night to use the Park and Ride facility.	An objective should be added to review the terms and conditions (or at least the webpage that describes these) so as to make provision for those who visit overnight (more than 24hours) but would prefer to leave their car at the Park and Ride.
6.16	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6619	Supporting	Support both the important provisions in paragraph 6.16	
6.17	665473	Dr Richard Norman		562	Supporting	I support this policy, and I think it needs more radical action than it is receiving, if there is to be a serious prospect of converting visitors to overnight stays. Despite all it has to offer, Canterbury is not an attractive and welcoming environment for visitors. Serious thought needs to be given to how to make Canterbury a more attractive place in which to spend time or stay overnight.	Get rid of the mobile stalls. Provide less encouragement to coach parties (which contribute little to the local economy) in order to encourage overnight visitors. Cut back the 'night-time economy'.
6.18	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4752	Objecting	6.18-19 on Cultural infrastructure outlines the wealth of what is available but makes no practical suggestions such as improving the signposting to The Poor Priest's and Roman Museums nor does it suggest scrapping the off-putting entry charge for the former.	
6.18	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5613	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as the cultural ideas set out in the paragraph.	
6.19	479400	Dr Doreen Rosman		3390	Supporting	Welcomes the plans recognition of the significance of tourism and the city's historical heritage. However is concerned that the words are not followed up with actions and that recent downgrading of tourist provision is embarrassing and has caused anger and sadness.	

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
6.19	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5240	Supporting	I support this statements, but would encourage the Council to ensure that a key part of our cultural appeal, museums, are maintained and kept open all year round. The current policy of closing the Canterbury Heritage, Whitstable and Herne Bay museums from October through to March contradicts the aims stated in both of these paragraphs. The museums must be supported all year round to help maximise the appeal of our District to tourists, visitors and local residents.	
6.19	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6490	Objecting	'The Council will also seek to build ...'. Does the Council have funding available to enable this ambition to be realised? Will the necessary money for this be forthcoming and from what sources?	
6.20	778536	Ms Patricia Marsh	Committee Member Wincheap Society	4627	Objecting	City's subways should be included in this paragraph. Subway from Castle Street to Wincheap is in a particularly shocking state. Its decoration could form the basis of a mural competition with local schools, residents' associations and university art departments.	
6.20	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4753	Objecting	6.20-25, on Public Art, could include valuable reminders, for example of the vibrancy of the Horsebridge Arts and Community Centre in Whitstable, the Wise Words Festival or the contribution made by the Canterbury Commemoration Society. We would recommend new displays, for example of sculpture during Festivals, such as used to be mounted in St Augustine's and elsewhere. There could also be more support for Canterbury in Bloom.	
6.20	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6492	Objecting	'Public Art can encompass a wide variety of elements ..'. It would be good to think that this will be a particularly well thought out consideration for both Sites 2 and 8.	
6.20	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6620	Objecting	Incorporate the city's subways in this paragraph. The subway from Castle St to Wincheap is dirty, with paint peeling off the walls. Decoration and maintenance of all the city's subways on the model of the section from St George's Street to the New Dover Road should be specified in the Local Plan.	Add the city's subways to paragraph 6.20.
6.21	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6493	Objecting	'Public Art can encompass a wide variety of elements ..'. It would be good to think that this will be a particularly well thought out consideration for both Sites 2 and 8.	
6.22	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5614	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as the cultural ideas set out in the paragraph.	
6.24	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4755	Objecting	Puts forward a need for more top-end hotels, partly on the ground that business has to be turned away in the summer months. This could well be a way of promoting longer stays. The criterion for a good standard of design of new hotels is welcome. Promoting Canterbury as a destination for weekend breaks, with advertising aimed at older people and those from London and the south east, could bring in visitors who would stay longer and spend more.	

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
6.25	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1021	Objecting	The Council needs to recognise that Canterbury does not and should not have a monopoly on culture and that it needs to invest in (not cut) Herne Bay's cultural offering. There appears to be a very unhelpful mindset at the Council that culture is synonymous with the Beaney, the Marlowe and Canterbury. Herne Bay needs cultural investment too.	Herne Bay needs cultural investment too.
Policy TV1	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1058	Supporting	Chapter 6: Tourism and the Visitor Economy -I agree with the policy TV1 in this section.	
Policy TV1	779075	Brigadier M J Meardon	Receiver General Canterbury Cathedral	2628	Supporting	The mixed variety of occupiers in the adjoining streets to the Cathedral, especially the craft users of Sun Street and Palace Street, mean that Policy TV1 would be a much more appropriate designation for these areas.	
Policy TV1	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3099	Objecting	Within all policies within this chapter it will be important to ensure that increases in visitor numbers are included within the assessment of impact as part of the HRA process and that new visitor accommodation contributes to any Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategies formulated. Within some of the policies the impacts on the European sites are considered whereas in other Policies this consideration is absent.	
Policy TV1	780620	Mr David Birmingham		4225	Supporting	Supports restoring the quality of life which culture brings in a city with three World Heritage sites, many medieval streets and pubs; and several museums.	
Policy TV1	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4439	Supporting	DIO supports this policy. The barracks site has potential to accommodate a hotel and this will be explored as part of the consultation process for the forthcoming planning application.	
Policy TV1	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5432	Objecting	Policy TV1 should be amended to specifically include the Strategic Development Sites identified at SP3.	Policy TV1 should be amended to specifically include the Strategic Development Sites identified at SP3.
Policy TV1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5719	Supporting	More specific positives:.Policies relating to leisure, cultural and tourist activities TCL11 and 12 + TV1, 2 and 3	
Policy TV1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6494	Supporting	Seems reasonable. The use of Section 106 agreements or similar mechanisms is welcomed.	
Policy TV1	784495	P Manser		6973	Objecting	Policy TV1 should be amended to specifically include the Strategic Development Sites identified at SP3.	Policy TV1 should be amended to specifically include the Strategic Development Sites identified at SP3.
6.26	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6495	Objecting	View of the District. This is too general. The situation for each type of accommodation in the distinct areas of the District should have individual mention under separate subheadings - Canterbury, Herne Bay, Whitstable and the separate rural areas, north, south and east and west of the city.	
6.27	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6496	Objecting	Providing sufficient hotel accommodation. Unless hotel chains share the opinion of both CCC and KCC the situation will not change.	
6.28	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6497	Objecting	Considerable interest in Canterbury than for anywhere else in Kent. This is relative and not quantified.	

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
6.28	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6498	Objecting	Levels of business turned away € especially in June, July and August. Three busy months will not bring the financial security required to support nine lean months. What is the corresponding situation elsewhere eg Herne Bay?	
6.29	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6500	Objecting	'Canterbury is already a strongly positioned leisure break destination. ...'. This seems to refer just to the City. What about the inclusion of the other towns in a Canterbury DISTRICT package?	
6.29	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6501	Objecting	HS1. This almost works against encouraging the longer stay visitor.	
6.29	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6502	Objecting	'... The Cathedral and the historic built environment also continues [sic] to attract many visitors'. How many Cathedral visitors want to stay longer in the City? The great majority seem to be day visitors in organised parties with a set itinerary. If the large parties of school children are taken out of the equation, the picture must change.	
6.32	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6503	Objecting	'.. golf hotels..'. So building houses on an already existing golf club makes sense? If this demand existed this could have been the site.	
6.34	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6504	Objecting	Achieving results will not be easy.	
6.35	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6505	Supporting	'Hotels are definately difficult to proactively encourage....'. Voice of experience here.	
Policy TV2	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		406	Supporting	I welcome that the potential for traffic generation and the accessibility by sustainable modes of transport are amongst the considerations in this policy.	
Policy TV2	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1059	Supporting	Chapter 6: Tourism and the Visitor Economy -I agree with the policyTV2 in this section.	
Policy TV2	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3101	Objecting	Within all policies within this chapter it will be important to ensure that increases in visitor numbers are included within the assessment of impact as part of the HRA process and that new visitor accommodation contributes to any Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategies formulated. Within some of the policies the impacts on the European sites are considered whereas in other Policies this consideration is absent.	
Policy TV2	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5242	Objecting	A number of conditions are listed to allow hotel developments on the edge of town centres. I would suggest that an extra condition is added, that requires any development to comply with the Council's Open Space Strategy to ensure open space is not lost to this type of development.	
Policy TV2	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5720	Supporting	More specific positives:.Policies relating to leisure, cultural and tourist activities TCL11 and 12 + TV1, 2 and 3	

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TV2	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5875	Objecting	Policy TV2 states planning permission will be granted in or on the edge of town centres for proposals to provide new tourism development including hotels, guesthouses, bed and breakfast, self catering accommodation and new visitor attractions. The lack of identified sites in the plan is questionable. KCC question why no sites for new hotels are identified by the local plan.	
Policy TV2	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6138	Objecting	Clarification needed	Define exactly what is covered and make consistent with polices for the town centres.
Policy TV2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6506	Objecting	a) the lower part of Site 2 at Sturry qualifies and could have been the ideal spot, providing much needed local employment, but instead it will get some 600 houses and virtually no employment. c) How about the impact on local residents as well? This seems likely to involve the loss of more greenfield land, but apart from that, and the observations above, the Policy seems reasonable.	
Policy TV3	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1060	Supporting	Chapter 6: Tourism and the Visitor Economy -I agree with the policy TV3 in this section.	
Policy TV3	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3102	Objecting	Within all policies within this chapter it will be important to ensure that increases in visitor numbers are included within the assessment of impact as part of the HRA process and that new visitor accommodation contributes to any Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategies formulated. Within some of the policies the impacts on the European sites are considered whereas in other Policies this consideration is absent.	
Policy TV3	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5721	Supporting	More specific positives:.Policies relating to leisure, cultural and tourist activities TCL11 and 12 + TV1, 2 and 3	
Policy TV3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6508	Objecting	Good	
6.39	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1023	Objecting	I'm not sure how this fits with the recent decision to close Reculver caravan park?	I'm not sure how this fits with the recent decision to close Reculver caravan park?

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
6.39	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6139	Objecting	Various points on caravan parks	The policy needs to be segmented: touring caravans from static. The latter must be clearly differentiated from mobile homes and detail provided on how static caravans are prevented from becoming residential accommodation for the council elsewhere implies they will grant permission for caravan parks where home would not be permitted and yet such vehicle can be used as homes. Unless there is a cast iron way of preventing residential use, all new caravan parks or extensions, including touring if they can be converted to static sites with ease, should like mobile home sites be subject to the full requirements applied for new residential accommodation in the District. The easiest solution is to have a policy for touring caravan parks and one for the rest instead of being mixed up together.
6.39	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6510	Supporting	Well considered	
6.40	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1813	Objecting	Para 6.40 should draw attention to the sensitive nature of the designated KDAONB and its setting and indicate that touring static caravan and tourist sites are only acceptable in line with the criteria set out in the Kent Downs Landscape Design Handbook.	Add text to draw attention to the sensitive nature of the Kent Downs AONB and its setting where touring and static caravan sites are generally considered inappropriate. Sites are only acceptable in line with criteria set out in the KD Landscape Design Handbook and LB1.
6.40	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6511	Supporting	Well considered	
Policy TV4	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1061	Supporting	Chapter 6: Tourism and the Visitor Economy -I agree with the policy TV4 in this section.	
Policy TV4	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1814	Objecting	This policy does not recognise the sensitivity of rural sites in the Kent Downs AONB, or where there are biodiversity issues. The Landscape and Biodiversity policies should also be acknowledged in the policy.	Add the following as indicated in BOLD: '..... that the proposals meet the aims of Policies DBE4, DBE7, DBE8 ,DBE9, DBE13, LB1- 16 (all LB policies)
Policy TV4	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3103	Objecting	Within all policies within this chapter it will be important to ensure that increases in visitor numbers are included within the assessment of impact as part of the HRA process and that new visitor accommodation contributes to any Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategies formulated. Within some of the policies the impacts on the European sites are considered whereas in other Policies this consideration is absent.	
Policy TV4	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3996	Objecting	Fails to provide safeguards for the countryside, appears development supported anywhere. Add text re complying with requirements. Problem sites are not dealt with. On existing sites where there is evidence of adverse impacts or breach of conditions the site should be closed or enforced and/or applications for upgrading refused.	Add at end of the third para add: "or the site does not comply with the Council's current requirements and/or would no longer be granted planning consent"

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TV4	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5629	Objecting	Whitstable The issue of mobile homes and the residential use of caravans need to be addressed in the context of the town (and also for that matter across the district).	
Policy TV4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6512	Objecting	Should there also be inclusion of the considerations listed in TV2?	
6.41	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5241	Supporting	I support this statements, but would encourage the Council to ensure that a key part of our cultural appeal, museums, are maintained and kept open all year round. The current policy of closing the Canterbury Heritage, Whitstable and Herne Bay museums from October through to March contradicts the aims stated in both of these paragraphs. The museums must be supported all year round to help maximise the appeal of our District to tourists, visitors and local residents.	
6.41	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6514	Supporting	Appreciated	
6.42	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6516	Supporting	Appreciated	
6.43	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1027	Objecting	Does this mean, for example, that Herne Bay can't position itself as arty (if that were the route that residents were to choose) because Margate and Folkestone are? This is unnecessarily restrictive. What we need is a proper tourism strategy for the town, spelling out what makes it special and what could be done to enhance that. If the market tells us that we could do something that another town has done and still be successful at it, it makes no sense to say "we can't do what they're doing."	Does this mean, for example, that Herne Bay can't position itself as arty (if that were the route that residents were to choose) because Margate and Folkestone are? This is unnecessarily restrictive. What we need is a proper tourism strategy for the town, spelling out what makes it special and what could be done to enhance that. If the market tells us that we could do something that another town has done and still be successful at it, it makes no sense to say "we can't do what they're doing."
6.43	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6517	Supporting	Appreciated	
6.44	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	1004	Objecting	Whitstable is the optimum location for such a development and the notion of a marina in other locations to prop up local economies makes no sense at all. A Marina option coupled with a cinema and one or two other initiatives would be good for business, good for the town and good for sailors. What we have on the plan lacks vision and needs to be far more positive for the town. It would do for Whitstable what the Marlowe and Beany is doing for Canterbury and what a pier could do for Herne Bay.	
6.44	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1037	Objecting	I agree that there is a need for a marina on the North Kent coast.However, Whitstable is not a viable option.	

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
6.44	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1067	Objecting	I agree with the policies in this section with the exception of the paragraph 6.44 on marina provision. The Council should be more pro-active on attracting a marina to Herne Bay. It would be a much more attractive location than Sheerness, and Herne Bay needs the economic generator. Any marina developments would require a significant housing development.	
6.44	778047	Mr Michael Perkins		1243	Objecting	There is a shortfall of marina berths along the north Kent Coast. Whitstable is ideal for a Marina for the following reasons: It is between similar facilities at Ramsgate and Medway; the location is perfect for stopovers on route to London; there is a Yacht Club; there are restaurants and pubs; and has a good train service to London. A Marina would attract economic development. Herne Bay has been considered as a possible site but for the wrong reasons; plans for a Marina already drawn up.	
6.44	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4778	Objecting	6.44 rules out the need for Marina development. This ignores the tourist potential of existing watersports facilities and the advantage of promoting them. The Chartham Lakes must offer potential in this respect.	The Chartham Lakes must offer potential in this respect.
6.44	784280	Whitstable Oyster Company Ltd		5121	Objecting	We ask that a specific policy is included in the Plan identifying the representation site (Whitstable harbour) as a site for marina and other developments. This would have significant economic and regeneration benefits, and create new leisure and recreation facilities, whilst enabling retention of the existing working harbour and improving/enhancing its facilities.	We ask that a specific policy is included in the Plan identifying the representation site (Whitstable harbour) as a site for marina and other developments.
Policy TV5	268778	Mrs Janet Hall		172	Objecting	A marina would do nothing for Herne Bay. When and not if, the Pier is rebuilt will we not need a docking area for pleasure boats to drop off visitors.	
Policy TV5	109244	Mr Andrew Newell		207	Supporting	Attract Investors for a State of the Art Pier/ Marina off the back of the two recent reports done by both Gifford Engineering a Marina Feasibility Study and the Business Impact Study done By Colliers International both of which are Global Experts in their fields respectively and cost both the Tax Payer and and through Public donations to complete.	
Policy TV5	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1063	Supporting	Chapter 6: Tourism and the Visitor Economy - I agree with the policy TV5 in this section.	
Policy TV5	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2808	Objecting	More thought should be given to attracting a marina to Herne Bay and reinstating the pier.	More thought should be given to attracting a marina to Herne Bay and reinstating the pier.
Policy TV5	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3073	Objecting	Allusion is made to the possible delivery of a marina along the North Kent coast. Due to the designations throughout the majority of the coast and the risk of impact across a number of coastal sites due to impacts on coastal processes, we would have concerns regarding the construction of yet another marina within or adjacent to the European network.	

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TV5	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3104	Objecting	It will be important to ensure that increases in visitor numbers are included within the assessment of impact as part of the HRA process and that new visitor accommodation contributes to any Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategies. Within some of the policies the impacts on the European sites are considered whereas in other Policies this is absent.	
Policy TV5	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3997	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent object to this Policy because, as explained in para 6.44 there is no requirement for this form of development in Canterbury district. Consequently the Policy is unnecessary and should be deleted	Delete
Policy TV5	784280	Whitstable Oyster Company Ltd		5120	Supporting	We support the principles set out in Paragraph 6.44 and Proposed Policy TV5 - Marina provision along the North Kent Coast.	
Policy TV5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6518	Supporting	Well considered	
Policy TV5	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6621	Supporting	Consider this [Policy TV5 f] an important proviso.	
6.45	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1029	Objecting	It is hugely disappointing that no mention is made of the Pier and its future in a document which is planning land use for the next 18 years. The Pier is the only unique visitor attraction that the town has and there needs to be a clear strategy for its use and its role in drawing visitors to the town from outside the district	It is hugely disappointing that no mention is made of the Pier and its future in a document which is planning land use for the next 18 years. The Pier is the only unique visitor attraction that the town has and there needs to be a clear strategy for its use and its role in drawing visitors to the town from outside the district
6.45	771556	Mr Phil Rose		2000	Objecting	The Council recognises the problem that the town has little tourist trade in the winter but seems to think that we can overcome this by having a few new benches and some events. This does not provide us with a stable tourist income for October to May. The Local Plan needs to recognise that Herne Bay needs a proper strategy for tourism, not just ad hoc fixes.	The Council must work with the people of Herne Bay to develop a comprehensive and coherent tourism strategy for Herne Bay. The glaringly obvious first step would be the reconstruction of Herne Bay Pier.
6.45	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6519	Objecting	'...modest signs of recovery'. Well done!	
6.46	109244	Mr Andrew Newell		206	Supporting	I recently raised my concerns regarding why the Pier had not been placed in the Local Plan 2013 It is extremely important to the Whole Tax Paying Community of Herne Bay that the Pier is included.	
6.46	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1038	Supporting	Herne Bay's economy would benefit greatly from a marina which would contribute to the regeneration agenda for the town.	
6.46	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6520	Objecting	'... remaining pier'. Could it be rebuilt in a modern style reflecting the wind farm?	
6.47	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6521	Objecting	'..recognised as a destination'. Actual numbers of residents and visitors?	
6.49	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6522	Objecting	Reculver Master Plan SPD 2009. A lot of thought has gone into this. What have been the results to date?	

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TV6	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1064	Supporting	Chapter 6: Tourism and the Visitor Economy -I agree with the policy TV6 in this section.	
Policy TV6	778931	Miss Gemma Avory	Water Resources Planner South East Water	1527	Supporting	The Reculver Desalination Scheme is likely to give rise to a number of planning issues. We would like to ensure we have a close working relationship with Canterbury City Council to overcome any of these issues in order to safeguard future water supplies to the area.	
Policy TV6	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3106	Supporting	It will be important to ensure that increases in visitor numbers are included within the assessment of impact as part of the HRA process and that new visitor accommodation contributes to any Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategies. Within some of the policies the impacts on the European sites are considered whereas in other Policies this is absent. We welcome the plans to improve the visitor offer within Reculver Country Park, providing this does not undermine biodiversity.	
Policy TV6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6524	Supporting	Seems to have covered everything.	
Policy TV6	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6624	Supporting	These safeguards are vital for any future development of the Reculver site.	
6.50	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	935	Objecting	Whilst tourism has its benefits for some, the interests of the indigenous population should not be ignored. I am mindful of the huge inconvenience that locals have to endure in terms of loss of parking provision in residential streets and congestion due to excessive visitor numbers, hence my earlier remarks relating to Park and Ride.	Please add to following to the end of paragraph 6.50 " and the quality of life for existing residents is not unduly compromised".
6.50	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5623	Objecting	The unique features and pressures in Whitstable warrant that more rigorous treatment in the DLP. This must go far beyond the unsatisfactory informal characterisations of the town in 5.70, 6.50 and 11.49, which it has to be said are also unhelpful and far too narrow as they mask underlying problems.	The big issues and difficulties facing Whitstable need to be more clearly identified and addressed in a focussed and determined manner. A proper recognition of the past level of growth here and an acknowledgement of the sustainability constraints on further growth must inform future plans for the town.
6.50	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6055	Objecting	Whitstable is not a holiday camp to expand willy nilly.	All this should be subject to infrastructure requirements. See attachment.
6.50	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6525	Objecting	'character of the town is maintained and enhanced'. How does this sit with traffic issues paras 5.7 and 5.45 (parking issues and Park and Ride) ?	
6.50	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6627	Supporting	This proviso vital for any future development of tourism in Whitstable.	
6.51	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1815	Supporting	This paragraph supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance.	

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
6.51	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4779	Objecting	6.51 support for rural tourism, holiday lets and so on, is to be welcomed and could well be of value. However, the Plan should contain practical proposals for promoting sites and activities, calendars of events and attractions and the means by which these are co-ordinated; how visitors' experiences to be made 'distinctive'; and the role and capability of the Council.	However, the Plan should contain practical proposals for promoting sites and activities, calendars of events and attractions and the means by which these are co-ordinated; how visitors' experiences to be made 'distinctive'; and the role and capability of the Council.
6.51	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5558	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'locational concerns'. This includes the desire for both competitive town centres and rural investment	
6.51	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6527	Objecting	'Woodland initiatives'- Den Grove Woods famous bluebells restricted access? See comment para 6.7 '... Country-sports activities' - Sturry - clay pigeon shooting range will be lost to housing.	
Policy TV7	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1065	Supporting	Chapter 6: Tourism and the Visitor Economy - I agree with the policy TV7 in this section.	
Policy TV7	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1816	Objecting	There should recognition of the sensitivity and need to conserve and enhance the KDAONB in this policy	Add to text as indicated in BOLD: '..... appropriate to their location AND IN CONFORMITY WITH POLICIES LB1-16
Policy TV7	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3107	Objecting	It will be important to ensure that increases in visitor numbers are included within the assessment of impact as part of the HRA process and that new visitor accommodation contributes to any Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategies. Within some of the policies the impacts on the European sites are considered whereas in other Policies this is absent.	
Policy TV7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6528	Supporting	Good	
6.52	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6530	Supporting	'... ensuring that the character of the countrysideis not destroyed'. Thank you.	
6.52	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6629	Supporting	These safeguards vital for any future development of rural tourism.	
Policy TV8	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1066	Supporting	Chapter 6: Tourism and the Visitor Economy - I agree with the policy TV8 in this section.	
Policy TV8	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1817	Supporting	This policy supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance.	
Policy TV8	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2024	Objecting	Object - to more over-prescriptive requirements for rural building conversions which conflict with the NPPF	A single rural conversion policy to incorporate the more appropriate criteria of policies TV8 and EMP14 would be appropriate
Policy TV8	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3109	Objecting	It will be important to ensure that increases in visitor numbers are included within the assessment of impact as part of the HRA process and that new visitor accommodation contributes to any Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategies. Within some of the policies the impacts on the European sites are considered whereas in other Policies this is absent.	

Summary Chapter 6 - Tourism and Visitor Economy

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy TV8	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6531	Objecting	Apart from the last sentence the Policy seems fine. Replace "... applicants may be expected to enter into a legal agreement...." with the request for a change to ... "applicants will be expected to enter into a legal agreement...".	Replace "... applicants may be expected to enter into a legal agreement...." with the request for a change to ... "applicants will be expected to enter into a legal agreement...".

Comments Summary:

Chapter 7: Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
7.1	665473	Dr Richard Norman		563	Supporting	It is vital that the district should play its part in tackling the massive problem of climate change.	
7.1	777655	Ms Emily Shirley	Director Kent Environment & Community Network	2229	Objecting	I am writing on behalf of KECN to object to the entirety of the Draft Local Plan. It fails to address avoiding dangerous climate change, putting future resident of the District at immediate danger from increased flooding, drought, air pollution and the other multitude of problems that are well understood and predicted to arise such as food security and civil war, if we do not bring our carbon levels, back to 350ppm. The Local Plan must make avoiding dangerous climate change top priority.	The Draft Local Plan must be redrafted to make all its policies consistent with the goal of bringing carbon levels back to 350ppm in order to achieve climate recovery. Climate recovery requires a reduction of carbon consumption by 6%+ each year from the adoption of and throughout the life of the Plan. In addition to this, extensive woodland planting has to occur.
7.1	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2425	Objecting	The chapter on climate change in the Draft Local Plan is hopeless. Mitigation and adaption to climate change needs to be threaded through the whole plan and inform all policy content. It should be the key strategy. The existing climate change policies only address new development proposals, how developments are to be constructed and in some instances where they are to be located. The full climate change impacts of existing developments and behaviour patterns are not even considered	Therefore, a district wide climate recovery plan must be made part of the Local Plan. This will require a 6%+ reduction of carbon each year with massive tree planting across the district. This is the prescription set out by a leading climatologist Dr. Hansen and his team of experts. To this end, the districts carbon footprint must be calculated (if not done already), and then across all policy areas a 6%+ annual carbon reduction must be made mandatory (with incentives provided if necessary) with comprehensive tree planting actions.
7.1	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3710	Supporting	We largely agree with this section, which strengthens the case against overdevelopment in South Canterbury	
7.1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4801	Supporting	This chapter contains a large number of well intentioned ideas including evidence that many of the recent advances on climate mitigation and adaptation have been addressed, and that the Council is using its past experience with flooding situations to good effect.	
7.1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4803	Objecting	We are concerned that a number of major points have received insufficient attention. Especially important here is the need to address the poor energy efficiency of much of the existing housing stock, the urgent need to improve water quality across some of the District, the wider impact of climate change on the District and its people, and the need to improve the ecological footprint of the city and protect water supplies.	Especially important here is the need to address the poor energy efficiency of much of the existing housing stock, the urgent need to improve water quality across some of the District, the wider impact of climate change on the District and its people, and the need to improve the ecological footprint of the city and protect water supplies.
7.1	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5604	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'sustainable environment'. This includes a concern for climate change and flooding.	
7.1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6631	Objecting	The title of this chapter should incorporate". . . and Water Resources". This is important since about a third of the chapter covers water resources and they are of major importance to local planning considerations.	Add"... and Water Resources" to the title of this chapter

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
7.1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6646	Objecting	Addition to the Plan: Climate change is likely to affect natural species distribution, especially with optimum cropping patterns and length of growing seasons. These factors are likely to impact on agricultural land uses and biodiversity in the District. There are also likely to be impacts on human health; most likely reflected in increased morbidity and mortality due to excessive summer heating, and incidences of disease caused by new strains of viruses or bacteria or by insect-borne diseases.	Addition to the Plan: Climate change is likely to affect natural species distribution, especially with optimum cropping patterns, the length of growing seasons, etc. These factors are likely to impact considerably on agricultural land uses and on biodiversity in the District. Additionally, there are likely to be impacts on human health. This will be most reflected in increased morbidity and mortality due to excessive summer heating, and the incidence of diseases caused by new strains of viruses or bacteria or by insect-borne diseases such as malaria.
7.2	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3998	Objecting	after "2020" insert "and also to the 2011 KCC Study Renewable Energy for Kent, and to the Government's forthcoming Planning Guidance on Renewable Energy".	after "2020" insert "and also to the 2011 KCC Study Renewable Energy for Kent, and to the Government's forthcoming Planning Guidance on Renewable Energy".
7.4	665473	Dr Richard Norman		564	Supporting	These are sensible practical steps which can be taken locally to tackle the problem of climate change.	
7.4	778563	Mrs Susan Langdown		1315	Supporting	Development should not take place on land designated by the Dept.of Environment as falling within zones 1 and 2 on the flood chart. This applies in particular to Kingsmead Field. Development on this land may well cause flooding further downstream, as Kingsmead Field has a vital role in water absorbtion during periods of heavy rain.	
7.4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6541	Objecting	See BOX - Encouraging Combined Heat and Power at strategic development sites. This is only specified for Site 1 in SP3. Why not for ALL sites ?	
7.4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6543	Supporting	Designing development to ensure water efficiency is an integral part of design. This has whole hearted support. Water shortage is a great concern amongst local residents. Pages 156 and 157 of this Plan highlight the fact that another 15,000 houses in the district by 2031 will exacerbate an already fragile situation. A reservoir at Broad Oak would not be operational until four years later.	
7.5	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2856	Supporting	Climate Change Action to reduce..... promoting developments that generate renewable energy and encouraging combined heat and power at strategic developments. Designing developments to increase energy efficiency & reduce consumption and carbon emissions.	
7.5	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4805	Objecting	Paragraphs 7.5 to 7.18 are concerned with climate change mitigation or adaptation as it is relevant to built developments. However, the discussion relates exclusively to new developments. Despite the fact the paragraph 7.3 notes that the NPPF requires planning authorities to "actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings" the draft Local Plan ignores existing buildings.	The Council should address what it intends to do to reduce energy losses from existing buildings.
7.5	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6638	Objecting	Despite the fact that paragraph 7.3 notes that the NPPF requires planning authorities to "actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings" the City Council has chosen to almost ignore existing buildings.	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
7.6	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4001	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent generally support this Policy. We would like to see the words in appropriate locations" added at the end of the first sentence. We also consider that the supporting text to the Policy should deal specifically with issue surrounding the location of large scale solar farms reflecting the matters raised in the recent CLG 'Planning practice guidance for renewable and low carbon energy' and the 10 commitments given by the Solar Trade Association.	Add the words in appropriate locations" added at the end of the first sentence.
7.7	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	3999	Objecting	This study does not explore in any detail the potential for large scale solar farms, for which a substantial number of planning applications are now being submitted throughout Kent. In the recent CLG 'Planning practice guidance for renewable and low carbon energy' it is clear that this is an issue that local authorities need to deal with in their local plans. This includes identifying the areas where such development might be acceptable. The study should be updated to provide this assessment.	
7.8	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	782	Objecting	The need for a Sustainable Construction and Renewable Energy Supplementary Planning Document is unjustified. Any policy that places additional requirements on development that go further than the Building Regulations such as the local policy for residential development to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 must be set out in the local plan.	
7.8	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1818	Supporting	This paragraph supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance. The Kent Downs wood Fuel Pathfinder can provide advice for LPAs and Developers. We would be happy to discuss further. http://www.kentdowns.org.uk/guidance-management-and-advice/kent-downs-woodfuel-pathfinder	
7.8	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6544	Objecting	The Council will prepare a Sustainable Construction and Renewable Energy Supplementary Planning Document' When will this be available? What impact may this have on the developer's profit margin? What influence will the Council be able to exert to ensure best practice?	
Policy CC1	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	781	Objecting	Policy CC1 relating to the provision of renewable energy is superfluous because it duplicates what is required under the Building Regulations. It also duplicates what is in policy DBE1.	
Policy CC1	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1069	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change - I agree with the policy CC1 in this chapter.	
Policy CC1	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2860	Supporting	Policy CC1 All good	
Policy CC1	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3236	Objecting	RSPB supports the recommended amendments to the Core Strategy text as set out in the AA:	The following policy wording should be included in relation to permitting renewable energy development: "No development will be permitted which may have an adverse effect on the integrity of any SAC, SPA or Ramsar site alone, or in combination, with other plans or projects."

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy CC1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4000	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent generally support this Policy. We would like to see the words in appropriate locations" added at the end of the first sentence. We also consider that the supporting text to the Policy should deal specifically with issue surrounding the location of large scale solar farms reflecting the matters raised in the recent CLG 'Planning practice guidance for renewable and low carbon energy' and the 10 commitments given by the Solar Trade Association.	Add the words in appropriate locations" added at the end of the first sentence.
Policy CC1	406848	Mr Graham Norton	Land and Planning Director Strategic Land Kent	5590	Objecting	Policy CC1 duplicates existing policy under Building Regulations and is not necessary.	Delete CC1
Policy CC1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6545	Supporting	Seems reasonable	
Policy CC1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6634	Objecting	Add that the Council will not accept planning applications for hydraulic fracturing (fracking) plants or facilities to be located within the District boundaries, nor will it allow any future coal extraction from the East Kent coalfields. Failure to stipulate this will put the Council in direct contradiction to the aims of Para.s 7.1 to 7.3.	Add the following text to Policy CC1: The Council will not accept planning applications for hydraulic fracturing (fracking) plants or facilities to be located within the District boundaries, nor will it allow any future coal extraction from the East Kent coalfields.
7.9	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6546	Objecting	'Proposed changes ...all new dwellings zero carbon rated after 2016 (non-domestic ...after 2019)'. At least another 2,000 houses will have been built by 2016. Is there anyway the Council could make them local requirements before then?	
7.10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6549	Objecting	Home insulation ... All new homes should seek to maximise energy efficiency....'. Could 'should' become 'must'?	
7.10	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6656	Objecting	Addition to the Plan: The Council should offer free (or subsidised) energy audits to all existing householders. This would encourage local investments in energy saving measures, generating local business and creating jobs, as well as helping the to reduce CO2 emissions and achieve emissions targets. Alternatively, the Council needs to promote the Government's Green Energy deal (January 2013) and which provides home owners with cash saving incentives to invest in energy saving installations.	Addition to the Plan: The Council should offer free (or subsidised) energy audits to all existing householders. This would encourage local investments in energy saving measures thus generating local business and creating jobs, as well as helping the Council to reduce CO2 emissions and to better achieve emissions targets. Alternatively, the Council needs to promote the government's Green Energy deal (January 2013) and which provides home owners with cash saving incentives to invest in a range of energy saving installations.
7.11	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2026	Objecting	contrary to paragraph 95 of the NPPF:	Revise in line with representation
7.11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6551	Supporting	Covering the possible lack of carbon targets is appreciated.	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
7.12	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5977	Objecting	In creating new buildings to meet its service delivery requirements, including new schools, the KCC will need to assess the viability of all requirements. Central government funding dictates standard designs linked to standard funding so additional requirements sought by district planners will impact on the accommodation to be provided and the viability of any additional requirements will need to be tested	
7.12	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6552	Supporting	'.... Accept contributions....improve the efficiency of existing housing stock ...'. Good	
7.14	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4809	Objecting	We propose that the City Council offers free (or subsidised) energy audits for all existing householders. This would encourage local investment in energy saving measures thus generating local business and creating jobs, as well as helping the City Council to reduce CO2 emissions and to better achieve emissions targets. Alternatively, the Council needs to promote the government's Green Energy deal which commenced in January 2013 (see gdcashback.decc.gov.uk), and which provides home owners with ca	
Policy CC2	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	786	Objecting	Policy is unnecessary since the Government target is for all homes to be built to zero carbon standards by April 2016. They should be deleted. The risk to the Council of having unviable sites and an implementable plan is greater than the benefit of a marginal improvement in carbon reduction before 2016.	
Policy CC2	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1087	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change I agree with policy CC2 in this chapter.	
Policy CC2	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4002	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent generally support this Policy, but we would not see points 1-3 as a hierarchy - there is no reason why these measures should not progress in parallel. In the paragraph after point 3 the words "and photovoltaic panels on buildings" should be added after "CHP".	Remove points 1-3 as a hierarchy After point 3 the words "and photovoltaic panels on buildings" should be added after "CHP".
Policy CC2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4808	Objecting	There is nothing in this chapter about the City Council having targets for CO2 reductions and for the city's eco-footprint reduction. In 2007 Canterbury was ranked as the =5th worst city in the country with respect to its eco-footprint, i.e. with the city then having a level of resource consumption equal to 3.4 planets. There is no mention in the Local Plan that this poor situation is being discussed or addressed, and in fact this extremely negative point seems to have been totally ignored.	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy CC2	782057	Peter Rhodes	Head of Estates Services University for the Creative Arts	5070	Objecting	UCA supports the principle of reducing carbon dioxide emissions, however the Policy should be amended to recognise the contribution that landlord estates, such as universities or research institutions, can make through the installation of a site wide energy solutions as this can deliver higher carbon savings for a lower cost. This could involve a range of renewable energy technologies including an onsite biomass boiler, combined heat and power district heating system.	This Policy should clearly state as to what development would trigger the requirement to include measures to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. We request that the wording of Policy CC2 is amended to expressly reference that minimising energy requirements, incorporating renewable energy or low carbon sources can be provided within a new building or through the installation of such systems on a site wide basis. The Policy should also expressly reference the thresholds for including measures to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.
Policy CC2	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5136	Objecting	The Council's approach to achieving Zero Carbon in Policies CC2, CC3 and DBE1 is not consistent with National Policy as there is none yet so to make the DLP 'Sound' remove the requirement to achieve zero carbon. Policies CC2/CC3 are not justified as Council's viability evidence does not support burdening developments with further obligations that could affect DLP delivery. Also they duplicate of the Building Regulations so are not sound. Delete policy.	Remove reference requirement to achieve zero carbon. Delete Policies CC2 and CC3
Policy CC2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6553	Supporting	Seems a flexible approach	
Policy CC2	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6658	Objecting	Addition to the Plan: This Policy should be revisited to include the Canterbury District targets for reducing CO2 emission levels and for reducing the high eco-footprint of the City. In 2007, Canterbury was ranked as the fifth worst city in the country r.e. its eco-footprint, with its then level of consumption equal to 3.4 planets.	Addition to the Plan: This Policy should be revisited to include the Canterbury District targets for reducing CO2 emission levels and for reducing the high eco-footprint of the City.
7.16	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1819	Supporting	This paragraph supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance. The Kent Downs wood Fuel Pathfinder can provide advice for LPAs and Developers. We would be happy to discuss further. http://www.kentdowns.org.uk/guidance-management-and-advice/kent-downs-woodfuel-pathfinder	
7.16	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5978	Objecting	In creating new buildings to meet its service delivery requirements, including new schools, the KCC will where ever possible include energy efficiency solutions. Biomass will be explored as one of the option but it should be recognised that its application is not suitable in all locations, and will depend upon availability of the fuel	
7.16	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6555	Objecting	'The Council will expect the new Strategic Development Sites' Should this be cross referenced with SP3? Only Site 1 has a specific mention of this.	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy CC3	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		440	Objecting	The obligations under Policy CC3 for Strategic Development Areas and other development over 200 units to provide renewable or gas fired CHP has not been justified. CHP is more suited and often only viable on mixed use /commercial schemes where there is high energy demand. The threshold of 200 units + has not been viability tested, nor if set at such a low level is it likely to effective. At present this Policy is not sound.	
Policy CC3	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	783	Objecting	Policy CCS is unjustified. How developers meet the standards for carbon reductions under the Building Regulations is a matter for them. The Council should not specify how the national carbon reduction targets are achieved. This is a matter for developers to consider.	
Policy CC3	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	784	Objecting	There are legal considerations relating to connection to district heating and renewable energy plant that means that the role of the Council is prescribing in detail how energy reduction targets will be achieved is unlawful. Customers are required under law to have the freedom of choice from whom they purchase their energy. The Council does not explain how this will be addressed. Also, any requirement for future connection to a district heating must be cost neutral the consumer.	
Policy CC3	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	785	Objecting	Under the CDM Regulations anyone that specifies a particular material/technology could be deemed under the law, to be the 'principle designer'. This carries with it legal responsibilities. So if a fatality occurs as a consequence of the Council specifying the use of a particular technology, then the Council could be legally liable.	
Policy CC3	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	787	Objecting	Policy is unnecessary since the Government target is for all homes to be built to zero carbon standards by April 2016. They should be deleted. The risk to the Council of having unviable sites and an implementable plan is greater than the benefit of a marginal improvement in carbon reduction before 2016.	
Policy CC3	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1088	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change I agree with policy CC3 in this chapter.	
Policy CC3	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2928	Supporting	Policy CC3 - Where it can be shown that there is sufficient development to support a Combined Heat and Power facility in addition to providing adequate gas and electricity from the grid then Kitewood would support the provision of a CHP facility. The proposed open spaces within the masterplan and their new planting will contribute to local carbon sequestration.	
Policy CC3	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4025	Objecting	Object to this Policy, because the site size threshold is too high as the choice, is not between renewables or gas fired CHP, but rather the priority should be given to renewables - for example building mounted photovoltaic panels. This technology should, be promoted as part of all development, not just on the large sites. We accept that CHP would only be feasible on larger sites, and threshold may be necessary. Encouragement of renewable should be more general	encouragement of renewable should be more general

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy CC3	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5147	Objecting	The Council's approach to achieving Zero Carbon in Policies CC2, CC3 and DBE1 is not consistent with National Policy as there is none yet so to make the DLP 'Sound' remove the requirement to achieve zero carbon. Policies CC2/CC3 are not justified as Council's viability evidence does not support burdening developments with further obligations that could affect DLP delivery. Also they duplicate of the Building Regulations so are not sound. Delete policy	Remove reference requirement to achieve zero carbon. Delete Policies CC2 and CC3
Policy CC3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6558	Objecting	Should this be cross referenced with SP3?	Should this be cross referenced with SP3?
7.17	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5627	Objecting	Whitstable The Council's concern about flooding is also appreciated.	
7.18	379953	Mr Chris Blunkell		53	Objecting	Core Strategy Objective 10 stated:"All development should be designed and located so that it is resilient to future changes in climate (including increases in flood risk) and contributes to reducing and mitigating its risk". I agree that this objective works up to a point, but am concerned that it appears preoccupied with new development and so fails to cover an important issue - that of people already occupying properties identified as being at risk (see LDP 7.18)	
7.18	778931	Miss Gemma Avory	Water Resources Planner South East Water	1520	Objecting	It is South East Water's view that the Local Plan as currently drafted does not adequately plan for future water resources.	There is not enough evidence in the plan to support the need for future increases in supply and the impacts of climate change on the local water resources. We need to work closely to ensure we are in line with each other in your plan and our WRMP.
7.18	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1820	Supporting	This paragraph supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance.	
7.18	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4027	Objecting	After "resources" insert "permeable hard surfaces, tree planting,".	After " resources " insert " permeable hard surfaces, tree planting," .
7.18	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6560	Supporting	Appreciated	
7.19	379953	Mr Chris Blunkell		57	Objecting	I agree, of course, with focus on reducing risk to people and the built environment. However, the encouragement of"economically sound and sustainable defence measures" surely conceals problems of equitable defence provision and the individualisation of risk with potentially dreadful consequences for relatively few individuals.	
7.19	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5730	Supporting	More specific positives:. Concern to reduce the risk of flooding and overtopping - paragraphs 7.19-7.42 and policies CC4 - CC7	
7.20	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6561	Objecting	"directly from rainfall on the ground surfaceand rising groundwater overwhelming sewers and drainage systems" This situation is of great concern to both residents of both Sturry and Fordwich. How will this be avoided with 1,000 houses on Sturry Hill ?	
7.26	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6563	Objecting	Flood risk assessment - Does this include the risk to other properties as result of the development?	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
7.27	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4028	Objecting	After "including" insert "permeable hard surfaces, tree planting,".	After " including " insert " permeable hard surfaces, tree planting," .
7.29	777842	Mrs Maria Thomas	Secretary Market Way Area Residents Association	1555	Objecting	Object to the proposal to build 100 houses on Kingsmead Field. Building on an area of open land as large as Kingsmead Field will decrease the area's absorption capacity after heavy rainfall and lead to an increased risk of flooding further downstream.	Reference to the construction of 100 houses in para 2.24 of the Draft Local Plan should be removed.
7.29	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2027	Objecting	Object - to the omission of any acknowledgement, by the Council, that the Council's Drainage Impact Guidance Note is out of date and requires a review.	Review document
7.29	781400	Charlie Mount		4898	Objecting	Building on Kingsmead Field would increase flood risk and is contrary to the aims of Paragraph 7.29. Kingsmead Field should be named for protection in Paragraph 7.29.	Kingsmead Field should be named for protection in Paragraph 7.29.
7.29	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6564	Objecting	"A Drainage Impact Guidance note has been adopted ... "What powers of enforcement will it give the Council?	
7.31	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1030	Objecting	It looks as if some of the areas marked out as housing estates around Herne Bay (both the Greenhill site and the Golf Course site) include areas which are at significant risk of flooding as defined by the Environment Agency. Already significant rainfall causes pollution problems (sometimes by sewage) at our coast. Our sewage system is struggling to cope with the current amount of housing. Building on flood plains and adding over 4000 new homes will exacerbate the problem.	reduce the planned development. Do not build on flood plains. Upgrade the sewage system before adding new homes.
7.32	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	243	Supporting	we welcome the stipulation that any application for development should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment and a Drainage Impact Assessment. The Little Stour area is a "known area at risk of flooding" (7.32). The proposals and illustration of Sustainable Drainage schemes are important	
7.32	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2840	Objecting	Concerns about flooding in the area of Strode Farm, A299 and Plenty Brook, foul sewer capacity, drain capacity on Bullockstone Road loss of flood storage. Climate change and heavy rainfall will make it worse.	
Policy CC4	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1089	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change. I agree with policy CC4 in this chapter.	
Policy CC4	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2029	Objecting	Object - to the omission of any acknowledgement, by the Council, that the Council's Drainage Impact Guidance Note is out of date and requires a review.	Review Document
Policy CC4	781064	Mr Richard Grayson		4342	Supporting	I agree with this policy that is based on Environment Agency guidelines. Local Authorities continue to allow housing development on floodplain land. This is an expedient to fulfill housing quotas. I	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy CC4	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5150	Objecting	Wording of Policy CC4 is confusing as it mixes up contributions, strategic and on site measures so is not effective, transparent, justified or deliverable. Does not meet tests of NFFP (204) as contributions sought are not fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind so is not sound. No justification or evidence provided that supports policy of putting onus of meeting the cost and maintenance on developers could be done by a management company. Amend policy to make it sound	Delete from second sentence 'including the requirement for a contribution towards new flood defence or mitigation measures'. Add instead in it's place 'Where new development proposals rely on the provision of new strategic flood defence or mitigation measures then a contribution towards their provision will be sought and shall be of a scale and kind that is fairly and reasonably associated to the development' In third sentence delete 'Measures identified to mitigate effects' Replace with 'Where new development proposals rely on the provision of new strategic flood defence or mitigation measures then a contribution towards their provision will be sought and shall be of a scale and kind that is fairly and reasonably associated to the development' Add on the end of the third sentence 'expense or put into a management company to ensure their long term retention and management.' At the start of the fourth sentence add 'Other' In the fourth sentence delete 'Will' and replace with 'may'. Add to the end of the fourth sentence add 'and their provision will be informed by the findings of a submitted Flood Risk Assessment and/or Drainage Impact Assessment (where relevant).'
Policy CC4	127115	B.J. Gore		5283	Objecting	There has been much in the National Press recently about the suggestion to charge every house owner an extra premium to cover insurers' costs in repairing flood damage. This is unjust to the people who chose not to have a flood risk house. I can foresee a move to make Local Authorities, and perhaps developers also, liable in damages for repair costs to such houses. In the Local Plan, proposals for new homes in flood risk areas, have absolutely no detail as to design or flood damage limitation.	
Policy CC4	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5732	Supporting	More specific positives: · Concern to reduce the risk of flooding and overtopping	
Policy CC4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6565	Supporting	Good	
7.33	771556	Mr Phil Rose		2090	Objecting	We have a known sewage management problem and yet the Council is proposing lots of new housing. None of the 5 development sites in Herne Bay mention sewage or water management under the "Infrastructure" heading.	Given the lead time involved in major infrastructure developments, the Local Plan must stipulate the water and sewage infrastructure capacity always exceeds the demands placed on it. This will probably require the infrastructure work to precede the house building.

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
7.33	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3135	Objecting	We have concerns regarding the possible culverting and pumping within the Gorrell Stream, Swalecliffe Brook, Westbrook and Plenty Brook. There is a danger that the aims to enhance aquatic habitats could be counteracted by deterioration of the health of the above waterways. We would recommend the Council consult the Biodiversity Officers within the EA to discuss ways in which the natural flows could be conserved within the waterways with sufficient land and suds provided to accommodate flooding.	
7.35	379953	Mr Chris Blunkell		56	Objecting	I would disagree that the City Council's flood defences are adequate at the current time. Although there has been recent work to the east and middle of the beach, there has been losses to the western end of the beach, with deterioration continuing. The EA will not put this right. It does not now acknowledge the defence of properties as an objective, or the beach as an important means of defence.	
7.37	379953	Mr Chris Blunkell		54	Supporting	I am pleased that the City Council is "firmly committed to minimising the risk of flooding to€ urban areas through continual maintenance of sea defences and through seeking financial assistance from central Government"	
7.37	379953	Mr Chris Blunkell		55	Objecting	I am pleased that the City Council is "firmly committed to minimising the risk of flooding to€ urban areas through continual maintenance of sea defences and through seeking financial assistance from central Government" (LDP 7.37) and would urge the Council to exercise both leadership and imagination in seeing how this commitment might be extended to non-urban locations such as Faversham Road. Central government now encourages contributions from localities in considering bids.	This is not a conversation that has been had locally, and I believe the Council is well placed to lead such a discussion and indeed has a pressing responsibility to do so.
7.37	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5244	Supporting	Paragraph 7.37 is to be welcomed, which states that the City Council is, "firmly committed to minimising the risk of flooding to...urban areas through continual maintenance of sea defences and through seeking financial assistance from central government.	
Policy CC5	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1090	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change.I agree with policy CC5 in this chapter.	
Policy CC5	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1282	Supporting	We support this policy, and would therefore draw attention to the Plan's reference to development on Kingsmead field Canterbury. This has not been developed, and is designated as within zone 2 as a flood risk. It should therefore be removed as a site for development.	
Policy CC5	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1741	Objecting	The wording of Policy CC5 is not consistent with the guidance at paragraphs 93 to 108 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Development and Flood Risk - Practice Guide and technical guidance published by the Environment Agency in respect of development of land within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Policy CC5 should be deleted.	Policy CC5 should be deleted.
Policy CC5	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2030	Objecting	Object - to the inclusion of this policy in its entirety. It is in conflict with section 10 of the NPPF	delete or revise
Policy CC5	777500	Mr & Mrs A R Pierce		4516	Objecting	We object to the wording of Local Plan Policies CC5 and CC6 which are not in accordance with the NPPF.	We object to the wording of Local Plan Policies CC5 and CC6 which are not in accordance with the NPPF.

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy CC5	784234	Sea Street Developments Ltd		5106	Objecting	On the grounds that the wording is not in accordance with the NPPF.	
Policy CC5	784280	Whitstable Oyster Company Ltd		5126	Objecting	Wording not in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.	
Policy CC5	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5153	Objecting	Policy CC5 is not consistent with National Policy not justified and no sound, because: The technical guidance to the NPPF sets out basis for a Sequential and exception test and identifies some forms of development are acceptable in flood zones without and exception test; Policy CC5 requires all developers to undertake exception test; approach run counter to discussion with EA on HB Golf Course proposals. Amend as outlined	Delete the folling text 'no development will be permitted unless an exceptional justification can be demonstrated' and replace with ' development in these areas will only be acceptable where the sequential and, where applicable, the exception test has been satisfied.'
Policy CC5	255372	Miss Jennifer Wilson	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	5345	Objecting	Policy CC5 For clarity would suggest this policy is amended to read: '...no new development will be permitted unless an exceptional justification can be demonstrated through the Sequential and Exception Tests'. Extensions to existing property and change of use must meet the requirements of flood risk assessments.'	Amend policy CC5 to read: '...no new development will be permitted unless an exceptional justification can be demonstrated t hrough the Sequential and Exception Tests'. Extensions to existing property and change of use must meet the requirements of flood risk assessments. '
Policy CC5	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5733	Supporting	More specific positives: · Concern to reduce the risk of flooding and overtopping	
Policy CC5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6567	Supporting	Seems a sensible approach	
Policy CC6	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1091	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change. I agree with policy CC6 in this chapter.	
Policy CC6	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2031	Objecting	Object - to the general wording and inclusion of the last sentence in this policy which weakens the overall aims and objectives of the policy itself and of guidance as provided by section 10 of the NPPF and its accompanying practice note.	Revise in line with representation
Policy CC6	777500	Mr & Mrs A R Pierce		4517	Objecting	We object to the wording of Local Plan Policies CC5 and CC6 which are not in accordance with the NPPF.	We object to the wording of Local Plan Policies CC5 and CC6 which are not in accordance with the NPPF.
Policy CC6	784234	Sea Street Developments Ltd		5107	Objecting	On the grounds that the wording is not in accordance with the NPPF.	
Policy CC6	784280	Whitstable Oyster Company Ltd		5127	Objecting	Wording not in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.	
Policy CC6	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5734	Supporting	More specific positives: · Concern to reduce the risk of flooding and overtopping	
Policy CC6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6568	Supporting	Seems a sensible approach	
7.42	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5731	Supporting	More specific positives:·. Concern to reduce the risk of flooding and overtopping - paragraphs 7.19-7.42 and policies CC4 - CC7	
Policy CC7	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1092	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change. I agree with policy CC7 in this chapter.	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy CC7	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2032	Objecting	Object - to the policy as being contrary to the NPPF. Government policy does not require any demonstration of 'exceptional justification' to be made in this scenario.	
Policy CC7	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3131	Supporting	We are pleased to note the commitment to protect the coastal designations from inappropriate development	
Policy CC7	255372	Miss Jennifer Wilson	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	5346	Objecting	Policy CC7 We would recommend more clarification on 'exceptional justification' is required for development to occur in the overtopping hazard zone. Ideally no new residential accommodation would be permitted in this zone.	No new residential accommodation would be permitted in this zone.
Policy CC7	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5735	Supporting	More specific positives: · Concern to reduce the risk of flooding and overtopping	
Policy CC7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6569	Supporting	Seems a sensible approach	
7.43	379953	Mr Chris Blunkell		58	Objecting	I do not agree that the SMP sets out "a broad and effective sustainable management approach", if the idea of sustainably is taken to extend to the economic and social interests of all rather than simply urban citizens. The original SMP proposals as they applied to Faversham Road would result in total blight for those who live here. Given the Environment Agency's current stance re: sea defence at Faversham Road I would observe that this these remain valid.	The SMP is far from effective or sustainable if egalitarian provision is considered to be an aim, and the local plan must both reflect and address this.
7.44	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5245	Objecting	Whilst the Local Plan therefore seeks to disallow new, replacement or extended dwellings in Faversham Road, it does not afford long-term protection to existing properties. This appears contrary to the stated aim in paragraph 7.37. I believe this should be reconsidered, and a sea defence plan established that seeks to protect existing properties along Faversham Road.	
7.44	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6571	Supporting	A pragmatic approach with plenty of notice.	
7.44	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6640	Objecting	Since most of the residents of Faversham Road who may be affected by the fact that future plans are not to defend this part of the shoreline from flooding due to sea level rise will have purchased their properties in good faith, it is recommended that the Council arranges some type of compensation for the residents concerned.	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy CC8	379953	Mr Chris Blunkell		52	Objecting	The effects of climate change, and policy responses like Shoreline Management Plans, undermine efforts to establish 'fairer, stronger and healthier communities' (EK Sust. Community Strategy) at vulnerable coastal communities such as Faversham Road. Attention is required with regard to sustainability faced by coastal communities. Home owners at Faversham Road face reduced housing mobility, and lack of development options to make properties and families safe from flooding and financial trauma.	The LDF represents an opportunity to deal with problems arising from this, but the draft contains nothing at all to this end - indeed it risks perpetuating a strong urban bias. I would urge planners to take this rare opportunity to put this straight, and to properly involve people at Faversham Road (and indeed elsewhere in England in Wales) in proper and structured efforts at constructing a genuinely sustainable future.
Policy CC8	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1093	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change. I agree with policy CC8 in this chapter.	
Policy CC8	255372	Miss Jennifer Wilson	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	5347	Objecting	We fully support the refusal of replacement dwellings. We would recommend that extensions to existing are exceptional and that additional sleeping accommodation should not be permitted, nor should proposals that result in a significant increase in living accommodation, particularly on the ground floor.	We would recommend that extensions to existing are exceptional and that additional sleeping accommodation should not be permitted, nor should proposals that result in a significant increase in living accommodation, particularly on the ground floor.
Policy CC8	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6572	Supporting	Very clear	
Policy CC9	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1094	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change. I agree with policy CC9 in this chapter.	
Policy CC9	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3238	Objecting	The RSPB would welcome the opportunity to be included on a list of stakeholders set out in this policy, to investigate and consider the definition of a Coastal Change Management Area at Reculver.	
Policy CC9	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6573	Supporting	The only approach to take.	
Policy CC10	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1095	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change. I agree with policy CC10 in this chapter.	
Policy CC10	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3132	Supporting	We are pleased to note the commitment to protect the coastal designations from inappropriate development	
Policy CC10	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5736	Supporting	More specific positives:. Coastal Protection Zone policy CC10	
Policy CC10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6574	Supporting	Could not be clearer	
7.50	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	245	Supporting	we welcome the stipulation that any application for development should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment and a Drainage Impact Assessment. The Little Stour area is a "known area at risk of flooding" (7.32). The proposals and illustration of Sustainable Drainage schemes are important (7.50).	
7.50	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6575	Objecting	"The urban runoff..."A great concern for Sturry residents. The Council's recognition of this by engagement with them, the giving of detailed information and explanation with on going reassurance would be much appreciated. See comment on para 7.20	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
7.52	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2855	Supporting	Rain garden should be encouraged and rain water harvesting is supported, water meters and over night watering	
7.52	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3606	Objecting	Rain gardens should be encouraged in all developments, including commercial/community buildings where possible. There is no mention of rain water harvesting for toilets, etc.	
7.54	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2848	Objecting	Concerns about flooding in the area of Strode Farm, A299 and Plenty Brook, foul sewer capacity, drain capacity on Bullockstone Road loss of flood storage. Climate change and heavy rainfall will make it worse.	
Policy CC11	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1096	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change. I agree with policy CC11 in this chapter.	
Policy CC11	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3134	Supporting	We are pleased to note the commitment to provide SUDS and green infrastructure within development.	
Policy CC11	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4029	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but delete 'normally' in the sentence after the first set of points a-d.	delete ' normally' in the sentence after the first set of points a-d.
Policy CC11	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5154	Objecting	The final paragraph of Policy CC5 is not justified nor effective, because: it requires the approval of the design and long term maintenance of SuDs prior to development being permitted, this will delay the consenting of acceptable schemes, especially in the case of outline applications; it is not the most appropriate strategy; should be secured through condition. Amend as outlined	Amendment last paragraph of Policy CC11 by adding 'Prior to development commencing, sufficient information should be provided to demonstrate that a suitable SuDs design can be achieved and that appropriate long term maintenance measures can be put in place.' and delete 'Approval for the design and long term maintenance of SuDS will be required prior to development being permitted.'
Policy CC11	255372	Miss Jennifer Wilson	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	5348	Objecting	Make Reference to The EA's Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice (GP3) to guide developers with respect to protection of groundwater. Support SuDs but make sure parking/amenity areas etc have treatments to prevent groundwater pollution. Ensure long term maintenance of SuDs. Design needs to be appropriate to location and no infiltration SuDs in SPZ1. Consider options early. Reflect the above in text and policy.	Make reference to The Environment Agency's Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice (GP3), https://brand.environment-agency.gov.uk/mb/rGL7f in this policy. Amend policy or supporting text to reflect content of submission (above) Make clear that prior to granting planning permission at individual sites, adequate sewage infrastructure must be available.
Policy CC11	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5737	Supporting	More specific positives:. Sustainable drainage and water policies	
Policy CC11	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5979	Objecting	When SuDS are planned it is important that the potential impact on the historic environment is fully considered and any unavoidable damage is mitigated. This is best secured by early consideration of the local historic environment following consultation with the Kent Historic Environment Record (HER) and by taking relevant expert advice. Kent County Council maintains the County HER and can offer guidance on avoiding damage to the County's heritage.	
Policy CC11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6577	Supporting	Endorsed in the hope that it proves deliverable and effective.	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
7.56	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4807	Objecting	The Plan needs to include a policy covering "water supply and resource protection", i.e. as well as the policies covering water quality and water infrastructure. While we think that the facts relating to these water points are well understood by the Council, they need to be articulated in Policies. For example, under the heading "Water Quality, Water Efficiency and Water supply", there should be a policy commitment to meet the Water Framework Directive targets by the year 2015.	The Plan needs to include a policy covering "water supply and resource protection", i.e. as well as the policies covering water quality and water infrastructure.
7.56	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6659	Objecting	Addition to the Plan: Under the heading "Water Quality, Water Efficiency and Water supply", there needs to be a Policy stating that water quality in local river catchments will achieve the Water Framework Directive targets by the year 2015	Addition to the Plan: Under the heading "Water Quality, Water Efficiency and Water supply", there needs to be a Policy stating that water quality in local river catchments will achieve the Water Framework Directive targets by the year 2015
7.57	771556	Mr Phil Rose		2108	Objecting	This is the only reference to sewage in the entire document. Southern Water is improving the sewage works at May Street, Herne Bay, but this is not to increase capacity, only to improve filtration standards to meet new EA requirements. This Local Plan seems to be sleep-walking into a pile of you-know-what. This Local Plan will increase the population of Herne Bay by between a quarter and a third. There is no explicit provision for a matching increase in the capacity of sewage treatment systems.	Policy CC4 should be extended so that all measures necessary to mitigate the effects of the additional load on the town's sewage treatment capacity shall be installed and maintained at the developers' own expense, and that this expense be split pro rata between the developers of the 5 sites around Herne Bay.
7.57	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4030	Objecting	Add at the end of the first point "and will modernise and/or repair surface water drainage to prevent "back up" to soil drainage, and thus make it unnecessary to pump partially treated sewage into streams and/or rivers".	Add at the end of the first point "and will modernise and/or repair surface water drainage to prevent "back up" to soil drainage, and thus make it unnecessary to pump partially treated sewage into streams and/or rivers".
7.57	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6578	Objecting	"..Southern Water will improve sewage works ...including Canterbury" When will the much needed improvements at Canterbury be completed? Will this be sufficient for the planned 15,000 new homes and all the business requirements, or is this just remedial work to cope with the present situation? What about the works at Hersden? Can they cope with another 800 houses plus business requirements?	
7.57	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6580	Supporting	"River Great Stour .. better rivers programme" Welcomed. Much needed. What exactly will this involve? Will this include the whole stretch of the Great Stour through the District? When will results of the programme start to appear?	
Policy CC12	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	788	Objecting	The question of water quality and supply is not a land-use planning matter. The requirements of policy CC12 is contrary to paragraph 122 of the NPPF.	
Policy CC12	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1098	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change. I agree with policy CC12 in this chapter.	
Policy CC12	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3133	Supporting	We are pleased to note the commitment to enhance the Great Stour	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy CC12	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4806	Objecting	We welcome the recognition in paragraph 7.58 and Policy CC12 that there is a need to improve water quality and the ecological status of local waterways. But the Local Plan makes no suggestion about measures the Council should take to ensure that water supply companies and the Environment Agency improve the quality of the water supply.	
Policy CC12	255372	Miss Jennifer Wilson	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	5349	Objecting	Policy CC12 states that new development must incorporate well designed mitigation measures to ensure that there is no adverse effect on water quality. While it does talk about other water pressures, this initial statement should fully encompass all Water Framework Directive (WFD) by stating that the water environment must not deteriorate, and any new development must not place further pressure on the water environment and compromise WFD objectives.	Amend initial statement to fully encompass all of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) aspects by stating that the water environment must not deteriorate, and any new development must not place further pressure on the water environment and compromise WFD objectives.
Policy CC12	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5377	Supporting	Southern Water strongly supports the protection of water quality in policy CC12	
Policy CC12	406848	Mr Graham Norton	Land and Planning Director Strategic Land Kent	5593	Objecting	Water Quality and Supply Policies CC12 and 13 should be deleted. They are not valid planning policies.	Policies CC12 and 13 be deleted
Policy CC12	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5738	Supporting	More specific positives:. Sustainable drainage and water policies	
Policy CC12	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6581	Supporting	Welcomed	
7.58	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6582	Objecting	"Canterbury is water stressed" New development must recognise the issue of water stress. CCC must ensure that building rates do not run ahead of new infrastructure completion. Measures required to secure water supply are outside control of CCC and sums are enormous, funding uncertain and timescales unknown. Given this is the plan's level of development sustainable or deliverable? Need for monitoring is crucial this needs to be cross referenced in CC13 and Page 32	
7.59	772200	Solihin Garrard		258	Objecting	A population increase of 440,000 by 2035 will see water use for individual consumption and waste/ sewerage increase enormously. This, together with a predicted fall in rainfall over the same period is likely to put water resources in Canterbury under stress. The proposal for a reservoir at Broad Oak is likely to be too little, and dated 2035, too late. The SA Report also notes that Broad Oak could have "significant adverse effects on the biodiversity objective [because of the] presence of GCN".	
7.60	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2858	Supporting	7.6 combines cooling, heat & power (CCHP)	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
7.61	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4032	Objecting	Other local plans have included a Policy which seeks to limit water consumption in new dwellings and this would be helpful here too. For example see the Shepway Core Strategy (submission draft July 2011) Policy CSD5.	Include a Policy which seeks to limit water consumption in new dwellings
7.62	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2847	Objecting	Canterbury is defined by the Environment Agency as seriously water stressed, and will become increasingly in deficit over the next 25 years. By 2034/35 supply might be by bulk transfers, and the water company has no proposals to increase supply before 2030 (Broadoak reservoir). South East Water will be unable to guarantee the minimum level of deployable drought output required to ensure security of supply	
Policy CC13	408032	Mr Stephen Metherell		40	Objecting	We are already borderline for water, and I have serious doubts about the adequacy of our other utilities services to cope with all this new housing. Is the new Broad Oak reservoir fully integrated into the planning? Are the sewage disposal facilities adequate?	
Policy CC13	777302	Ms Sheila Chesney		745	Objecting	My concern is outwith the remit of the council and that is future water supply and waste disposal plants. I have looked at the websites of South East and Southern Water and the information is not readily available. It is apparent that both companies are upgrading their infrastructure and are looking to the future however specifics are few and there is no correlation (that I can find) between the local plan and future water and waste demands.	
Policy CC13	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	789	Objecting	The Council cannot use issues of water stress as a vehicle to introduce new restrictions or requirements on development. In law there is a requirement placed upon water and sewerage providers to make provision for new development. It is recognised, however, that the house building industry has a role in this respect. The objective to conserve water is addressed through two mandatory measures: Water Infrastructure Charge placed on house builders and the Building Regulations	
Policy CC13	776051	Mr Rick Strange		868	Objecting	The sewage Treatment Plant on the Sturry Road is only just coping with the amount of sewage generated by the existing houses it serves. What are the plans for the expansion of this plant or where would a new plant be situated? The smell generated by the current sewage plant is frequently nauseating; hardly an inducement for people to buy houses nearby.	
Policy CC13	776051	Mr Rick Strange		869	Objecting	The water supply for the area is under extreme pressure as it is and the chalk aquifers of the North Downs and the Wye Downs which supply both Ashford and the Canterbury area are stretched to the limit and would not be able to service the suggested increase in housing.	
Policy CC13	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1103	Supporting	Chapter 7: Climate Change. I agree with policy CC13 in this chapter.	
Policy CC13	778931	Miss Gemma Avory	Water Resources Planner South East Water	1522	Supporting	Support that developments keep pace with water resource development	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy CC13	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3087	Objecting	If Canterbury is to be increased by some 20%, and the wider area by another large factor, will the water supply be sufficient? If not, what is the lead time for any significant increase in the supply?	
Policy CC13	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4031	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but add at end "and to avoid all conflicts of interest the Council may consult independent water experts/engineers, the cost of which will be payable by the developer."	Add at end " and to avoid all conflicts of interest the Council may consult independent water experts/engineers, the cost of which will be payable by the developer."
Policy CC13	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5155	Objecting	Policy CC13 is not effective and so is unsound, because: the LDP needs to identify infrastructure requirements and delivery timescales to ensure that the plan is positively prepared and to avoid delays in granting planning permissions, ensure co-ordination and deliverability of the LDP.	Identify infrastructure requirements and delivery timescales
Policy CC13	127115	B.J. Gore		5284	Objecting	Most of the South East, and certainly Canterbury District is in a Water Stressed Area (that wonderful use of English means we don't have enough for our present needs, let alone the proposed new dwellings). Even if the Broad Oak reservoir were built now (in reality it is probably 20 years or more away) there is insufficient water flowing into it to keep it full all the time. The Plan should make it clear that no development will take place until the water situation is resolved	
Policy CC13	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5378	Objecting	Southern Water supports the phasing of development in line with the provision off water and wastewater infrastructure. However, provision of infrastructure at the right time is vital whether the necessary infrastructure is major, as in the policy, or smaller. Therefore we request the removal of the word 'major' at the second line of the policy.	Remove of the word 'major' at the second line of the policy.
Policy CC13	406848	Mr Graham Norton	Land and Planning Director Strategic Land Kent	5594	Objecting	Water Quality and Supply Policies CC12 and 13 should be deleted. They are not valid planning policies.	Policies CC12 and 13 be deleted
Policy CC13	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5739	Supporting	More specific positives:. Sustainable drainage and water policies	
Policy CC13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6104	Objecting	THIS AREA IS STRESSED FOR WATER NOW. THE SEWAGE SYSTEM IS INADEQUATE. All necessary work needs to be completed well ahead of the development proposed in this Plan.	
Policy CC13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6583	Objecting	This area is stressed for water now. The sewage system is inadequate.All necessary work needs to be completed well ahead of any development proposed in this Plan. The supply of water is outside the Council's control both for funding the major capital investment required to provie the additional water supply and for the timescale of the major works that will be required. The sewerage system will need major improvements the funding and delivery of which is outside the Council's control.	

Summary Chapter 7 - Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
7.63	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		17	Objecting	Where is the water coming from for all these new dwellings? We are often asked to conserve water as supplies are scarce. A Broad Oak Reservoir might be needed to meet the needs of the existing population, but how would that be filled? Levels in the Stour are dangerously low much of the time and water abstraction not a possibility.	
7.63	408032	Mr Stephen Metherell		41	Objecting	We are already borderline for water. Is the new Broad Oak reservoir fully integrated into the planning?	
7.63	776051	Mr Rick Strange		870	Objecting	It is understood that the reservoir plans for Calcot Hill are being looked at again, but in a much smaller format. This reservoir could only be filled by the extraction of water from the River Stour. If this were to be done the health and well being of the river and all the plants and animals that depend on it would be in jeopardy, as would the Nature reserves at Grove and Stodmarsh which are of national importance and contain the second largest area of reed bed in the country.	
7.63	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1252	Supporting	South East Water own the necessary land to implement the £76.5m scheme to deliver 13.5 million litres per day. Reducing the size of the proposal from the 2010 plans will avoid inundation of an SSSI site and ancient woodland. They plan to deliver this by 2033. This reservoir is considered essential as all the new homes will impact on water requirements. The reservoir needs to be considered in the context of strategic site 2.	
7.63	778931	Miss Gemma Avory	Water Resources Planner South East Water	1524	Objecting	The proposed reservoir at Broad oak will have a full formal environmental impact assessment carried out. It is a long standing option and has positive impacts on the SSSI and ancient woodland whilst creating new habitats. We need to work together to secure future water supplies for the area and ensure planning for such developments is included and supported in your plans.	Working together to secure future water supplies and new developments and ensure our plans support each other.
7.63	779274	Mr Graham Duplock	Parish Councillor Parish Councillor Beskesbourne	2838	Supporting	I support the construction of a new reservoir at Broad Oak, this would go some way to providing water to the City and environs.	
7.63	778625	Mr David Wadmore		4380	Supporting	The Local Plan needs also to factor in the proposal for a new reservoir at Broad Oak. How will the area cope with competing developers' vehicles all using the same roads?	
7.63	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bokesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council	4575	Supporting	The Parish Council support the construction of a new reservoir at Broad Oak This would go some way to providing water to the City and its environs. We have had severe problems with overloaded sewers in our villages and additional provision to cope with the extra need should be in place. Can the sewage treatment works on Sturry Road cope with this increase?	
7.63	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4767	Objecting	This does not appear as a specific proposal in the plan.	

Comments Summary:

Chapter 8: Design and Built Environment



Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
8.1	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		293	Supporting	Agree with aims expressed. Hope you hold to them	
8.1	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3711	Supporting	We strongly agree with the opening paragraph and, indeed, this section as a whole. Good design is not timid design, nor is it usually developer-led.	
8.1	779662	Mr Graham Kenmir		4468	Objecting	Chapter 8 of the plan. [Design and the built environment] sets out a laudable commitment to seeking high quality design. However the majority of the policies are expressed as expectations rather than requirements. There is a concern that the developers may not deliver high quality or good standards of amenities unless this is required and backed by legally binding agreements.	
8.1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4810	Objecting	Most of the direction of this chapter is welcomed. However, previous similarly well- intentioned aspirations have not been delivered. To a large extent this is because the lack of commitment by developers has not been satisfactorily controlled by the systems in place at the City Council. No attempt appears to have been made to see where and why past schemes failed. It is not clear how this is to be achieved.	
8.1	781716	Mr Stephen Hurren	Secretary Whitstable Green Lung	5012	Supporting	Support the section on Design and the Built Environment and the importance of the historic nature of many sites in Canterbury and the surrounding areas, and the need to take the preservation of important historic sites into consideration within the planning application process.	
8.1	13812	Mr N J Blake		5192	Objecting	Chapter 8 includes many virtuous principles that would be applied to all proposed new developments. It is difficult to give credibility to the delivery in future of intended policies. The enormous scale of development proposed would need a commensurate level of resources and will, to secure any intended design standards. There is no evidence that this would be achieved.	Do not underestimate the commitment needed to shift developers from their default "mediocre" position.
8.1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5657	Supporting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:· Design and Built Environment chapter 8	
8.1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6588	Objecting	Commendable intentions, however, will this be borne out in reality? Recent development in Sturry is hardly an example of this in being put into practice.	
8.1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6661	Supporting	There is much to admire in this chapter, as the underpinning philosophy is suitably modern and relevant. It will ensure that all new development will be "attractive, functional and sustainable"	
8.2	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3600	Objecting	More should be done to encourage energy savings in existing buildings.	
8.2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4815	Objecting	Good design policies have been in place in the past but have not delivered what was promised. They must in future be reinforced by greater Council input.	Good design policies have been in place in the past but have not delivered what was promised. They must in future be reinforced by greater Council input.
8.2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6589	Objecting	Commendable intentions, however, will this be borne out in reality? Recent development in Sturry is hardly an example of this in being put into practice.	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
8.3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6590	Objecting	Commendable intentions, however, will this be borne out in reality? Recent development in Sturry is hardly an example of this in being put into practice.	
8.4	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1135	Supporting	Section 8.4 refers to places within the District as having: "a distinctive character created by a mixture of elements including architectural style, layout, history, landscape and the mix of uses" and WPC believes that this is an apt description of the Parish of Waltham.	
8.4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6591	Objecting	Commendable intentions, however, will this be borne out in reality? Recent development in Sturry is hardly an example of this in being put into practice.	
8.5	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2383	Objecting	Get Britain Cycling Report 2013. We would like to see these recommendations included in the draft Local Plan:	revision of existing design guidance, to include more secure cycle parking, continental best practice for cycle-friendly planning and design, and an audit process to help planners, engineers and architects to think bike in their work
8.5	784612	Mr Dale Greetham	Planner Sport England	5749	Objecting	Support (with amendments) Sport England recommends that Sport England's Active Design Guidance http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/ is referenced within this section. Active Design is an innovative set of design guidelines to promote opportunities for sport and physical activity in the design and layout of development. The guidance promotes sport and activity through three key Active Design principles of - improving acc	Sport England recommends that Sport England's Active Design Guidance http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/ is referenced within this section.
8.5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6592	Objecting	Commendable intentions, however, will this be borne out in reality? Recent development in Sturry is hardly an example of this in being put into practice. Reference to site specific development briefs and guidance that is available is misleading. These are not yet available for the Strategic Development Sites	
8.6	665473	Dr Richard Norman		565	Supporting	I support this interpretation of 'sustainable', and I consider it vital that the word 'sustainable' should be given just as much emphasis as the word 'development'. The presumption in favour of sustainable development is acceptable only if the development REALLY IS sustainable. The development proposals in this plan do not satisfy that criterion. The target of 15,600 new dwellings over the period of the Plan, including 4000 in South Canterbury, is unsustainable.	
8.7	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1787	Supporting	It is important that brownfield or underused land is used first to reduce impact on residents both in terms of having to absorb new developments, but also keeping existing communities/commercial estates places people want to live and work in. Derelict sites have significant negative effects- see comments 3.42	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
8.7	780327	Mr Robin Townsend	Secretary to the Trust The Crab & Winkle Line Trust	3264	Objecting	The Trust feel this Crab &Winkle land should also be covered by a Memorandum of understanding with the Council. Has this been over-looked for inclusion in the Local Plan? It is a nationally renowned route, runs through a densely populated area, is the missing link in a recognised route, it is traffic free and safe, and popular tourist attraction. Investment priorities will need to change - C&W is a blue chip investment, on-off capital project.	
8.7	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5433	Objecting	This aspiration does not appear to be supported by a policy. This is encouraged by the NPPF para 111. One of the features of our rural environment are the agricultural buildings. The Plan does not acknowledge their unique contribution to our rural built landscape and therefore makes no provision for their protection or their setting.	
8.7	784495	P Manser		6974	Objecting	This aspiration does not appear to be supported by a policy. This is encouraged by the NPPF para 111. One of the features of our rural environment are the agricultural buildings. The Plan does not acknowledge their unique contribution to our rural built landscape and therefore makes no provision for their protection or their setting.	
Policy DBE1	766238	Mr Mike Sole		23	Objecting	If homes must be built then the City Council should insist that they go well beyond the existing "green" requirements. I undertand that it is proposed that they will be "level 4" but this is an opportunity for the City to make a really impact and a significant proportion of these homes should be "level 5". There will of course be objections to these additional costs from developers but in a site of this size there will be enough money to do this.	New homes should reach Code Level 5
Policy DBE1	665473	Dr Richard Norman		566	Supporting	I support the principle that all development should be sustainable, should safeguard the quality of life for residents, should conserve energy resources, and should protect and enhance the environment.	
Policy DBE1	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	790	Objecting	We note that the Council is prescribing compliance with Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. As this is a building standard that goes further than the Building Regulations it will need to ensure that it has factored-in the cost of this in the viability assessment of the local plan.	
Policy DBE1	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1104	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment - I agree with policy DBE1 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE1	778931	Miss Gemma Avory	Water Resources Planner South East Water	1525	Supporting	South East Water supports policy DBE1 of the Local Plan which recognises the importance of reducing the causes of climate change and implementing the highest standards of sustainable construction, promoting and encouraging resource efficiency including water efficiency.	
Policy DBE1	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2035	Objecting	Object - to all requirements that are either covered by legislation outside of the planning process and those that are local standards inconsistent with paragraph 95 of the NPPF	Delete inappropriate clauses

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE1	779286	Mr Mark Aplin	Planning Policy Team Leader Shepway District Council	2073	Supporting	It is recognised that a swathe of individual policies have been drafted with the objective of protecting the varied environments and individual places in Canterbury and east Kent. This will provide certainty and allow the detail of policies to be refined and be a positive feature of the final Local Plan. These are welcomed in supporting the character of east Kent and in managing the shared assets of the area, such as precious local water resources.	
Policy DBE1	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2849	Supporting	The parish council supports DBE1, DBE3, DBE4, DBE5, DBE6 and are very pleased with the proposals in DBE7 that there are minimum space standards. This is especially important with regard to bedroom sizes. The quality of any homes built is considered very important.	
Policy DBE1	13969	Mr Paul Watkins		2929	Supporting	Policy DBE1 - Kitewood supports the policy as drafted, subject to viability testing of individual proposals. It is noted that the economic viability assessment of the Local Plan undertaken by Adams Integra has taken account of the cost implications of building to Level 4 of the Code of Sustainable Homes. However, the report also acknowledges that the adverse implications for viability of progressing to Code Level 5 or 6 would necessitate a reduction in the level of affordable housing provision.	
Policy DBE1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4034	Objecting	CPRE Protect generally support this Policy, but add an additional point as follows:"e. The Council will not grant subsequent applications to vary these criteria."	Add an additional point as follows: " e. The Council will not grant subsequent applications to vary these criteria ."
Policy DBE1	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4440	Supporting	DIO supports these policies and the opportunity will be taken when planning the site to take these policies into account, in particular the comments at paragraph 8.20 and from 8.35 onwards to enhance the World Heritage Site and other significant views.	
Policy DBE1	779662	Mr Graham Kenmir		4471	Objecting	The NPPF sets out seven further core principles dealing with specific aspects of sustainability. The Consultation draft does have policies which relate to the matters listed but it is not clear how these will be interpreted or implemented at each of the strategic sites.I have a general concern that given the large amount of money that will be required of the developers for funding the railway crossing they will be reluctant or unable to fund other facilities needed to comply with the NPPF.	
Policy DBE1	781440	Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC		4702	Objecting	Our client accepts that BREEAM ratings are an appropriate measure of a buildings performance in terms of sustainability. However, concerned that setting stringent requirements for all commercial developments to achieve BREEAM 'Excellent ' could represent an unreasonable burden on companies which could jeopardise investment, regeneration and employment creation in the district. Particularly in current economic climate and the government's emphasis on promoting economic growth.	A flexible and pragmatic approach needs to be adopted to ensure that it is justified and consistent with national policy. In light of this we would suggest that the Policy includes some flexibility, i.e. that the BREEAM requirements will be subject to the tests of feasibility and viability, to ensure that it is sound. We trust that these comments will be taken into consideration in finalising the Local Plan.
Policy DBE1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4959	Objecting	It is vitality important that all future development across the district complies with the principle of sustainability at least as defined in the NPPF. This means that the Council has to pro actively apply these principles themselves and ensure that developers do the same and not devolve this responsibility to "market forces."	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE1	788181	Mr Gary Day	McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	4970	Objecting	Concerned about Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 requirement. Stepped carbon emission targets are reflected in the Building Regulations. Prescribing compliance with the full code goes much further than the Building Regulations and as such the viability of enhanced sustainability targets should be justified to ensure that it does not impede the pace of house building. Current government review is looking at the relationship between the Building Regs, CfSH and Energy Act 2008.	Request that the Council revise its approach towards the setting of housing standars, particulaly the requirement for all new homes to be built to Code Level 4.
Policy DBE1	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5148	Objecting	The Council's approach to achieving Zero Carbon in Policies CC2, CC3 and DBE1 is not consistent with National Policy as there is none yet so to make the DLP 'Sound' remove the requirement to achieve zero carbon.	Remove reference requirement to achieve zero carbon.
Policy DBE1	255372	Miss Jennifer Wilson	Planning Liaison Technical Specialist Environment Agency	5344	Objecting	Overall support the policy especially point C (breeam excellent) and can provide additional evidence and drivers to make policy stronger. However, point B refers to Code for sustainable homes level 4, it would be better to include a specific reference to water efficiency as CfSH has been contentious. Include text outlining minimum water efficiency levels.	Include following text to point B policy DBE1: "Require all new homes to be designed to achieve a minimum water efficiency of 105 litres per person per day (equivalent to Code for Sustainable Homes Levels 3/4) in advance of mandatory requirements".
Policy DBE1	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5379	Supporting	Southern Water supports the use of the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards in new residential and non residential development. We promote efficient use of water as part of a twin-track strategy to meet future demand through demand management combined with provision of additional resources. This strategy has been developed in collaboration with the Environment Agency and helps to minimise the volume of water abstracted from the environment.	
Policy DBE1	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5954	Objecting	Support objective of conserving energy and ensuring energy efficiency but it must have regard to viability and is will constrain development. CSH Level 3 is not attainable . While Code 4 is a worthy aspiration it will inhibit viability. Development proposals should not be regarded as in conflict with plan because policies go beyond building regulations requirements. Policy should be more flexible and recognise viability.	The Policy should be more flexible and recognise the practicalities of the economic viability of development projects.
Policy DBE1	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5980	Objecting	KCC support policy DBE1 as it requires storage space for recycling/compostables in new development. However, KCC am disappointed that there is nothing about minimising the waste from construction in the chapter on design and the built environment. This is surprising as KCC Would have thought that minimising waste during construction is part of sustainable development and this is something which rectified in the next version of the document by adding this in the table D1.	
Policy DBE1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6596	Supporting	Seems to cover most points but very technical	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6662	Objecting	This Policy sets a Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) benchmark of Level 4 for new buildings. There are currently housing developments where a higher standard has been achieved, notably Sinclair Meadows, South Shields. It is recommend that the benchmark for new development in Canterbury should be at CSH Level 6 (or equivalent) from the outset.	
8.10	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2036	Objecting	Object - to the inclusion of overly prescriptive measures as part of this Plan. Such a checklist should be part of an up-to-date Supplementary Planning Guidance where it can be reviewed in line with changes to legislation or Government guidance.	Delete and review SPD
8.10	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3591	Objecting	All new homes built should use the latest technology to be built to the highest ecological standard: · Orientation for solar gain and solar PV. · Be insulated to the highest standard · A rated energy efficient thermal windows. · Grey water harvesting · Permeable surfaces outside.	
8.10	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3673	Objecting	The wording in Table D1 should be amended to read "A safe circulation system for vehicles and non-motorised traffic with priority clearly given to non-motorised traffic safety and links to public transport modes".	Change the wording in Table D1 to read; "A safe circulation system for vehicles and non-motorised traffic with priority clearly given to non-motorised traffic safety and links to public transport modes".
8.10	780692	Mr Andrew Lloyd		3840	Objecting	One proposal that I believe the Council must adopt, is that every new property, residential or commercial must have a rainwater recycling facility. I have one and the saving on fresh water is surprising.	
8.10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4042	Objecting	Add at the end of Table D1 "Existing and future Air Quality."	Add at the end of Table D1 " Existing and future Air Quality ."
8.10	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4816	Objecting	It is noted that the location and extent of the development sites put forward in the DLP have not been subject to such rigour and are not tested against the Draft Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal 2012, which is a supporting document to the DLP.	
8.10	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6041	Objecting	KCC are disappointed that there is nothing about minimising the waste from construction in the chapter on design and the built environment. This is surprising as KCC Would have thought that minimising waste during construction is part of sustainable development and this is something which rectified in the next version of the document by adding this in the table D1.	
8.10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6593	Objecting	Commendable intentions, however, will thisbe borne out in reality? Recent development in Sturry is hardly an example of this in being put into practice.	
8.11	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4817	Objecting	Sustainability should include the encouragement of local developers/builders which would also promote some visual diversity. We note that this is the case at Poundbury Dorchester and New Hall, Harlow, but does not happen in Canterbury.	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
8.11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6594	Objecting	LPAs are required to identify the size, type tenure and range of housing that is required in a particular location, reflecting local demand. Where are these reports for each location? They should be in the supporting evidence for this Local Plan and available for public consultation. How can discussions have taken place with developers without them? How can financial decisions be taken for infrastructure funding without them? This information should already be in the public domain.	
Policy DBE2	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1105	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment - I agree with policy DBE2 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6597	Supporting	Thank you - quite right!	
8.16	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	246	Supporting	We welcome the proposal that developments need to respond to local character and history and reflect local identity and distinctiveness (while not preventing or discouraging innovation)	
8.16	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5981	Objecting	Central Government funding dictates standard designs linked to standard funding so additional requirements sought by district planners will impact on the accommodation to be provided and the viability of any additional requirements will need to be tested. KCC will make every endeavour to work effectively with CCC to achieve the highest quality of design and place making achievable within governmental funding and design constraints.	
8.17	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	247	Supporting	We welcome the proposal that developments need to respond to local character and history and reflect local identity and distinctiveness (while not preventing or discouraging innovation)	
8.17	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4836	Objecting	The Council needs to improve the way it deals with design issues in the development process.	An essential part of this would be to include in the DLP an audit of achievement of past projects. The City Council needs to set guidelines for "good Application Drawings" which describe all materials. Enforcement is a weak link in the chain.
8.17	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6599	Objecting	Please state clearly by adding the following text: This also includes all types of affordable and social housing	Please state clearly by adding the following text: This also includes all types of affordable and social housing
8.18	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	248	Supporting	We welcome the proposal that developments need to respond to local character and history and reflect local identity and distinctiveness (while not preventing or discouraging innovation)	
8.19	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	249	Supporting	We welcome the proposal that developments need to respond to local character and history and reflect local identity and distinctiveness (while not preventing or discouraging innovation)	
8.20	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	250	Supporting	We welcome the proposal that developments need to respond to local character and history and reflect local identity and distinctiveness (while not preventing or discouraging innovation)	
8.20	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4818	Objecting	Members of the Development Management Committee should have more design experience encouraged by visits to a variety of developments. Garden Cities and Suburbs could provide an historic context, especially as this concept is flagged up in the DLP.	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
8.21	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4819	Objecting	Reference to 'past' design having 'high quality' is vague. The twentieth century, during which the Planning System developed has, nationwide, produced some of the worst design ever. Have, as is postulated, expectations of design been rising over the past decade?	
8.22	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4823	Objecting	Materials and colours used in buildings have not been specified by CCC with enough care. Too much conformity has been in evidence within schemes that are intended to look as if they have arisen over a long period. Planners and architects seem to have a default position of consistency which is quite alien to such design briefs.	
Policy DBE3	405613	Mr Adam Roake		504	Objecting	The policy needs to be reinforced by reference to objective design criteria guidance/criteria.	Include reference that designs will be judged against the Building for Life 12 criteria and that proposals will only be approved if they score no reds against the twelve criteria.
Policy DBE3	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1106	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment - I agree with policy DBE3 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE3	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1137	Objecting	Section 8.4 refers to places within the District as having: "a distinctive character created by a mixture of elements including architectural style, layout, history, landscape and the mix of uses" and WPC believes that this is an apt description of the Parish of Waltham.	WPC would therefore like to see references in the Plan as to how CCC intends to apply Policy DBE3 in practice to achieve the commitment stated therein to promote, protect and enhance the distinctive character, diversity and quality of the Canterbury District through high quality, inclusive design which reinforces and positively contributes to its local context creating attractive, inspiring and safe places.
Policy DBE3	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1482	Supporting	For example, UKC has been allowed to build low-cost poor quality new buildings that, unlike the original architect designed colleges, have little or no architectural merit. These are often visible from the city itself and are detrimental to the 'look and feel' of the City. The policy should be strongly implemented to prevent any more of this style of development.	
Policy DBE3	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2037	Objecting	Object - to this overly prescriptive set of policy criteria; many of which are too broad ranging in their aims to provide meaningful advice or encourage high quality developments.	Revise in line with representation
Policy DBE3	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2382	Objecting	Get Britain Cycling Report 2013. We would like to see these recommendations included in the draft Local Plan:	(there should be) a statutory requirement that cyclists' and pedestrians' needs are considered at an early stage of all new development schemes, including housing and business developments as well as traffic and transport schemes, including funding through the planning system
Policy DBE3	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2578	Objecting	When looking at the maps for South Canterbury in the Local Plan, in addition to the above, one might like to consider the following when considering a development in any area (not just south canterbury): . Larger allotment spaces	
Policy DBE3	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2579	Objecting	When looking at the maps for South Canterbury in the Local Plan, in addition to the above, one might like to consider the following when considering a development in any area (not just south canterbury): . Wild flower meadows and more green areas	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE3	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2850	Supporting	The parish council supports DBE1, DBE3, DBE4, DBE5, DBE6 and are very pleased with the proposals in DBE7 that there are minimum space standards. This is especially important with regard to bedroom sizes. The quality of any homes built is considered very important.	
Policy DBE3	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3136	Objecting	The Policies within this section are excellent and incorporate all functions of sustainability. Where relevant both the impacts to and the enhancement of biodiversity are highlighted. These policies should lead to developments that contain ecological enhancement and benefits for the communities within the design. In relation to Policy DBE3 to strengthen the ecological protection we would recommend that the additional wording below is incorporated into the policy.	b. The conservation integration, extension, connection and management of existing natural features including trees and hedgerows to strengthen local distinctiveness, character and biodiversity;
Policy DBE3	13837	Mr William Leetham		3281	Objecting	Any new housing development must be mainly high density. All housing concentrated around public transport nodes to encourage non car use with pedestrian and cycle use promoted as a priority. Car use to be dissuaded by managing indirect routes.	Any new housing development must be mainly high density. All housing concentrated around public transport nodes to encourage non car use with pedestrian and cycle use promoted as a priority. Car use to be dissuaded by managing indirect routes.
Policy DBE3	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4044	Objecting	Generally support this Policy, but: Add at the end of first para. "which will be healthy and contribute to social well-being". After "design" in the second para insert "appropriate to the area in terms of form and materials". Add at the end "m. Existing and Future Air Quality."	Add at the end of first para. "which will be healthy and contribute to social well-being". After "design" in the second para insert "appropriate to the area in terms of form and materials". Add at the end "m. Existing and Future Air Quality."
Policy DBE3	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4441	Supporting	DIO supports these policies and the opportunity will be taken when planning the site to take these policies into account, in particular the comments at paragraph 8.20 and from 8.35 onwards to enhance the World Heritage Site and other significant views.	
Policy DBE3	780837	Mrs Margaret Darby		4747	Supporting	I welcome the idea that new buildings will be required to be built to the highest standards but wonder how this will be achieved as this has not always been the case in Canterbury recently. Some of the Tannery development is showing signs that quality could have been better.	
Policy DBE3	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4824	Objecting	At (h) should include the need to site housing away from noisy, high speed roads. It is noted that the DLP housing sites take no account of this. Recent housing can be seen adjacent to the A299 and the A2 at Wincheap and such locations should not be repeated. Business use is much more compatible with the background noise of traffic.	At (h) should include the need to site housing away from noisy, high speed roads.
Policy DBE3	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5157	Supporting	The indicative masterplan for the redevelopment of the Former Herne Bay Golf Club, as attached at Appendix 1, has been prepared in accordance the design principles set down in draft Policy DBE3 and will deliver a high quality development which contributes to its local context. Draft Policy DBE3 is supported as currently worded and is considered 'Sound'.	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE3	127115	B.J. Gore		5285	Objecting	I am concerned to see such little reference to house design, other than a misleading reference to "garden cities" which shows a complete lack of knowledge about the term. Local people are very disappointed with the design and materials used for most of the houses built in Canterbury District. Most of the houses could be seen anywhere in the SE & are evidence of the developers' desire to build cheaply with materials that the Council will expect for any new houses, urban or rural.	
Policy DBE3	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5380	Objecting	Would like the policy to include the protection of amenity of sensitive development adjacent to wastewater infrastructure from which odors arise at times. There needs to be adequate separation. The plan should contain a policy to protect this amenity to ensure sufficient distance to allow odour to disperse. Amend as outlined.	Add to policy DBE3: m. development adjacent to wastewater treatment works should only be permitted if the distance between the works and the development is sufficient to allow adequate odour dispersion.
Policy DBE3	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5887	Objecting	The commitment to good design is in conflict with past practice and attitudes to its former Conservation Unit.	
Policy DBE3	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6035	Supporting	KCC will make every endeavour to work effectively with CCC to achieve the highest quality of design and place making with its new developments. It should be noted however, that for new schools this must be compatible with safeguarding and security requirements which may mean setting a school building back from the street, among other things.	
Policy DBE3	781581	UNITE Group PLC		6195	Objecting	Criterion (n) of this policy is considered too ambiguous to meet the 'positively prepared' test within policy 182 of the NPPF. The assessment against 'the compatibility of the proposed development with other adjacent uses', does not meet the objectively assessed test of soundness. Other elements of the local plan policy adequately address this matter through detailed design and land use criteria. Criterion (n) of this policy is therefore unjustified.	Delete part n) "The compatibility of the proposed development with other uses"
Policy DBE3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6600	Objecting	Policy DBE3 opening sentence is at odds with the CX's statements that plan will change character of Sturry forever. Under this policy and DBE4 the visual impact of the proposals for Site 2 must be revisited. What about safe access onto the highway this is no specifically covered by k) j) or m). Need to include: The need for the design to deter anti-social behaviour and to provide a safe environment for the well being of residents. This appears to have been omitted here but is in DBE11e)	INCLUSION REQUIRED: The need for the design to deter anti-social behaviour and to provide a safe environment for the well being of residents. This appears to have been omitted here but it is mentioned in DBE11 (e). What about safe access onto the highway this is no specifically covered by k) j) or m)
Policy DBE3	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6664	Objecting	Add the following bullet points to Policy DBE3 I): - recreational amenity (dog walking, reading and sports) - functional/social amenity (allotments) - visual amenity (a still and empty green open space has a value in itself) - all within a 5-10 minute walking distance from home. Encouraging to see these amenities enshrined elsewhere in the Plan at 1.47 and 1.48 and that allotments are included in indicative plans for the major areas of new development.	Add the following bullet points to Policy DBE3 I): recreational amenity (dog walking, reading and sports) functional/social amenity (allotments) visual amenity (a still and empty green open space has a value in itself) all within a 5-10 minute walking distance from home.

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE3	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6864	Objecting	The DLP sets no minimum density of habitable rooms/hectare for new housing, but argues for reducing in future.PPG3 required 30-50 dwgs/ha. Many LPAs have set 30 as the absolute minimum. With increasing pressure on land, we think it is reasonable to require 40-50 dw/ha, with safeguards on suitable unit design/location (higher densities - increased storey heights will not suit all locations). Rearm Planning and Conservation with effective powers to enforce good quality infill across city	
8.24	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2040	Objecting	Object - to the inclusion of such an oblique and inappropriate design parameter	Delete
8.24	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3712	Objecting	Much recent development has been mean (para 8.34), bland and unadventurous. Good contemporary design is to be preferred to overcautious traditional design and mere pastiche. The best of the new may well be juxtaposed with the best of the old, as at King's Cross/St Pancras Stations.	
Policy DBE4	405613	Mr Adam Roake		505	Objecting	This policy is contrary to paragraphs 59, 60 and 61 of National Planning Policy Framework.	The policy should be deleted and any specific phrases in criteria a to g not already covered in policy DBE3 should be inserted there.
Policy DBE4	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1108	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment -I agree with policy DBE4 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE4	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2041	Objecting	Object - to this policy as being (i) contrary to the NPPF, (ii) inappropriate for the district as a whole and (iii) far too stringent and overly restrictive with the potential to prevent high quality development from coming forward.	Revise
Policy DBE4	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2851	Supporting	The parish council supports DBE1, DBE3, DBE4, DBE5, DBE6 and are very pleased with the proposals in DBE7 that there are minimum space standards. This is especially important with regard to bedroom sizes. The quality of any homes built is considered very important.	
Policy DBE4	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3713	Objecting	Policy DBE4 may err on the side of caution. A case could be made for putting major projects, especially in the City Centre, out to competitive tender at international level, commensurate with its World Heritage status. "Land is a finite resource" (8.7). Nowhere is this more true than in Canterbury City Centre, which is discrete, walled, infinitely precious and incapable of expansion to cope with projected population expansion and suburbs. Do we really want Canterbury to be a second Ashford?	
Policy DBE4	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4442	Supporting	DIO supports these policies and the opportunity will be taken when planning the site to take these policies into account, in particular the comments at paragraph 8.20 and from 8.35 onwards to enhance the World Heritage Site and other significant views.	
Policy DBE4	784123	A E Estates Developers		5084	Objecting	We also object to Proposed Policy DBE4 on the grounds that this is not in accordance with NPPF guidance on design.	
Policy DBE4	380262	Mr and Mrs Gibbon		5091	Objecting	We object to Policy DBE4 - not in accordance with NPPF guidance on design	
Policy DBE4	380375	Wrentham Estates		5108	Objecting	. We also object to the wording of Policy DBE4 on the grounds that this is not in accordance with the NPPF.	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE4	784234	Sea Street Developments Ltd		5109	Objecting	On the grounds that the wording is not in accordance with the NPPF.	
Policy DBE4	784280	Whitstable Oyster Company Ltd		5124	Objecting	Wording not in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.	
Policy DBE4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6603	Supporting	Seems reasonable	
Policy DBE4	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6867	Supporting	CCC do not mention directly the effects on housing prices of their schemes (although DTZ and NLP do). Need further analysis by CCC of the impacts on house prices of the schemes - it may well be that the one positive outcome of higher volume scenarios is a relative reduction in Canterbury house prices (i.e. a less steep rise as a % of average wages). Conflicts within NPPF 174 173 which is being used to relax contributions eg affordable housing, quality. AI study has indicated 30% is affordable	
8.25	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4825	Objecting	It has been seen that development applications have often been validated by CCC with inaccurate or misleading drawings. This has often not been addressed during the Planning process. At 8.29 the DLP asks for photographic evidence, but the document itself is completely devoid of illustrations. Isometric drawings should be mandatory for such schemes as Whitefriars or the Churchill site in St Dunstan's Street. Application drawings often fail to include descriptions of materials.	Isometric drawings should be mandatory for such schemes as Whitefriars or the Churchill site in St Dunstan's Street.
8.28	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4047	Objecting	After the fourth point add "deal with water usage, drainage, air quality, and light and noise pollution issues."	After the fourth point add "deal with water usage, drainage, air quality, and light and noise pollution issues."
8.28	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6036	Objecting	In light of Paragraph 128 of the NPPF, the most appropriate place for such information to be presented for building-related applications is within the Design & Access Statement. I would suggest that a new bullet point is added to paragraph 8.28: * Explain how the design will affect the significance of any heritage assets	I would suggest that a new bullet point is added to paragraph 8.28: Explain how the design will affect the significance of any heritage assets
8.32	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4049	Objecting	Add at the end "The Council will include on the planning files all correspondence and discussion notes on pre-application matters for public inspection."	Add at the end "The Council will include on the planning files all correspondence and discussion notes on pre-application matters for public inspection."
Policy DBE5	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1110	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment - I agree with policy DBE5 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE5	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2042	Objecting	Object - to the inclusion of this unnecessary policy. The requirement to submit, and the contents of, Design and Access Statements are provided by secondary legislation.	Delete
Policy DBE5	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2852	Supporting	The parish council supports DBE1, DBE3, DBE4, DBE5, DBE6 and are very pleased with the proposals in DBE7 that there are minimum space standards. This is especially important with regard to bedroom sizes. The quality of any homes built is considered very important.	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE5	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4443	Supporting	DIO supports these policies and the opportunity will be taken when planning the site to take these policies into account, in particular the comments at paragraph 8.20 and from 8.35 onwards to enhance the World Heritage Site and other significant views.	
Policy DBE5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6604	Supporting	Seems Clear	
Policy DBE6	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	791	Objecting	The requirement of this policy is contrary to the NPPF, paragraph 98. Applicants for energy development are not required to demonstrate the overall need. These are matters that are addressed under the Building Regulations. This is not a land-use planning matter. The policy should be deleted.	
Policy DBE6	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1111	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment - I agree with policy DBE6 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE6	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2043	Objecting	Object - to the requirements of this policy which go beyond those required to enable quality planning applications, and sound decisions, to be made.	Revise or clarify
Policy DBE6	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2853	Supporting	The parish council supports DBE1, DBE3, DBE4, DBE5, DBE6 and are very pleased with the proposals in DBE7 that there are minimum space standards. This is especially important with regard to bedroom sizes. The quality of any homes built is considered very important.	
Policy DBE6	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4444	Supporting	DIO supports these policies and the opportunity will be taken when planning the site to take these policies into account, in particular the comments at paragraph 8.20 and from 8.35 onwards to enhance the World Heritage Site and other significant views.	
Policy DBE6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6605	Objecting	Cross reference to Policy CC3, Policy CC4, and Policy CC11 is missing and no direct reference to Table D1.	Cross reference to Policy CC3, Policy CC4, and Policy CC11 is missing and no direct reference to Table D1.
8.35	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4826	Objecting	We welcome the emphasis given to the effect of skylines. Whitefriars from both near and far shows an inappropriate visual profile. Rear elevations are often poorly conceived and yet they can have a huge effect on their setting. We cite the contrast of the carefully thought out front of the Marlowe theatre with its gross and out of scale rear. Again this was a City Council project.	
8.37	665473	Dr Richard Norman		567	Supporting	I support the principle of height restrictions on new building, and the need for any new development to preserve or enhance the setting and views of the World Heritage Site and historic buildings.	
8.40	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1138	Objecting	Section 8.40 comments that: "many rural properties are set further back from the roadway than their urban counterparts and walls, railings, fences and hedges are very important to the character of the area". This applies to the properties in the Parish of Waltham, and WPC would like to see a stronger commitment in the Plan to the recommendation in Section 8.40 that: where new development is permitted, traditional types of boundary treatment should be used without being too prescriptive about the	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
8.40	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1140	Supporting	Section 8.40 also acknowledges the impact of large buildings located in rural conservation areas and the Kent Downs AONB. WPC agrees that such large buildings should be carefully designed and that there is rigorous enforcement of the statement that: "bland materials and garish colours should not be acceptable".	
8.40	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1821	Objecting	The KDAONB has concerns over reuse of large new agricultural buildings for non agricultural purposes and would require conditions on planning permissions for large agricultural buildings to ensure their demolition and restoration of the land to its former condition after it is no longer needed for agricultural purposes. It is considered that there should be a separate policy covering design in rural areas which reflects the criteria set out in this paragraph 8.40	Draft a new policy to reflect the content of para 8.40 and the request from the KDAONB to indicate that conditions requiring demolition and reinstatement of the land will be imposed on all new planning permissions for large agricultural buildings.
8.40	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4827	Objecting	The very intrusive pack house at Chartham for Mansfields contradicts the thrust of this policy.	
8.40	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6606	Objecting	The rural area:This includes Sturry, Broad Oak and Hersden.	
8.41	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6037	Objecting	While KCC would not anticipate the extensive use of flat roofs on new buildings, there may be occasions when their use is unavoidable, particularly when considering the use of temporary or urgently required buildings. As previously noted Central Government funding dictates standard designs linked to standard funding so additional requirements sought by district planners will impact on the accommodation to be provided and the viability of any additional requirements will need to be tested.	
8.42	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4828	Objecting	We note the dominance of developers' continual use of a 2.4 metre ceiling height, no matter in which idiom they are designing. Victorian or Georgian ceilings are usually about 2,7 metres whilst a 17th century cottage might have a 2.1 metre height. Variety should be enhanced by repeating such differences.	We note the dominance of developers' continual use of a 2.4 metre ceiling height, no matter in which idiom they are designing. Victorian or Georgian ceilings are usually about 2,7 metres whilst a 17 th century cottage might have a 2.1 metre height. Variety should be enhanced by repeating such differences.
8.43	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1788	Supporting	Property sizes should reflect occupants needs. We have some of the smallest living accommodation in Europe, so minimum space standards are to be welcomed.	
8.43	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1789	Supporting	Property sizes should reflect occupants needs. We have some of the smallest living accommodation in Europe, so minimum space standards are to be welcomed.	
8.43	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4829	Objecting	The desire for better room and garden sizes is welcomed but there appear to be no comments on density or garden sizes. It is noted that some recent homes in Sturry have gardens as short as 1.5 metres (5'0").	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
8.43	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6607	Objecting	"...room sizes and room shapes have been substandard..."Acknowledgement of this is appreciated, however planning applications have been also been granted where this has been the case as well. As a result houses have not sold. Eg Stour Mews Fordwich Road, still all houses empty a year after completion.	
8.44	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6608	Objecting	Standards: Does this also apply to applications from now until the adoption of a Local Plan with this requirement? Are these the "good space standards" of para 8.11?	
Policy DBE7	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		407	Supporting	Add requirements that: - Bicycles can be easily taken from the covered cycle parking to the highway without needing to pass through a dwelling; - The route to take a bicycle from the cycle parking to the highway must not difficult to navigate with a bicycle (e.g. not a narrow passage or necessitate turning tight corners)	Add requirements that: Bicycles can be easily taken from the covered cycle parking to the highway without needing to pass through a dwelling; The route to take a bicycle from the cycle parking to the highway must not difficult to navigate with a bicycle (e.g. not a narrow passage or necessitate turning tight corners)
Policy DBE7	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	792	Objecting	The viability of the requirements contained in this policy has not been properly tested.Paragraph 2.8.5 of the Economic Viability Assessment does not factor in the cost of the full range of the dwelling sizes specified in policy DEB7. The sizes of dwellings tested by the report do not reflect the full range of minimum sizes specified by policy DEB7. It also assumes an indicative minimum density of between 40 and 50 dwellings per hectare. It is unclear what the implications are for land take.	
Policy DBE7	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	793	Objecting	It is also unclear quite what the policy is requiring because it also specifies that 20% of all residential development is built to Lifetime Homes standards. It is unclear whether this is in addition to the minimum space standards specified in table D3.	
Policy DBE7	753542	Mr James Stevens	Strategic Planner Home Builders Federation	794	Objecting	It is also unclear whether the cost of Lifetime Homes has been included in the viability assessment. the report implies that the Council has discounted this as a significant cost. Contrary to what the report implies, the cost of Lifetime Homes was never finally incorporated into the Code for Sustainable Homes despite this being mooted at one point. As the viability report outlines, the cost of complying with Lifetime Homes would vary between £500 and £1,600 per unit depending on dwelling type.	
Policy DBE7	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1112	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment - I agree with policy DBE7 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE7	778387	Mr David Smith		1338	Supporting	I think that it is very important that The Council exercises tight control over new developments to ensure that high standards are ALWAYS maintained, and that after planning permission has been given, developers are not allowed to vary the agreed design to cut back on costs.	
Policy DBE7	777305	Mr Jason Hobbs	Area Manager Homes and Communities Agency	1606	Supporting	HCA strongly supports Policy DBE7 requiring new homes to have an acceptable standard of accommodation, especially that 20% of all residences are to be built to Lifetime Homes Standard.	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE7	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1790	Supporting	Property sizes should reflect occupants needs. We have some of the smallest living accommodation in Europe, so minimum space standards are to be welcomed.	
Policy DBE7	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2044	Objecting	Object - to the requirement for all residential developments to provide 20% of homes to be built to lifetime homes standards. This may place undue viability pressures on small developments. A threshold, based on evidence, would be appropriate and should be considered alongside the requirement for affordable housing and in terms of viability.	revise
Policy DBE7	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2045	Objecting	Object - to the inclusion of overly prescriptive measures as part of this Plan. Such a set of standards should be part of any up-to-date Supplementary Planning Guidance where it can be assessed against Reasoned Justification and reviewed in line with changes to legislation or Government guidance.	Revise
Policy DBE7	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2854	Supporting	The parish council supports DBE1, DBE3, DBE4, DBE5, DBE6 and are very pleased with the proposals in DBE7 that there are minimum space standards. This is especially important with regard to bedroom sizes. The quality of any homes built is considered very important.	
Policy DBE7	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5158	Objecting	Policy DBE7 is not justified so is unsound, because: space standards should not be address through local plan; it is up to the market/consumers to decide/self regulate; there is a large amount of national and local guidance on good design apply the requirements in the local plan is unnecessary and makes it inflexible; no evidence provided to justify approach, Delete policy	Remove Policy DBE7
Policy DBE7	406848	Mr Graham Norton	Land and Planning Director Strategic Land Kent	5598	Objecting	Lifetime Homes A provision of 20% is too high and unjustified. The percentage figure should be reduced considerably. This brings about additional costs and its evidence base is not clearly set out.	Reduce percentage of life times homes required.
Policy DBE7	406848	Mr Graham Norton	Land and Planning Director Strategic Land Kent	5600	Objecting	The site is within an area of HLV under policy LB2. Object to this designation as the small field is capable of frontage housing without having a harmful impact on the wider landscape. The site has no features of merit and is not worthy of protection. development would gvie a small extension of the defined urban area to match that on the southern side of Cockerling Road. The land is unproductive scrub land that could be developed for a small housing scheme. Allocate for housing.	We wish to have the landscape designation removed from The Cockerling Road site.
Policy DBE7	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5686	Supporting	More specific positives:. Pursuit of Lifetime Homes Standard DBE7	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE7	786671	Mr Elliott Newlyn	Land Manager Rydon Homes Ltd	5955	Objecting	Minimum space standards are an unjustified intrusion restricting choice, increasing development costs, impact on affordability and deliverability, because: no standard that can be applied; trade off between space and cost; is arbitrary, no basis for assessing what is acceptable; no evidence base; will not address plan para 8.43; house building needs to be freed from regulations; will design to those standards; minimum needs differ; no one is forced to live in harmful housing; Lifetime homes good	
Policy DBE7	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6040	Supporting	KCC support policy DBE7 as it requires storage space for recycling/compostables in new development.	
Policy DBE7	781581	UNITE Group PLC		6196	Objecting	Clarification that purpose built student accommodation is not required to meet the residential accommodation standards, should be made within the submission version of the Local Plan, to reflect the specialist nature of the accommodation proposed.	Add "Purpose Built student accommodation is not required to meet the residential accommodation standards as it meets an identified specialist element of overall housing need in the borough".
Policy DBE7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6610	Objecting	This should come after 8.47. What about being specific and include the need for provision of space for a child's buggy/pram and/or wheelchair, in addition to cycle parking? Should refer to minimum outdoor space standard here as well. 20% Lifetime Home Standards should apply to all new housing as 'Economic Viability Assessment stated would not have significant negative effect. It would be lasting legacy to future generations. Should refer to Local quality open space provision standards in OS10	
Policy DBE7	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6868	Supporting	CCC do not mention directly the effects on housing prices of their schemes (although DTZ and NLP do). Need further analysis by CCC of the impacts on house prices of the schemes - it may well be that the one positive outcome of higher volume scenarios is a relative reduction in Canterbury house prices (i.e. a less steep rise as a % of average wages). Conflicts within NPPF 174 173 which is being used to relax contributions eg affordable housing, quality. AI study has indicated 30% is affordable	
8.45	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4830	Objecting	A double bedroom width of 2.6metres long (8'6")is inadequate as it gives a gap of only 0.5metre (1'8") for circulation. We would suggest a minimum width of 2.75metre(9'0").	A double bedroom width of 2.6metres long (8'6")is inadequate as it gives a gap of only 0.5metre (1'8") for circulation. We would suggest a minimum width of 2.75metre(9'0").
8.45	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6609	Objecting	Recognition of problems appreciated, but room sizes quoted are not "good"	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
8.46	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6038	Objecting	8.46 "ability to meet the requirements of a wide range of households such as families with pushchairs, wheelchair users". The Lifetime Home Standards, Lifetime Neighbourhoods strategy for an ageing population states that these standards are mandatory from 2011 for all public sector housing (affordable housing) and by 2013 for all new housing, not just 20% as suggested in Policy DBE7 Reference http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk/data/files/Reports/lthltn_dclgstrategy.pdf	
8.48	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6612	Objecting	Local Residents are stakeholders. They should know this process is underway, has implications for their immediate neighbourhood; who will be seen to represent their views; such representatives will be obliged to actively seek the views of residents and prove this happened; all meetings are open and above board; these meetings given good advance publicity in the local neighbourhood; minutes are kept and are readily available; all presentations/exhibitions are open to public with advance publicity	
Policy DBE8	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1114	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment - I agree with policy DBE8 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE8	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2072	Objecting	Comment - Is this policy necessary? The Building Regulations and provisions of Equality and Disability legislation would ensure that developments incorporate the listed aims.	delete?
Policy DBE8	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6042	Objecting	Agree with principles of Inclusive Design but disagree with the comment "without special treatment". Accessibility needs to be dealt by specialist guidance to ensure it is inclusive. Wheelchair Accessible Housing guidance recommends where possible the provision of a carport so that the wheelchair user can stay dry while transferring outside to a wheelchair and while negotiating the front entrance. Policy statement should refer to best practice BS8300-2009	
8.49	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2046	Objecting	Object - to the inference that it is no longer possible to build on any part of a residential garden which, although not previously developed land (as defined by the NPPF), may be suitable for development in line with draft policy SP4.	revise
8.50	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6613	Objecting	This section is confusing. It has principles which apply to both small and large scale development."However, local character and distinctiveness are crucial elements in why people choose to live where they do" How true! Then planners decide things must change Character of Sturry Broad Oak and Hersden is not understood. Further analysis is needed: stats for each community; appraisal of existing amenities and open space provision requirements; Without this how can decisions be made?	
Policy DBE9	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1115	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment - I agree with policy DBE9 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE9	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2074	Objecting	Object - to the unreasonably restrictive nature of this policy in terms of clause (b) which will prevent suitable developments coming forward during the Plan period.	Revise

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE9	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4051	Objecting	Object to this Policy, is not necessary. Accept it is possible to intensify existing residential areas there is no need for a Policy to say this. It can happen through the development management process under general policies in the Plan. It is inappropriate to suggest that allocated sites might be developed at a higher density than proposed. Undermines certainty in site policies by suggesting high numbers might be acceptable. Delete policy	Delete policy
Policy DBE9	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6622	Supporting	suggest this comes at the end of the section	suggest this comes at the end of the section
8.54	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5550	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'locational concerns'. This includes the acceptance of local individuality as with the acceptance of the need to analyse the character of a locality before development.	
8.56	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6623	Supporting	Excellent. Den Grove Wood is an intrinsic part of Sturry's character, as is the newer wooded area south of A28 Island Rd.	
8.58	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6670	Supporting	Paragraph 8.58 describes an important principle for the layout of the new developments. This is to ensure that "built form and external space design (are) conceived together prior to traffic circulation"; "built development is then arranged within the openings in the framework".	
8.59	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6625	Supporting	para 8.59-8.71 All very clear	
8.60	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4831	Objecting	The imposition of these guidelines is thought to be very arbitrary. Visually successful extensions prior to the Planning System, were often in the same plane as the original fronts, with a straight joint honestly showing the history and varying brick dimensions.	
8.68	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6626	Objecting	How does this compare with the standards set in Policy DBE7, Table D3 and para 8.45?	
Policy DBE10	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1117	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment - I agree with policy DBE10 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE10	778387	Mr David Smith		1339	Supporting	It is very important that this policy is strictly administered.	
Policy DBE10	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2075	Objecting	Comment - With one of the NPPF's core planning principles concerned about the conservation of heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance (paragraph 17, 10th bullet point), should the term 'special architectural character' in the last sentence of the policy read 'significance of heritage assets'?	revise?
Policy DBE10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6628	Supporting	Support	
8.74	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6630	Objecting	"New development, particularly large scaled developments on sites where the context is ordinary or poor, demands a particular approach...."How this relates to the Sturry/Broad Oak site will be interesting to see.	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
8.74	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6672	Supporting	Paragraph 8.74 ensures that "built form and external space design (are) conceived together prior to traffic circulation ... built development is then arranged within the openings in the framework". It exploits the potential of new sites for designing in favour of community life rather than the car. It recognises neighbourhood amenities are important in allowing communities to develop. There is potential for these community buildings to be at the forefront of sustainable design and living.	
8.76	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6632	Objecting	"Detailed tree survey.." Who pays for this? It should be a totally independent survey to avoid bias.	
8.77	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6633	Supporting	The Landscape scheme for Sturry/Broad Oak will be interesting to see.	
8.78	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6635	Objecting	Good stuff, particularly where the proposed development removes an open view, a large area of woodland and wild life habitat. How will this aim be reconciled with the proposals for Sturry/Broad Oak?	
Policy DBE11	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1118	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment - I agree with policy DBE11 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE11	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2076	Objecting	Object - to the over-prescriptive and unnecessary wording of the policy contrary to the general provisions of the NPPF and the need for positive plan making. Could this policy be combined with policy DBE12?	revise and combine?
Policy DBE11	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2940	Supporting	Policies DBE 11, DBE 12 and DBE 13 are all positive and supported in respect of providing a sensitive and high quality approach to landscape design, open space and external lighting.	
Policy DBE11	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4055	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but after "reinforce" in a. insert "improve".	After " reinforce " in a. insert " improve ".
Policy DBE11	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4447	Supporting	DIO supports the principles of these policies. The redevelopment of a secure and fenced environment will open up new areas for access, widen the public realm and create a new well designed and sustainable gateway to the city.	
Policy DBE11	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5159	Objecting	DBE11 is not sound, because it fails to reflect the design guidance in NPPF (58) so is not consistent with national policy. Amend policy	Amend Policy DBE11 follows: Add to the end of point a. ', whilst not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation' Add point h. 'Optimise the potential of sites to accommodate development.'
Policy DBE11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6636	Objecting	May be problems with part b). The ancient country footpath between Sturry and Broad Oak is at great risk. How it will survive the closure of its crossing of the railway line at the Hamels and then the obstruction of its path by the new A28/A291 road, (currently about where the indicative map shows a roundabout joining the A28 and A291), is uncertain. The integration of this historic way with new footpaths will be a challenge, to say the least.	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE11	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6667	Supporting	Policy DBE11 b) describes an important principle for the layout of the new developments. This is to ensure that "built form and external space design (are) conceived together prior to traffic circulation"; "built development is then arranged within the openings in the framework".	
8.79	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6637	Supporting	The need for Public Realm areas to ones where the public feel safe is very important.	
8.80	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2857	Objecting	Manual for Streets is suitable to use only within a development but the standards are not suited to provision of a road which is expected to take HGV's, buses etc. Has CCC done any investigations as to the construction of Bullockstone Road as this may need rebuilding in order for it to be a suitable road for heavy traffic?	
8.80	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6639	Supporting	Difficult issues to get right.	
8.80	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6673	Supporting	Paragraph 8.80 describes an important principle for the layout of the new developments. This is to ensure that "built form and external space design (are) conceived together prior to traffic circulation"; "built development is then arranged within the openings in the framework".	
8.81	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6641	Supporting	The council's responsibility for this is much appreciated!	
8.82	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6642	Objecting	Unfortunately not a best example, more the 'uncoordinated and haphazard' and on market days there is very little feeling of 'space	
Policy DBE12	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		408	Supporting	The majority of incorporated PRoWs should be cycleable to ensure a high level of cycle permeability and so as to make it a natural choice to use bicycles for everyday journeys.	
Policy DBE12	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1120	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment - I agree with policy DBE12 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE12	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2078	Objecting	Object - to the over-prescriptive and unnecessary wording of the policy contrary to the general provisions of the NPPF and the need for positive plan making. Could this policy be combined with policy DBE11?	revise and combine?
Policy DBE12	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2861	Supporting	Policy DBE12 Public Open Space on large developments there should be a reasonable sized play area installed to accommodate families and reduce the need to travel to get to a play area. This site should be suitable for up to age 13-14. Outdoor lighting kept to a minimum to ensure low light spillage onto surrounding areas. Agree DBE12.	
Policy DBE12	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2941	Objecting	Policies DBE 11, DBE 12 and DBE 13 are all positive and supported in respect of providing a sensitive and high quality approach to landscape design, open space and external lighting.	

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE12	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2942	Objecting	Policies DBE 11, DBE 12 and DBE 13 are all positive and supported in respect of providing a sensitive and high quality approach to landscape design, open space and external lighting.	
Policy DBE12	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3610	Objecting	High quality public art - often a target for vandalism. Far better to spend money on flowerbeds, trees, gardens to make cities, towns and villages look good and welcoming. Planning should encourage Green Walls/vertical gardens help reduce roofs water run-off, looks good, insulate buildings and absorbs CO2.	
Policy DBE12	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3676	Objecting	Policy DBE12a should be amended to read "The retention, enhancement and incorporation of public rights of way and the creation of a connected open space and non-motorised traffic circulation system€¹".	Change the wording of Policy DBE12a to read; "The retention, enhancement and incorporation of public rights of way and the creation of a connected open space and non-motorised traffic circulation system€¹".
Policy DBE12	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4059	Objecting	Support this Policy, but: After "design" in c. insert "and tree planting" In d. delete in the two places "will expect" and insert "may require". At the end add "Private local artists will be encouraged to become involved".	
Policy DBE12	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4448	Supporting	DIO supports the principles of these policies. The redevelopment of a secure and fenced environment will open up new areas for access, widen the public realm and create a new well designed and sustainable gateway to the city.	
Policy DBE12	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6643	Supporting	This would sit better after paragraph 8.88, but the content is supported and the provision of Public Art as part of a new development is appreciated.	This would sit better after paragraph 8.88, but the content is supported and the provision of Public Art as part of anew development is appreciated.
8.84	767391	Mr Adrian Fromm	Crime Prevention Design Advisor Partnership and Crime Reduction	118	Supporting	Kent Police have been working with the local planners, KCC and architects to develop the Kent Design Initiative (KDI), Design For Crime Prevention document, which is a Kent Design Guide for Developers, Designers and Planners. The attached Design For Crime Prevention document will assist in the consultation process.	
8.87	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4832	Objecting	Public art is often an irrelevant afterthought, as with the inappropriately small Whitefriars lamb.	
8.88	665473	Dr Richard Norman		569	Supporting	I agree with the policy of promoting public art to enhance the urban environment.	
8.88	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3714	Supporting	We strongly support what is said in para 8.91 about the possible ill effects of mixed development, especially evening and late night opening.	
8.89	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4061	Objecting	In the first sentence after "countryside" insert "and night skies".	In the first sentence after " countryside " insert " and night skies " .
8.89	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6644	Supporting	This will be an issue for the Sturry/Broad Oak site	
8.90	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4062	Objecting	In the first sentence after "residents" insert ", night skies".	In the first sentence after " residents " insert ", night skies " .

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
8.90	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6645	Supporting	Recognise the public safety issue	
8.91	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6647	Objecting	The development site is totally dark at night at the moment, and light pollution will affect Sturry village particularly	
8.92	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6648	Objecting	There is great concern about the effect lighting will have on the Den Grove wood wildlife. Who should seek the advice ?	
8.93	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4835	Objecting	It is welcome to see attention given to intrusive lighting in commercial sites. The recent Sainsbury's in St Dunstons Street and the cricket ground display unnecessarily intense lighting levels which have not been subject to control.	
8.93	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6649	Supporting	Paragraphs 8.93 to 8.97 - all very clear	
8.94	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4063	Objecting	We agree that the Council should take into account the ILE guidance, but parts of some historic urban areas, particularly Conservation Areas, will not always fall within zones E3 and E4. Delete "will" and insert "may".	Delete " will " and insert " may " .
8.96	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4066	Objecting	A number of changes to the bullet points dealing with outdoor lighting.	Under "Orientation", in the second sentence, delete " will " and " encouraged ", and replace with " may " and " appropriate " respectively. Under "Safety" after " hazardous " insert " where there is no or little illumination from retail premises." Under "Security" add at the end " In most residential situations outside lights in excess of 150watts are not needed." Under "Environment" add at the end "In some areas there will be no justification for any public outdoor lighting, such as villages and hamlets who decide that they do not wish to have it." Under "Architectural Lighting" insert 'sensitive " before " illumination " and at end add " also not to detract from nor magnify other nearby lighting schemes ."
8.97	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6651	Objecting	Regarding street lighting for the proposed new A28/A291 road, what regulations apply and who governs them?	
Policy DBE13	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	251	Supporting	It is vital to control excessive outdoor lighting and light pollution.	
Policy DBE13	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1121	Supporting	Chapter 8: Design and the Built Environment - I agree with policy DBE13 in this chapter.	
Policy DBE13	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1822	Supporting	This policy supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance.	
Policy DBE13	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4065	Supporting	Support this Policy, but "and tranquillity" should be added to the end of point d).	Add "and tranquillity" to the end of point d).

Summary Chapter 8 - Design and the Built Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy DBE13	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5160	Supporting	The indicative masterplan has been developed following input from expert lighting consultations who advised on levels of lighting required for the 'Sports Hub' and residential setback, to avoid adverse impacts on residential amenity. The proposals have been informed by the ILE lighting guidance, which provides an industry standard and is reproduced in DLP. The policy and Appendix 5 are considered to be 'Sound' and is supported.	
Policy DBE13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6650	Supporting	Supported	

Comments Summary:

Chapter 9: Historic Environment



Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
9.1	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	1053	Objecting	The conservation section is an excellent section - but it is the actioning of the guidance that counts - and how this plan of aspiration will achieve its goals. The Plan's new housing chapter clearly sets out its details and numbers and how it will be achieved. The conservation chapter is written in a different way and reads very differently. It doesn't differ much from the Canterbury Area Appraisal document and this Appraisal document should be linked in.	There needs to be specifics and mechanisms should be written in to set out how the appraisal document should be linked in. There needs to be firm recommendations linked to the comments - like the other chapters. For example, "All new applications should be judged on whether there is adequate provision for refuse storage/waste disposal.
9.1	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3715	Supporting	We greatly appreciate this whole chapter and its proposals. Their implementation, however, will require a strengthened Conservation Team.	
9.1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4069	Objecting	In the third sentence delete "key in.....development" and add to the end "This quality and character should influence all development, which should not only be sustainable, but should enhance or improve the quality and character of the relevant area."	In the third sentence delete " key in.....development " and add to the end " This quality and character should influence all development, which should not only be sustainable, but should enhance or improve the quality and character of the relevant area."
9.1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4664	Supporting	We are gladdened by the proposals for the heritage and built environment, which recognize the value of Canterbury's architectural inheritance and the need to preserve the inherent character of the city in any future development. Broadly speaking, this is an excellent chapter that covers pretty well every aspect of the historic environment.	
9.1	781716	Mr Stephen Hurren	Secretary Whitstable Green Lung	4988	Supporting	Support the section on the Historic Environment (Ch9) and the safeguards being put in place to protect the environment for the local communities, and the need for development to be sympathetic.	
9.1	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5246	Supporting	The historic environment of our District is vitally important in the future, and I welcome policies to retain and enhance this.	
9.1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5658	Supporting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:Â· Historic Environment chapter 9	
9.1	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5838	Supporting	Welcomes chapter 9 but should come earlier in plan to set context for land use. City Centre critical for character and impact of new devt on views/vistas. An AHLV has been identified to protect historic setting of city and WHS. Within this area any devt that causes harm should not be permitted.	
9.1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6652	Supporting	The principles of all HE Policies are supported. Would not have expected anything less from a responsible Council	
9.2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4846	Objecting	Our overriding concern is the risk that the Council will fail to implement what is proposed and will not take the proposed measures into account in the decision-making process.	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
9.2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4850	Objecting	Our one area of disappointment with this chapter is that it is essentially reactive rather than pro-active. There is a complete absence of Conservation based urban planning ideas, ideas for how the City can be enhanced by development and by well-placed public realm improvements.	
9.3	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4070	Objecting	Delete 'may nonetheless" from near the end and replace with "will usually".	Delete 'may nonetheless " from near the end and replace with " will usually ".
9.4	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3716	Supporting	We strongly support the affirmation in para 9.4 that the preservation of the historic environment "rather than being a constraint on economic growth" will ensure the District remains attractive to investment in the future." We are less sure that it really does "underpin planning policy for the District." Overdevelopment in South Canterbury, if unchecked, is sure to have a detrimental effect on the City Centre.	
9.4	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6685	Objecting	Reference should made to the Westgate Towers. The Council must undertake to close the Towers to traffic since the recent Stonewest survey found that the stonework was not only heavily scoured and damaged by vehicles striking it, but also eroded by salt-laden water splashed from vehicles passing through the archway.	In order to "enhance the character and appearance of the area" as stated, the whole of lower St Dunstan's Street should be pedestrianised.
9.5	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3642	Objecting	We welcome this clause. This section should also make reference to the Canterbury Conservation Area Appraisal document, linking this and other conservation area appraisals to the policy and to an enforcement regime robust enough to stand scrutiny during the appeal process.	
9.6	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3643	Supporting	We welcome this clause. This section should also make reference to the Canterbury Conservation Area Appraisal document, linking this and other conservation area appraisals to the policy and to an enforcement regime robust enough to stand scrutiny during the appeal process.	
9.7	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3648	Supporting	We welcome this clause. This section should also make reference to the Canterbury Conservation Area Appraisal document, linking this and other conservation area appraisals to the policy and to an enforcement regime robust enough to stand scrutiny during the appeal process.	
9.8	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3649	Supporting	Welcome this clause but feel the associated policy HE1 is not specific or strong enough to be enforced. In particular the requirements of Clause 9.8 must find their way into the validation process for planning applications and this should be noted in the policy. This section should also make reference to the Canterbury Conservation Area Appraisal document, linking this and other conservation area appraisals to the policy and to an enforcement regime robust enough to stand scrutiny during appeals	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
9.8	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6044	Objecting	Although CCC has considerable information resources for the historic environment, particularly in the form of the Canterbury Urban Archaeological Database, its information resources are not comprehensive. KCC would suggest that this paragraph also mention the Kent Historic Environment Record which has additional information, particularly for the part of the district outside Canterbury city centre	
9.9	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3651	Supporting	We welcome this clause. This section should also make reference to the Canterbury Conservation Area Appraisal document, linking this and other conservation area appraisals to the policy and to an enforcement regime robust enough to stand scrutiny during the appeal process.	
9.10	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3652	Supporting	We welcome this clause. This section should also make reference to the Canterbury Conservation Area Appraisal document, linking this and other conservation area appraisals to the policy and to an enforcement regime robust enough to stand scrutiny during the appeal process.	
9.11	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1141	Objecting	WPC welcomes the commitment that CCC will; "support the production of neighbourhood plans, conservation area appraisals, parish plans, and village design statements". However, the action mentioned in section 9.11 for CCC to achieve this by "working with local communities to help to identify those aspects of the historic environment which they consider to be important to thto the character of their locality" is expressed too generally.	More detailed measures should be set out as to how CCC can support the production of parish plans, particularly for small parishes with limited resources such as Waltham.
9.11	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4071	Objecting	After "support" insert "and help finance".	After " support " insert " and help finance ".
9.11	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5521	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'Localism'. This includes the willingness to work with Neighbourhood Plans as well as the commitment to meeting current needs and working with the community.	
9.12	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6046	Objecting	KCC would suggest the first sentence be modified to begin 'The historic environment'.	KCC would suggest the first sentence be modified to begin 'The historic environment'.
Policy HE2	665473	Dr Richard Norman		570	Supporting	I strongly support the policy of protecting and enhancing the World Heritage Site and the views to and from the Site.	
Policy HE2	775856	Mr Michael McDonnell		644	Supporting	Fully support Policy HE2 and am encouraged that there is a Buffer Zone.	
Policy HE2	109652	CLlr Michael Dixey		1124	Supporting	Chapter 9: The Historic Environment - I agree with policy HE2 in this chapter.	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE2	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1228	Supporting	We welcome the continued commitment to the protection of the World Heritage Site and the preservation of the long-distance views of the site, including the views from the University Road and University slopes. We wish to emphasise that this policy would rule out any development on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus, and that this must be recognised in the Masterplan for the University campus (see our comments on EMP7).	
Policy HE2	778563	Mrs Susan Langdown		1317	Supporting	This has to be supported. We are fortunate to have this wonderful inheritance which must be safeguarded at all costs.	
Policy HE2	778387	Mr David Smith		1340	Supporting	I welcome the continued preservation and enhancement of The World Heritage Site and the long distance views of the City and Cathedral. This Policy will rule out and any development of the Southern Slopes of The University of Kent's campus.	
Policy HE2	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1937	Supporting	Support the continued commitment to the protection of the World Heritage Site and the preservation of the long-distance views of the sites, including the views from New House Lane.	
Policy HE2	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		2057	Supporting	Supporting comment.	
Policy HE2	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2080	Objecting	Object - to the extent of the proposed World Heritage Buffer Zone	
Policy HE2	778680	Mark & Dawn Walsh		2140	Supporting	support	
Policy HE2	778683	Ms Sarah Wood		2145	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces, so I support policies HE2.	
Policy HE2	778716	Ms Sue Pratt		2170	Supporting	We need to protect our open spaces, as we have many young people in the City, who are very poorly provided with exercise opportunities.	
Policy HE2	778712	Mr Robert Keen		2183	Supporting	I support Policy HE2 in the Draft Local Plan	
Policy HE2	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2212	Supporting	We welcome the continued commitment to the protection of the World Heritage Site and the preservation of the long-distance views of the site, including the views from the University Road and University slopes. We wish to emphasise that this policy would rule out any development on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus.	
Policy HE2	778801	A C Strange		2345	Supporting	The environment should be carefully protected, including views across the city from the University slopes and the open spaces used by residents (including students). I support these policies.	
Policy HE2	778657	Prof J H Strange		2417	Supporting	Support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8 the environment should be carefully protected, including views across the city from the University and the open spaces	
Policy HE2	778686	Alan & Britta Pearlman		2433	Supporting	Support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8. It is crucial to productive life in the city and the wider community that the environment and open spaces, including views across this historic city, be protected.	
Policy HE2	778956	Dr Michael Forrester		2480	Supporting	I support policy HE2 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE2	778868	Mr Tom Tomaszewski		2505	Supporting	I support Policy HE2	
Policy HE2	778870	Leigh Derbyshire		2529	Supporting	I support Policy HE2 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein	
Policy HE2	779099	Ms Jennifer Lennard		2641	Supporting	I would like to support policy HE2.	
Policy HE2	779572	Ms Margaret Derbyshire		2768	Supporting	I support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein	
Policy HE2	780332	Ms Lucinda Malster		2897	Supporting	I support policies HE2 LB2 OS8 which protect the environment.	
Policy HE2	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3067	Supporting	Support for Policy HE2	
Policy HE2	780293	John & Kate Hills		3214	Supporting	We support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	
Policy HE2	780292	Mrs Marianne Fearnside		3220	Supporting	I also agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces. I therefore support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8	
Policy HE2	780314	Ms Helen Gardiner		3226	Supporting	The environment in Canterbury should be protected, including open spaces and views across the city from the University of Kent slopes. Therefore I support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8	
Policy HE2	780449	Daniel & Elizabeth Rikh		3323	Supporting	We support policy HE2 to protect views of the city from the southern slopes.	
Policy HE2	780207	Pru Cherry	The Whitstable Road Residents Association	3403	Supporting	We also support policies HE2, HE3, LB2, and OS8. We think views of, and from, the city, and its open spaces, should be protected at all costs.	
Policy HE2	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3414	Supporting	I support policies HE2, HE2, HE6, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	
Policy HE2	481630	Dr R B Mallion		3460	Supporting	I support the proposal to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University Slopes, and protecting open spaces as a 'World Heritage Site'. In particular, I very much hope that the Council will not grant permission for grubbing up centuries-old hedgerows, fields and meadows, for which the present generation are merely the custodians, with an obligation to pass these on to future generations, just as we have inherited them from previous generations.	
Policy HE2	479719	Dr Robert Jupe		3501	Supporting	I support policy HE2 on environmental grounds.	
Policy HE2	780690	Ms Rosemary Cane		3517	Supporting	I support the policy HE2 which deal with protection of the environment and open spaces and views across the city from the University slopes.	
Policy HE2	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3661	Objecting	Policy HE2: This should also be linked to the Conservation Appraisal document as Policy HE3, and the requirements of Clause 9.8. The policy should be stronger and able to withstand the appeal process both in the scrutiny and validation of applications but also in the control of quality of detailing and materials.	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE2	780505	Dr Jeremy Kendall		3730	Supporting	Support the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and to protect these open spaces. Policy HE2 should be retained and indeed strengthened.	
Policy HE2	780518	Mr Ken Fox & Family		3798	Supporting	Support policy HE2 and proposals to protect the local environment.	
Policy HE2	780988	Ms Laura Leahy		3963	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces, write to say that you support policy HE2.	
Policy HE2	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4072	Objecting	Support the Policy, but at end add: "Lighting of development within the CWHS and within the buffer zones and settings should not detract from nor reduce the visual impact of the CWHS."	At end add: " Lighting of development within the CWHS and within the buffer zones and settings should not detract from nor reduce the visual impact of the CWHS."
Policy HE2	780731	Mr T J Patten		4204	Supporting	I support the proposals for the protection of the environment, views across the city etc.	
Policy HE2	780732	Mr Jonathan A Cane		4208	Supporting	I support the policies which deal with protection of the environment and open spaces and views across the city from the University slopes.	
Policy HE2	780983	Mr Martin Ward		4268	Supporting	Further to the above, I agree with the proposal to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces. Without these safeguards, the very essence which makes Canterbury unique will be destroyed. I support Policy HE2.	
Policy HE2	781064	Mr Richard Grayson		4327	Supporting	I agree with this policy to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes.	
Policy HE2	780971	Mr Tom Cane		4358	Supporting	I support policy HE2 which deals with protection of the environment and open spaces and views across the city from the University slopes.	
Policy HE2	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4450	Supporting	DIO supports these policies. The Vision that DIO has for the barracks site will create historic and long lost views of Canterbury, enhance the appreciation of the World Heritage Site and create new vistas to the City. DIO will work closely with the Council and other stakeholders during the preparation of the planning application and will undertake appropriate studies to inform the application and public consultation events.	
Policy HE2	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4562	Objecting	I welcome the continued commitment to the protection of the World Heritage Site and the preservation of the long-distance views of the site, including the views from the University Road and University slopes. I emphasise that this policy would rule out any development on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus, and that this must be recognised in the Masterplan for the University campus (see comments on EMP7).	
Policy HE2	781413	Dr Adam Bartley		4586	Supporting	Support for Policy HE2 in relation to Chaucer Fields.	
Policy HE2	781637	Mr Brendan Power		4795	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces, so support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8.	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE2	781595	Ms Laura Jowers		4800	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces, so support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8.	
Policy HE2	782070	Julie Rowe		5039	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces. I support policy HE2.	
Policy HE2	782449	Ms Jayne Ward		5139	Supporting	I agree with the proposal to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces. Without these safeguards, the very essence which makes Canterbury unique will be destroyed.	
Policy HE2	784481	Fabio Hedayioglu		5253	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces.	
Policy HE2	421400	Mr Ben Knox		5298	Supporting	I support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment. However Canterbury residents are poorly served by open space and playgrounds within the city and this should be addressed.	
Policy HE2	781622	Mr T Whiting		5398	Supporting	I have attended all the meetings in the Guildhall with regard to St. Stephan's field and as a neutral observer who has played on those fields as a younger man I have been impressed with the arguments put forward by the public to save the fields as an open space for all to use. In contrast I have been shocked by the content and presentation put forward by the council, ill researched and blatantly incorrect. I therefore support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8.	
Policy HE2	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5850	Supporting	KCC suggest that the Historic Environment chapter should come much earlier in the plan to set the context for the land use - transportation, visitor, retail and design strategies. This would underline the internationally critical importance of the World Heritage Site, which is recognised in Policy HE2 and supported, and the large and high quality central Conservation Area.	
Policy HE2	784807	Mr John Pike		5943	Supporting	I support policy HE2 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	
Policy HE2	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	6009	Supporting	We welcome the continued commitment to the protection of the World Heritage Site and the preservation of the long-distance views of the site, including the views from the University Road and University slopes. We wish to emphasise that this policy would rule out any development on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus.	
Policy HE2	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6445	Supporting	We support these policies which can underpin and enhance Canterbury's unique character and Outstanding Value as a World Heritage Site which makes this a good place to live and drives so much of our economy. See also our detailed comment 10 on 2.23 Strategic Requirement on the potential damage of the South Canterbury development to this character and Value.	
9.21	775856	Mr Michael McDonnell		646	Supporting	So pleased to see that this paragraph has been included and the view of the Cathedral from University Road should definitely be protected.	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
9.21	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1229	Supporting	We welcome the continued commitment to the protection of the World Heritage Site and the preservation of the long-distance views of the site, including the views from the University Road and University slopes. We wish to emphasise that this policy would rule out any development on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus, and that this must be recognised in the Masterplan for the University campus (see our comments on EMP7).	
9.21	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1938	Supporting	Support the continued commitment to the protection of the World Heritage Site and the preservation of the long-distance views of the sites, including the views from New House Lane.	
9.21	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4563	Objecting	I welcome the continued commitment to the protection of the World Heritage Site and the preservation of the long-distance views of the site, including the views from the University Road and University slopes. I emphasise that this policy would rule out any development on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus, and that this must be recognised in the Masterplan for the University campus (see comments on EMP7).	
9.22	771779	Mrs Patricia Kane		398	Supporting	I wholeheartedly support this policy and am assuming that, in protecting the view from University Road, the open space on the Chaucer field site will be retained. This is particularly important because the building of the Innovations Centre has already completely obliterated the exceptional views of the Cathedral above University Road.	
9.22	665473	Dr Richard Norman		571	Supporting	The views across the valley to the World Heritage Site are one of Canterbury's greatest and irreplaceable assets, and I strongly support the policy of protecting these. I note that the long-distance views include the views from the University of Kent, the University Road and the University slopes. This should preclude any proposals for building on the southern slopes of the University.	
9.22	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1192	Supporting	We also welcome Point 9.22 of the Draft Plan ensuring that the view of the city and cathedral from the University Road must not be impaired.	
9.22	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1230	Supporting	We welcome the continued commitment to the protection of the World Heritage Site and the preservation of the long-distance views of the site, including the views from the University Road and University slopes. We wish to emphasise that this policy would rule out any development on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus, and that this must be recognised in the Masterplan for the University campus (see our comments on EMP7).	
9.22	772683	Mr Bruce Woodcock		1347	Supporting	Recently the university has built extensively on buffer zone land. If the south side of University Road is also built upon, there will be no green space left between City and University. There is strong opposition to such a development from local residents and also the Student Union which found that students were also overwhelmingly against this development. Many students choose the university because of its beautiful campus so the university would destroy its key selling point to applicants.	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
9.22	778818	Mr and Mrs Jim and Colleen Howard		1481	Supporting	Development on the Southern Slopes would severely damage existing sight lines	
9.22	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1939	Supporting	Support the continued commitment to the protection of the World Heritage Site and the preservation of the long-distance views of the sites, including the views from New House Lane.	
9.22	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3068	Supporting	Support for Paragraph 9.22	
9.22	479400	Dr Doreen Rosman		3386	Supporting	Welcomes policies committed to protecting the landscape, views across the city, and existing open spaces within urban areas.	
9.22	481630	Dr R B Mallion		3464	Supporting	I support the proposal to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University Slopes, and protecting open spaces as a 'World Heritage Site'. In particular, I very much hope that the Council will not grant permission for grubbing up centuries-old hedgerows, fields and meadows, for which the present generation are merely the custodians, with an obligation to pass these on to future generations, just as we have inherited them from previous generations.	
9.22	780985	Ms Jennifer Keaveney		4280	Supporting	I support the statement that "Planning permission will not be granted for development of buildings or structures within or close to the areas that are of special importance for the preservation of views of Canterbury (the view cones), unless it can be shown that the development will not affect one of the identified 'long distance-views' locations and/or, significantly change the skyline".	
9.22	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4564	Objecting	I welcome the continued commitment to the protection of the World Heritage Site and the preservation of the long-distance views of the site, including the views from the University Road and University slopes. I emphasise that this policy would rule out any development on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus, and that this must be recognised in the Masterplan for the University campus (see comments on EMP7).	
9.22	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5247	Objecting	Regarding paragraph 9.22 and long distance views of the Cathedral, I would suggest two other sites should be added to this list, namely the Victoria Recreation Ground and open space land between University Road and Salisbury Road, all of which offer excellent views of the Cathedral which should be protected.	I would suggest two other sites should be added to this list, namely the Victoria Recreation Ground and open space land between University Road and Salisbury Road, all of which offer excellent views of the Cathedral which should be protected.
9.22	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6653	Supporting	Significant views: So the public can enjoy these, free and easy access to these must be protected and maintained	
9.23	665473	Dr Richard Norman		572	Supporting	I strongly support the policy of protecting the setting of Canterbury in the Stour Valley and the surrounding rural landscape. This should rule out not only any building on the southern slopes of the University of Kent, but also the proposed new development in South Canterbury, which would have an irretrievably destructive effect on the rural setting of the city.	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
9.25	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4840	Supporting	We strongly support recognition of the elements of historic character relevant to the setting of the World Heritage site, including roof scape, grain, scale and massing, materials and colours.	
Policy HE3	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		294	Supporting	Support for these laudable aims, but you are focusing on Canterbury and towns and seem to be forgetting the villages	More references in Policies to rural areas
Policy HE3	665473	Dr Richard Norman		573	Supporting	I strongly support the policy of protecting views of the city and the World Heritage Site, and that any development proposals should be assessed in the light of this criterion.	
Policy HE3	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	1052	Supporting	In the Heritage section there is a policy for long distance views. CCAC supports this initiative. Policy HE3 should also be linked to the Conservation Appraisal document and the requirements of Clause 9.8. The policy should be stronger and able to withstand the appeal process both in the scrutiny and validation of applications but also in the control of quality of detailing and materials.	
Policy HE3	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1126	Supporting	Chapter 9: The Historic Environment - I agree with policy HE3 in this chapter.	
Policy HE3	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		2058	Supporting	Supporting comment.	
Policy HE3	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2943	Objecting	The treatment of views of the cathedral from the South Canterbury site are not set out in the Preferred Option Draft Consultation document. However, it would appear that new views will be provided from open space to the north west of the site. It is perhaps surprising that the clear and elevated views along Dover Road adjacent to the South Canterbury site are not included as a significant View in the CCC Conservation Area Appraisal.	
Policy HE3	383359	Ms Judy Seymour - Ure		3312	Objecting	The history setting of the city of Canterbury must be preserved - it is our heritage, and this plan does not make allowances for that.	
Policy HE3	780449	Daniel & Elizabeth Rikh		3333	Objecting	We must preserve the historic setting of our city - it is our heritage.	
Policy HE3	780207	Pru Cherry	The Whitstable Road Residents Association	3404	Supporting	We also support policies HE2, HE3, LB2, and OS8. We think views of, and from, the city, and its open spaces, should be protected at all costs.	
Policy HE3	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4074	Objecting	Support the Policy, but Insert before "scale" in fourth point "materials".	Insert before " scale " in fourth point " materials ".
Policy HE3	780985	Ms Jennifer Keaveney		4281	Supporting	I support policy HE3: "The City Council will seek to protect significant views of the city, and in particular the three parts of the World Heritage Site and their setting, from both within and from outside the city. Development proposals should respond positively to the character and setting of the World Heritage Site which contributes to its Outstanding Universal Value."	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE3	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4451	Supporting	DIO supports these policies. The Vision that DIO has for the barracks site will create historic and long lost views of Canterbury, enhance the appreciation of the World Heritage Site and create new vistas to the City. DIO will work closely with the Council and other stakeholders during the preparation of the planning application and will undertake appropriate studies to inform the application and public consultation events.	
Policy HE3	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4839	Supporting	Some of the elements we most strongly support are as follows: The need to protect views of the Cathedral and the importance of the views from the valley sides across the city.	
Policy HE3	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5608	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'sustainable environment'. This includes an the acceptance of the importance of preserving views of city from outside.	
Policy HE3	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6447	Supporting	We support these policies which can underpin and enhance Canterbury's unique character and Outstanding Value as a World Heritage Site which makes this a good place to live and drives so much of our economy. See also our detailed comment 10 on 2.23 Strategic Requirement on the potential damage of the South Canterbury development to this character and Value.	
9.27	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2863	Objecting	9.27 Concerns that the Listed buildings on CCC website still show Strode Farm House, nearly 60 years after it was demolished.	
9.27	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3611	Objecting	Strode Farm House still on the list of Listed Buildings on CCC website (dated Nov 2010) nearly 60 years after it was demolished! What other erroneous information is the CCC relying on?	
9.29	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4075	Objecting	In the third sentence delete "should" and replace with "must"	In the third sentence delete " should " and replace with " must "
9.30	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6047	Objecting	All reports relating to the investigation of heritage assets, whether archaeological sites, historic buildings or the landscape, should be sent to the Kent Historic Environment Record. In Canterbury, however, this often does not happen, particularly with regard to recording in listed buildings, and I would urge the City Council to work closely with the Kent HER to ensure that information is passed on appropriately.	
9.30	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6061	Objecting	All reports relating to the investigation of heritage assets, whether archaeological sites, historic buildings or the landscape, should be sent to the Kent Historic Environment Record. In Canterbury, however, this often does not happen, particularly with regard to recording in listed buildings, and I would urge the City Council to work closely with the Kent HER to ensure that information is passed on appropriately	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
9.32	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6063	Objecting	Heritage statements are mentioned in this paragraph but it is the only time that they are mentioned. It is not clear that they apply to all proposals affecting heritage assets. NPPF is quite clear that proposals which affect heritage assets should be accompanied by a statement of the impact of the proposals on the significance of the heritage asset. KCC feel that a clear statement to this effect is lacking and could be confusion over where to include this Design & Access or Heritage statements?	
9.33	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6069	Objecting	Local lists of heritage assets are not limited to buildings. Archaeological sites, parks/gardens and landscape features are all equally valid assets to appear on a Local List. KCC has for the past few years worked closely with volunteers from the Kent Gardens Trust to review sites in the Kent Gardens Compendium & elsewhere and bring the reports up to a standard appropriate for use for planning purposes and potentially for inclusion in a Local List. KCC recommends that CCC considers this project.	
9.35	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6689	Supporting	Supportive of the provision for the reduction of the energy consumption of listed buildings, allowing roof insulation, draught proofing and secondary glazing to be installed.	
Policy HE4	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		295	Supporting	Complete agreement with policy Locally listed buildings important in environment	
Policy HE4	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1127	Supporting	Chapter 9: The Historic Environment - I agree with policy HE4 in this chapter.	
Policy HE4	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1825	Supporting	This policy supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance.	
Policy HE4	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1826	Supporting	This policy supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance.	
Policy HE4	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2082	Objecting	The policy is negative in its citation and development management aims and does not meet the over-arching aims of the NPPF for Plans to be positively prepared.	revise
Policy HE4	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3674	Objecting	Any demolition of Listed or Curtilage Listed buildings should be with the agreement of English Heritage. The policy should be stronger and able to withstand the appeal process both in the scrutiny and validation of applications but also in the control of quality of detailing and materials.	
Policy HE4	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4076	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support the Policy, but in the last sentence delete "can be"	
Policy HE4	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5161	Objecting	Para 2 of Policy HE4 contradicts and is not consistent with NPPF (132, 133), so is not sound, because: it contradicts the criteria based approach in Para 4 of the policy, which is supported by NPPF. Delete para 2.	Delete the following paragraph from Policy HE4 : 'Development that would have an adverse impact on their special historic or architectural interest, or their setting will not be permitted.'

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE4	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6072	Supporting	KCC is pleased to see that CCC intends to limit the demolition of locally listed buildings in the same way as for listed buildings	
Policy HE4	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6449	Supporting	We support these policies which can underpin and enhance Canterbury's unique character and Outstanding Value as a World Heritage Site which makes this a good place to live and drives so much of our economy. See also our detailed comment 10 on 2.23 Strategic Requirement on the potential damage of the South Canterbury development to this character and Value.	
Policy HE4	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6694	Objecting	All older buildings in the city whether listed or not, should have energy audits. This is hugely important as a way of saving CO2, of warming houses, of improving health and of providing jobs in the energy savings/insulation industries. The following is proposed in addition to Policy HE4: It is desirable that all buildings have an energy audit and that owners act upon it to reduce energy consumption in those older buildings in the city which are particularly prone to energy waste.	Add the following text to Policy HE4: It is desirable that all buildings have an energy audit and that owners act upon it to reduce energy consumption in those older buildings in the city which are particularly prone to energy waste.
Policy HE5	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		296	Supporting	Importance of detail in the built environment	
Policy HE5	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1129	Supporting	Chapter 9: The Historic Environment - I agree with policy HE5 in this chapter.	
Policy HE5	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1827	Supporting	This policy supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance.	
Policy HE5	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2083	Objecting	Object to the omission of the need to consider proportionality of evidence and information accompanying applications which will be dependent upon the importance or significance of the heritage asset, (Paragraph 141 of the NPPF).	revise
Policy HE5	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3680	Objecting	The policy should be stronger and able to withstand the appeal process both in the scrutiny and validation of applications but also in the control of quality of detailing and materials.	
Policy HE5	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6074	Objecting	The policy requires developers to submit detailed plans and drawings of the proposed alterations but does not require them to assess the impact of these alterations on the significance of the asset. Depending on the view taken of my suggestions under 9.32, KCCI would suggest a clause be added : (d) An assessment of the impact of the proposed alterations on the historic significance of the building and its setting	The policy requires developers to submit detailed plans and drawings of the proposed alterations but does not require them to assess the impact of these alterations on the significance of the asset. Depending on the view taken of my suggestions under 9.32, KCCI would suggest a clause be added : (d) An assessment of the impact of the proposed alterations on the historic significance of the building and its setting

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE5	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6450	Supporting	We support these policies which can underpin and enhance Canterbury's unique character and Outstanding Value as a World Heritage Site which makes this a good place to live and drives so much of our economy. See also our detailed comment 10 on 2.23 Strategic Requirement on the potential damage of the South Canterbury development to this character and Value.	
9.44	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6654	Objecting	Text states CCC can carry out emergency repairs: It is very interesting to note that Sturry Court, opposite Sturry Station and in the Sturry Conservation area, empty since 2004, has been allowed to decay over the years. Could it be that the Council anticipates that it's eventual demolition will be required to accommodate the changes to the A28 as outlined in the indicative map for Site 2? What else can be done about Slatter's Hotel? Surely this is a brownfield site.	
9.45	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6655	Objecting	List of Conservation Areas "formally adopted for development management purposes and as background papers to the Plan" does NOT include Sturry or Herne, although both have been earmarked as Strategic Development Sites in Plan. Sturry, Herne, Fordwich and Bramling are listed under Draft Conservation Area Appraisals however, NO information or map of the respective areas is available through the Conservation Area web pages although clearly listed on the List. Why? where does this leave Sturry Herne	
9.46	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5026	Supporting	We support the amendment to the Eddington Conservation Area boundary which removes the northern boundary of the Former Herne Bay Golf Club from falling within the designation. This is supported by the City Council's Eddington Conservation Area Assessment (January 2009), which recommended removing the Site from within the Conservation Area. The amendment is 'Justified' and therefore 'Sound'.	
9.48	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3679	Objecting	Generally concerning the developments around the City which may affect its setting either in terms of views out or views in the requirement on planning applications to provide setting analysis should be strong and firmly entrenched in the validation process.	
Policy HE6	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		297	Supporting	A strongly worded policy which supports the Conservation Areas in rural areas as well as in urban areas	
Policy HE6	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1130	Supporting	Chapter 9: The Historic Environment - I agree with policy HE6 in this chapter.	
Policy HE6	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1828	Supporting	This policy supports the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance.	
Policy HE6	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2085	Objecting	Object - to the policy being over-prescriptive in terms of providing the six criteria against which development proposals will be assessed. These criteria do not take into account the impending changes to 'Heritage Regulations' as brought in by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013	revise

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE6	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2862	Objecting	Strode farm adjoin the conservation area. The view out of the conservation area of Home Farm will not be preserved or enhanced by the proposed development, is therefore contrary to the proposals in HE6. The character and appearance of this area is its openness, and its real open space boundary between the A299 and Greenhill. The skyline would be changed beyond recognition.	
Policy HE6	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2944	Objecting	The treatment of views of the cathedral from the South Canterbury site are not set out in the Preferred Option Draft Consultation document. However, it would appear that new views will be provided from open space to the north west of the site. It is perhaps surprising that the clear and elevated views along Dover Road adjacent to the South Canterbury site are not included as a significant View in the CCC Conservation Area Appraisal,	
Policy HE6	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3415	Supporting	I support policies HE2, HE2, HE6, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	
Policy HE6	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3681	Objecting	The policy should be stronger and able to withstand the appeal process both in the scrutiny and validation of applications but also in the control of quality of detailing and materials.	
Policy HE6	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4452	Objecting	The boundary of the St Martin's Conservation area crosses the A257 and includes some MOD land on its Northern boundary. DIO think this is inaccurate. The boundary of the conservation area should reflect the northern boundary of the hospital site south of the road.	
Policy HE6	380262	Mr and Mrs Gibbon		5092	Objecting	We object to Policy HE6 - policy wording not in accordance with NPPF guidance on Conservation Areas	
Policy HE6	784234	Sea Street Developments Ltd		5110	Objecting	On the grounds that the wording is not in accordance with the NPPF.	
Policy HE6	784280	Whitstable Oyster Company Ltd		5125	Objecting	Wording not in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.	
Policy HE6	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5162	Supporting	Support amendment to the Eddington Conservation Area boundary outlined in the conservation area appraisal that removes the northern boundary of the Herne Bay Golf Club. The amendment is 'Justified' and therefore 'Sound'. Whilst the Site has been removed, the designation remains adjacent so proposal will seek to enhance features that contribute to the setting. The policy is considered sound.	
Policy HE6	784807	Mr John Pike		5945	Supporting	I support policy HE6 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	
Policy HE6	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6451	Supporting	We support these policies which can underpin and enhance Canterbury's unique character and Outstanding Value as a World Heritage Site which makes this a good place to live and drives so much of our economy. See also our detailed comment 10 on 2.23 Strategic Requirement on the potential damage of the South Canterbury development to this character and Value.	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6657	Objecting	There is a footbridge proposed over the railway at Sturry from a new station car park on the north side of the line. There is also mention of 'funneling of residential lanes to the heart of village'. Is this footbridge dual purpose? The closure of the foot crossing at Hamels Sturry, would mean a footbridge to maintain the ancient, and well used footpath between Sturry and Broad Oak. This would be in Sturry conservation area, adj to Oast at Kings school. How would this be managed under policy?	
Policy HE6	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6703	Objecting	All older buildings in the city whether listed or not, should have energy audits. This is hugely important as a way of saving CO2, of warming houses, of improving health and of providing jobs in the energy savings/insulation industries. The following is proposed in addition to Policy HE6: It is desirable that all buildings have an energy audit and that owners act upon it to reduce energy consumption in those older buildings in the city which are particularly prone to energy waste.	Add the following text to Policy HE6: It is desirable that all buildings have an energy audit and that owners act upon it to reduce energy consumption in those older buildings in the city which are particularly prone to energy waste.
Policy HE7	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		298	Supporting	This is important especially in rural areas where the environment can be easily damaged by insensitive application of inflexible KCC 'standards' applied without consideration for the particular situation.	
Policy HE7	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1131	Supporting	Chapter 9: The Historic Environment - I agree with policy HE7 in this chapter.	
Policy HE7	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		2059	Objecting	The policy as drafted is inadequate because it fails to mention mitigation of traffic noise.	After "and kerb materials." add: "Full consideration must be given to mitigation of traffic noise."
Policy HE7	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3682	Objecting	The policy should be stronger and able to withstand the appeal process both in the scrutiny and validation of applications but also in the control of quality of detailing and materials.	
Policy HE7	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4841	Supporting	We strongly support the importance of Listed buildings and Conservation areas and the need to protect them, particularly when carrying out works on highways	
Policy HE7	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6452	Supporting	We support these policies which can underpin and enhance Canterbury's unique character and Outstanding Value as a World Heritage Site which makes this a good place to live and drives so much of our economy. See also our detailed comment 10 on 2.23 Strategic Requirement on the potential damage of the South Canterbury development to this character and Value.	
Policy HE8	776445	Dr Grainne Evans		629	Supporting	Support for the protection of heritage sites.	
Policy HE8	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1144	Objecting	The policy does not give sufficient indication as to how CCC would quantify, or otherwise judge, the amount to harm that individual proposals might bring against the amount of public benefit that might flow from the changes sought in the proposal. Without a reasonable methodology, there is a danger that the thrust of Policy HE8, will not apply if economic or other considerations are judged to be of greater public benefit than the preservation of historic buildings and the character of the area.	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE8	171665	Mr John Burden		1166	Supporting	I wish to record my personal submission about the long term future of the entire length of the old historic Canterbury to Whitstable Railway, a Conservation Area travelling from Canterbury to Whitstable. It opened on the 3rd May 1830 and was the first passenger steam railway in the world forming a huge and important part of the heritage of the Canterbury City Council District. The entire length of the line deserves this long term protection.	Safely protect this wonderful historic railway line.
Policy HE8	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1356	Supporting	Chapter 9: The Historic Environment - I agree with policy HE8 in this chapter.	
Policy HE8	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2086	Objecting	Object - to the wording of the policy which does not accord with paragraph 133 of the NPPF	
Policy HE8	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3678	Objecting	Any demolition of Listed or Curtilage Listed buildings should be with the agreement of English Heritage. The policy should be stronger and able to withstand the appeal process both in the scrutiny and validation of applications but also in the control of quality of detailing and materials.	
Policy HE8	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5601	Objecting	Applicable to all the above chapters: We need explicit protection of the remaining undisturbed track-bed and embankment of the former Crab and Winkle Railway Line in Whitstable i.e. the sections from the end of the existing cycleway in the vicinity of All Saints Close and along the rear of Clare road to the Sidings development.	This wooded corridor should be protected as containing a valuable historical feature and heritage asset which should be preserved.
Policy HE8	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6453	Supporting	We support these policies which can underpin and enhance Canterbury's unique character and Outstanding Value as a World Heritage Site which makes this a good place to live and drives so much of our economy. See also our detailed comment 10 on 2.23 Strategic Requirement on the potential damage of the South Canterbury development to this character and Value.	
9.54	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4848	Supporting	There is a discussion of Article 4 areas and this sets out the ground rules for consideration of replacement windows. As far as the Local Plan goes, we support what is proposed.	
9.56	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4849	Objecting	As far as the Local Plan goes, we support what is proposed, but would suggest looking in more detail at the five criteria for replacement windows in paragraph 9.56. We would like to see some toughening up of the criteria to prevent more plastic windows and also to establish a policy for the latest advances in window glazing.	
9.59	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1829	Objecting	Advertisements in rural areas should also be addressed in this paragraph. Advertisement in rural areas can have a very damaging landscape impact and should be restricted to small non illuminated signs for the purposes of directions only.	Add text to cover the impact of advertisements in rural areas and amend Policy HE9
Policy HE9	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		299	Supporting	Agree with aims to preserve appropriate detail in the street scene	
Policy HE9	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	1056	Objecting	And applications should also consider : - Signage colouring and typeface in conservation areas - The quality of the details and materials. We recommend the wording of this to be tested in relation to enforcement and consideration given to a shop front and signage control document.	
Policy HE9	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1357	Supporting	Chapter 9: The Historic Environment - I agree with policy HE9 in this chapter.	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE9	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1830	Objecting	Impact of advertisements in rural areas is not covered in this policy. Advertisement in the AONB can have very damaging impacts on the quality of the landscape. This policy should address this.	Add text as indicated in BOLD to the final sentence: 'advertisement alongside roads AND IN RURAL AREAS will not be permitted where they would prejudice road safety AND IMPACT ON THE CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE KDAONB
Policy HE9	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2088	Objecting	Object - to the overly prescriptive and inappropriate requirements that listed, or locally listed, buildings should only be permitted to have timber painted fascia signs. This requirement would, for example, be quite ridiculous for the David Greig building in Canterbury City Centre (now Superdrug). Object also to the policy's other inappropriate restrictions	revise
Policy HE9	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3683	Objecting	The policy should be stronger and able to withstand the appeal process both in the scrutiny and validation of applications but also in the control of quality of detailing and materials.	
Policy HE9	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4078	Objecting	Support the Policy, but: After the fourth para add "Whenever and wherever possible, the Council may require the removal of inappropriate advertisements, for example when the occupancy or ownership of premises changes." Add to the end of the fifth para: "or have adverse visual effects in relation to nearby historic or listed buildings and Conservation Areas."	After the fourth para add "Whenever and wherever possible, the Council may require the removal of inappropriate advertisements, for example when the occupancy or ownership of premises changes." Add to the end of the fifth para: "or have adverse visual effects in relation to nearby historic or listed buildings and Conservation Areas."
Policy HE9	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6454	Supporting	We support these policies which can underpin and enhance Canterbury's unique character and Outstanding Value as a World Heritage Site which makes this a good place to live and drives so much of our economy. See also our detailed comment 10 on 2.23 Strategic Requirement on the potential damage of the South Canterbury development to this character and Value.	
Policy HE10	776445	Dr Grainne Evans		635	Supporting	Canterbury's historic city centre has diminished due to an increased number of garish shop fronts and unsightly A-boards	
Policy HE10	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1358	Supporting	Chapter 9: The Historic Environment - I agree with policy HE10 in this chapter.	
Policy HE10	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3684	Objecting	The policy should be stronger and able to withstand the appeal process both in the scrutiny and validation of applications but also in the control of quality of detailing and materials.	
Policy HE10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4079	Objecting	Support the Policy, but add to end: "Whenever and wherever possible the Council may require the removal of an inappropriate shop front (or part of it) that does not comply with the above criteria, for example when the occupancy or ownership of the premises changes."	Add to end: " Whenever and wherever possible the Council may require the removal of an inappropriate shop front (or part of it) that does not comply with the above criteria, for example when the occupancy or ownership of the premises changes."
Policy HE10	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4843	Supporting	We strongly support the need for existing and new shop fronts to be uphold the historic character of the city by use of traditional fascias and hanging signs, and discouraging of corporate identities	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE10	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6455	Supporting	We support these policies which can underpin and enhance Canterbury's unique character and Outstanding Value as a World Heritage Site which makes this a good place to live and drives so much of our economy. See also our detailed comment 10 on 2.23 Strategic Requirement on the potential damage of the South Canterbury development to this character and Value.	
9.63	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4080	Objecting	Add to the end "When the Council is dealing with proposed new tree planting in urban areas or on footways, it may ignore where appropriate the recommendations of KCC arising from KCC's "A New Tree Policy for Kent Highways 2007".	Add to the end " When the Council is dealing with proposed new tree planting in urban areas or on footways, it may ignore where appropriate the recommendations of KCC arising from KCC's "A New Tree Policy for Kent Highways 2007" .
9.71	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6076	Objecting	It should be noted that CCC only holds a snapshot of part of the Kent Historic Environment Record. The HER is maintained at Kent County Council not CCC. CCC does, however, hold the UAD	
Policy HE11	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		441	Supporting	We support Policy HE11 and have submitted an Archaeology Desk Top Assessment (CGMS) in 2009 for Site 7: Land north of Thanet way Whitstable (Policy SP3g)	
Policy HE11	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1359	Supporting	Chapter 9: The Historic Environment - I agree with policy HE11 in this chapter.	
Policy HE11	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2089	Objecting	Object - to the requirements of the policy (second paragraph) which go beyond the advice of the NPPF in requiring information to be submitted where important or potential heritage assets may exist. The requirement for a field evaluation is not disputed where evidence exists to suggest that one is necessary but this policy has the potential to result in a higher number of invalid applications as a result of onerous policy requirements.	revise
Policy HE11	13751	Mrs S Shaw	Clerk Lower Hardres Parish Council	3425	Objecting	Furthermore, the land at Nackington has a long history of producing ancient artefacts, such as old pots, tools and Roman coins etc. We are aware that there is provision in the plan dealing with archaeological issues, but this land is a relative gold mine.	
Policy HE11	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3685	Objecting	The policy should be stronger and able to withstand the appeal process both in the scrutiny and validation of applications but also in the control of quality of detailing and materials.	
Policy HE11	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5164	Objecting	Support the protection of archaeological features but the wording is not sufficiently flexible to address unavoidable issues that may prohibit fieldworks occurring prior to planning permission being granted. The NPPF (176, 203) considers the use of planning conditions to secure fieldworks prior to works commencing. Amend policy as outlined to make sound and consistent with national policy..	Add the following paragraph to Policy HE11: 'Where other material considerations prevent field evaluation works from being carried out, prior to the grant of planning consent, then an appropriate condition should be attached to the consent to secure that the works take place prior to the commencement of development.'

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy HE11	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6456	Supporting	We support these policies which can underpin and enhance Canterbury's unique character and Outstanding Value as a World Heritage Site which makes this a good place to live and drives so much of our economy. See also our detailed comment 10 on 2.23 Strategic Requirement on the potential damage of the South Canterbury development to this character and Value.	
Policy HE12	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1360	Supporting	Chapter 9: The Historic Environment - I agree with policy HE12 in this chapter.	
Policy HE12	115298	Ms A Sparkes	Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee	3686	Objecting	The policy should be stronger and able to withstand the appeal process both in the scrutiny and validation of applications but also in the control of quality of detailing and materials.	
Policy HE12	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4844	Supporting	We strongly support the need to protect the general archaeological aspects of the district and in particular the area covered by the designated area of archaeological importance in Canterbury	
Policy HE12	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6457	Supporting	We support these policies which can underpin and enhance Canterbury's unique character and Outstanding Value as a World Heritage Site which makes this a good place to live and drives so much of our economy. See also our detailed comment 10 on 2.23 Strategic Requirement on the potential damage of the South Canterbury development to this character and Value.	
Policy HE12	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6663	Objecting	There have been finds of major importance at Sturry Pit, is just to the E of A291 and archaeological remains have also been found in the area of Greenfields Shooting Range to W. What else is waiting to be discovered at Site 2? Are the developers fully aware of the history of this area? It started 430,000 - 130,000 B.C. in the Acheulian Period & continued from there - see 'Sturry the Changing Scene' edited by Miss K. McIntosh. Further work will be required how will this be managed/protected?	
9.82	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6666	Objecting	Appendix 6 :Elbridge House, Sturry Compendium no 90. For the record:Elbridge House may have a Sturry Post code, but it is not in Sturry. It is mid way between Westbere and Fordwich/Littlebourne/Wickhambreaux. Elbridge House,Conservation Area Appraisal 2. Location and Setting - no mention of Sturry.	
9.83	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6077	Objecting	Compendium has not been revised since 1996 & was also not compiled as a planning document or intended to formally underpin the planning process. Eg the means by which gardens were selected for the Compendium was not rigorous or objective. In order to serve the function intended the Compendium needs to be checked and reviewed. KCC has been working with the Kent Gardens Trust to carry out a review. If CCC intends to use Compendium in this way KCC urge a review as existing info may not be reliable.	

Summary Chapter 9 - Historic Environment

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
9.84	780525	Ms Katharine Rist	Campaigner - Ancient Woodland The Woodland Trust	3835	Objecting	Paragraph 9.84 states "The Woodland Trust maintains an ancient woodland inventory.." The Woodland Trust does not maintain the ancient woodland inventory; this is maintained by Natural England	Change the wording of Paragraph 9.84 to read "Natural England maintains an ancient woodland inventory.."
9.84	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6088	Objecting	The text should also mention the Kent Historic Landscape Characterisation Survey (2001) which is an important resource for understanding the landscape of Kent and its development through time. KCC recommend that CCC prepares a district-wide Heritage Strategy. This would meet the requirements of NPPF that LPAs should prepare a positive strategy for the historic environment and would ensure that Canterbury's rich heritage was properly was properly integrated into long term planning.	
Policy HE13	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1361	Supporting	Chapter 9: The Historic Environment - I agree with policy HE13 in this chapter.	
Policy HE13	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4845	Supporting	We strongly support the emphasis on conservation and restoration of historic landscape, woodlands, hedgerows and parks and gardens	
Policy HE13	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5168	Supporting	The Herne Bay Golf Club is not identified in the 'Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal, 8/12', as forming part of, containing or contributing to an historic landscape or historic landscape features. As such the proposals to redevelop the Site will not harm these features. Based its findings, we do not object to the policy as currently worded and is considered it to be 'Sound'.	
Policy HE13	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6458	Supporting	We support these policies which can underpin and enhance Canterbury's unique character and Outstanding Value as a World Heritage Site which makes this a good place to live and drives so much of our economy. See also our detailed comment 10 on 2.23 Strategic Requirement on the potential damage of the South Canterbury development to this character and Value.	

Comments Summary:

Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
10.1	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3717	Supporting	Again we appreciate and support the main thrust of this Chapter with the proviso that proposals for overdevelopment in South Canterbury are incompatible with it.	
10.1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4631	Supporting	We welcome the attention the Local Plan gives to the natural environment, including the provision of open spaces, landscape and biodiversity.	
10.1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4852	Supporting	We therefore welcome the Council's stated emphasis on countryside and landscape protection, on nature conservation and on the protection and enhancement of biodiversity, and its recognition that "a high quality rural environment contributes to the economic, social and cultural well-being of the district". Further, we are pleased to see the depth into which this chapter addresses the issues, and we trust that these intentions are successfully met over the coming decades.	
10.1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4854	Objecting	Our main concerns are that all the existing major housing and industrial allocations are assigned to Greenfield land, much of which is of high agricultural quality; there is an apparent lack of recognition of the conflict between public access to nature and the need to best conserve nature; the fact that none of the rural land around Canterbury has been assigned Green Belt status.	
10.1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4863	Objecting	We find it difficult to understand why the Council does not declare a "Green Belt " for the city - something that it is entitled to do. It is useful to recall here that the Council's Core Strategy (2010) says - "...encouraging the protection of land that may contribute to habitat networks in the future and support sensitive land management practices and proactive initiatives for biodiversity improvement." This is virtually Green Belt creation - please go the rest of the way!	We find it difficult to understand why the Council does not declare a "Green Belt " for the city - something that it is entitled to do.
10.1	781716	Mr Stephen Hurren	Secretary Whitstable Green Lung	5009	Supporting	Support the section on Landscape and Biodiversity and the safeguards being put in place to protect the environment for the local communities, and the need for development to be sympathetic.	
10.1	13812	Mr N J Blake		5187	Supporting	Chapter 10 of the DLP, entitled, Landscape & Biodiversity (L&B) sets out some reasonable constraints to be implemented , which should inform the development concepts for the District.	
10.1	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5435	Objecting	This general statement is laudable but is not translated into any of the stated Policies. The Policies are mainly limited to specific designated areas leaving the general countryside unprotected. Para 112 of the NPPF encourages the use of poorer quality land in preference to land of a higher quality. Para 123 of the NPPF requires that planning policies should identify and protect areas of tranquility. These have not been adopted in the draft Local Plan.	
10.1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5659	Supporting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:· Landscape and Biodiversity chapter 10 (though will be infringed by CCC due to development proposed in South Canterbury!)	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
10.1	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6460	Supporting	We support this chapter which is why we oppose the South Canterbury Development. See objections to 2.23	
10.1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6707	Supporting	Supportive of the strong conservation and sustainability ethos that lies behind much of the content of this chapter.	
10.1	784495	P Manser		6975	Objecting	This general statement is laudable but is not translated into any of the stated Policies. The Policies are mainly limited to specific designated areas leaving the general countryside unprotected. Para 112 of the NPPF encourages the use of poorer quality land in preference to land of a higher quality. Para 123 of the NPPF requires that planning policies should identify and protect areas of tranquility. These have not been adopted in the draft Local Plan.	
10.2	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4081	Objecting	Add the following to the end of the first sentence:"and its tranquillity contributes to the health and well-being of residents and visitors alike."	Add the following to the end of the first sentence: "and its tranquillity contributes to the health and well-being of residents and visitors alike."
10.3	778572	Mrs Denise Horswell		1318	Supporting	Blean Parish Council fully supports the City Council's objectives to protect and enhance the countryside but wishes to add to the area of a Green Buffer Zone.	Blean Parish Council propose that there should be a Green Buffer Zone north of the University playing fields to Tyler Hill Road eastwards to the railway and onto Tyler Hill and westwards to the gardens on the East of Tile Kiln Hill.
10.3	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4768	Objecting	The importance of urban and suburban habitat networks (corridors and stepping stone etc) must not be overlooked in regards to protecting and enhancing biodiversity,	
10.3	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4864	Objecting	Allied to the lack of designation of Green Belt, the proposed Local Plan fails to recognise the demise of biodiversity that is now in progress both in the District and the much wider world. The Plan simply relies on a range of major site designations to effect the necessary biodiversity conservation.To address this escalating loss of biodiversity the Council needs to take actions such as those in Policies LB6, LB7, LB8 and LB9 and explained in paragraphs 10.50 to 10.55.	To address this escalating loss of biodiversity the Council needs to take actions such as those in Policies LB6, LB7, LB8 and LB9 and explained in paragraphs 10.50 to 10.55.
10.6	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4082	Objecting	Add to end of the para: "Tranquillity is also an important reason why people enjoy and visit the AONB and the Council will protect this through the policies in this Plan."	Add to end of the para: "Tranquillity is also an important reason why people enjoy and visit the AONB and the Council will protect this through the policies in this Plan."
10.7	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4083	Objecting	Add to end of para "and will support membership on the committee by representatives of amenity bodies and parish councils within, or concerned with, the AONB."	Add to end of para " and will support membership on the committee by representatives of amenity bodies and parish councils within, or concerned with, the AONB. "
10.10	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1147	Supporting	The Parish of Waltham lies within the North Downs AONB, and WPC welcomes the assurance given in Section 10.10 that a range of objectives and policies of the Local Plan seek to address the needs of local communities within the AONB in ways that meet the requirement that the special qualities, features and character of the AONB are properly safeguarded.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
10.10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4084	Objecting	Add at the end "However, the National Planning Policy Framework explicitly states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply within the AONB, and that major development is only acceptable in exceptional circumstances."	Add at the end "However, the National Planning Policy Framework explicitly states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply within the AONB, and that major development is only acceptable in exceptional circumstances."
Policy LB1	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1148	Supporting	WPC is also pleased to see the inclusion of Policy LB1 which states that:"high priority will be given to conservation and enhancement of natural beauty in the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and planning decisions should have regard to its setting. Proposals which conflict with the objective to conserve and enhance the AONB will not be permitted."	
Policy LB1	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1363	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity - I agree with policy LB1 in this chapter.	
Policy LB1	779149	Worham		1671	Objecting	Need to consider also the value and retention of prime agricultural land.	Bringing prime agricultural land into this consideration.
Policy LB1	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1831	Objecting	Paras 10.6- 10.12 are welcomed. The NPPF para 113 requires criteria based policies. The mention of the Management Plan is welcomed but its policies are management policies for the AONB and need support from a Planning Policy. We would therefore suggest that LB1 is strengthened by inserting mention of all supporting KDAONB guidance and listed criteria.	We would be very pleased to discuss re wording LB1 as indicated in BOLD: Second paragraph '.....provided that they do not conflict with the aim of conserving and enhancing natural beauty, BY ADDRESSING LOCATION, SCALE, FORM, HIGH QUALITY DESIGN, MATERIALS AND MITIGATION AND CONFROM WITH THE ADVICE SET OUT IN THE KDAONB MANAGEMENT PLAN AND SUPPORTING GUIDANCE.
Policy LB1	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2094	Objecting	Object- to the omission of "where possible" after"and"- last line of second paragraph	revise
Policy LB1	778777	Mr Nick Waldron	The Waldron Family	2127	Objecting	That policy states that the emphasis of development in the AONB should be on small-scale proposals. This approach is not advocated in NPPF or the Kent Downs AONB Management Plan. Neither of these documents refers to the need to restrict development to'small-scale' proposals. As long as proposals accord with the NPPF ("conserving landscape and scenic beauty" and"wildlife and cultural heritage") and the Management Plan there is no need to place further burden upon developers and development	See attached statement.
Policy LB1	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3138	Supporting	This policy appears to protect the integrity of the AONB. However it will be for the AONB to comment on any changes required to ensure full protection in accordance with the NPPF.	
Policy LB1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4085	Supporting	Support this Policy, but in the second sentence after "AONB" insert "or that endangers its tranquillity".	In the second sentence after " AONB " insert " or that endangers its tranquillity ".
Policy LB1	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5169	Objecting	The intention of the second para of policy LB1 is unclear and imprecise, because it implies all development regardless of location should be small in scale, which contrary to DLP objectives and impacts on sites in SP3. Policy should only relate to development in AONB which is what if justified by evidence and NPPF (14). Amend as outlined.	In the first sentence of the second para of Policy LB1 insert the words 'within the AONB' after ...proposals for development...

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB1	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6090	Objecting	"€ sustainably and appropriately located..." There is a wrong place for development, both within and without designated landscapes. Locations should always be informed by landscape and knowledge of its character	Add "...sustainably and appropriately located..." There is a wrong place for development, both within and without designated landscapes. Locations should always be informed by landscape and knowledge of its character
Policy LB1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6668	Supporting	Endorsed	
10.13	779262	Mr John Bailey		1976	Supporting	I fully support this especially the character of the stour valley and the views across it to and from the city and world heritage site. Protecting areas of high landscape value is vital esp the open space around area known as Chaucer fields below UKC.	
10.13	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2093	Objecting	Object- to the failure of the Council to review the boundaries of the AHLV following the previous examination of the existing Local Plan and as part of the preferred allocations of the strategic development sites as part of the Plan.	revise AHLV boundaries
10.13	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2946	Objecting	The New Thanington site also lies adjacent to The North Downs AHLV, which is a landscape designation associated with the Kent Downs AONB. CCC indicate that they will be proposing this AHLV as an extension to the AONB when the boundary is reviewed by Natural England in due course.	There would have to be substantive reasons to extend the AONB designation and this should be fully supported by landscape analysis and full public consultation.
10.13	406391	Mr Alan Best	Swale Borough Council	5511	Supporting	It is noted that we each share a number of environmental designations across our borders and hope that we can approach the issues in a consistent fashion. In this respect, we would refer to our own local landscape area designations for the North Kent Marshes and The Blean and our proposals for a Coastal Change Management Area.	
10.13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6669	Objecting	e. Canterbury AHLV (The Valley of the River Stour around Canterbury). To the east of Canterbury the valley of the Stour has been poorly treated. It would be hoped that Policy LB2 will enhance the area andnot'protect' the existing character! Strategic Site 2 takes an area, which is very much appreciated locally as an AHLV, should mean that this would be anopportunity to correct past mistakes. However, this is very unlikely.. Urbanisation, with a loss of countryside is not welcomed in Sturry.	
10.14	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2947	Objecting	There are no other wildlife or heritage designations on either New Thanington or South Canterbury. The main value of the AHLV designation is more to do with the wider setting of Canterbury. In relation to New Thanington, the main significant view to the cathedral is retained unaffected.	
Policy LB2	771779	Mrs Patricia Kane		399	Supporting	As a resident of Canterbury, I welcome this policy, particularly in relation to Blean Woods and the Stour Valley.	
Policy LB2	665473	Dr Richard Norman		574	Supporting	I strongly support the policy that all development proposals in or near Canterbury should have regard to the historic setting of the city and the World Heritage Site.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB2	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1231	Supporting	We wish to emphasise that this policy would rule out any development on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus, and that this must be recognised in the Masterplan for the University campus (see our comments on EMP7). We also believe that the proposed development in South Canterbury would be incompatible with this policy. (See our comments on SP3a.)	
Policy LB2	778563	Mrs Susan Langdown		1314	Supporting	Supportive of all of these areas, but would draw particular attention to the valley of the River Stour around Canterbury. This will include the area of Kingsmead Field.	
Policy LB2	778387	Mr David Smith		1341	Supporting	It is good to see that the current Policy R7 protecting AHLV's is being maintained, and it is further supported by the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal.	
Policy LB2	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1364	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity -I agree with policy LB2 in this chapter.	
Policy LB2	778739	Mr A Salvatori		1670	Objecting	The AHLV designation needs to be lifted from this site as the land does not fall within the definition of the historic setting of the City as defined by the previous local plan inspector	Omit the land at and to the rear of 51 Rough Common Road from the Area of High Landscape Value
Policy LB2	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	1692	Objecting	The Mountfield Park site should be excluded from the AHLV designations for the reasons set out in our report, submitted separatley	
Policy LB2	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	1703	Objecting	The whole of the South Canterbury site should not be designated as an AHLV as it fails to meet the tests set out by the previous local plan inspector who set the parameters for the AHLV in the first instance.	The AHLV boundary should be reviewed as it affects this site.
Policy LB2	778733		The John Graham Centre	1867	Objecting	The AHLV designation is indiscriminate and the boundaries as they affect Lucketts Farm need to be reviewed. The land fronting A290 needs to be excluded from the designation	AHLV boundary needs to be amended in line with the comments above
Policy LB2	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1940	Supporting	Support the continued commitment to the protection of areas of high landscape value, including the Stour valley slopes. The proposed development in South Canterbury would be incompatible with this policy.	
Policy LB2	779262	Mr John Bailey		1977	Supporting	Fully and completely support as we need these AHLV sites for the good of the community and the health of residents.	
Policy LB2	778777	Mr Nick Waldron	The Waldron Family	2128	Objecting	We contend that in these circumstances the value of the landscape designation firstly does not warrant AHLV status and secondly is not necessary in addition to the existing AONB status. We should also point out that the NPPF suggests that protection should be commensurate with the status of the designation (the AHLV is a local designation) and appropriate weight should be given to its importance. In this case the weight given to the land status should be low. See attached statement.	Exclude the Representation Site (Land at Great Bossingham Farm) from the AHLV.
Policy LB2	778680	Mark & Dawn Walsh		2141	Supporting	support	
Policy LB2	778683	Ms Sarah Wood		2146	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces, so I support policies LB2.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB2	778716	Ms Sue Pratt		2171	Supporting	We need to protect our open spaces, as we have many young people in the City, who are very poorly provided with exercise opportunities.	
Policy LB2	778712	Mr Robert Keen		2182	Supporting	I support Policy LB2 of the Draft Local Plan	
Policy LB2	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2214	Supporting	We welcome the continued commitment to the protection of areas of high landscape value, including the Stour valley slopes.	
Policy LB2	778801	A C Strange		2347	Supporting	The environment should be carefully protected, including views across the city from the University slopes and the open spaces used by residents (including students). I support these policies.	
Policy LB2	778657	Prof J H Strange		2418	Supporting	Support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8 the environment should be carefully protected, including views across the city from the University and the open spaces	
Policy LB2	778686	Alan & Britta Pearlman		2434	Supporting	Support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8. It is crucial to productive life in the city and the wider community that the environment and open spaces, including views across this historic city, be protected.	
Policy LB2	778956	Dr Michael Forrester		2481	Supporting	I support policy LB2 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	
Policy LB2	778868	Mr Tom Tomaszewski		2506	Supporting	I support Policy LB2	
Policy LB2	778870	Leigh Derbyshire		2530	Supporting	I support Policy LB2 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein	
Policy LB2	779099	Ms Jennifer Lennard		2642	Supporting	I would like to support policy LB2.	
Policy LB2	779572	Ms Margaret Derbyshire		2769	Supporting	I support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein	
Policy LB2	780332	Ms Lucinda Malster		2898	Supporting	I support policies HE2 LB2 OS8 which protect the environment.	
Policy LB2	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2945	Objecting	Policy LB2- Area of High Landscape Value Designation. Both New Thanington and South Canterbury are fully covered by the Canterbury Area of High Landscape Value Designation. Para 10.13 states that 'Canterbury City Council has retained a number of landscape designations, because of their 'greater than local' importance and where the Council is certain that their special importance requires particular policy recognition. Of particular note is the Canterbury AHLV.	It would be reasonable to note in respect of the AHLV designation that New Thanington and South Canterbury are both equally constrained
Policy LB2	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3069	Supporting	Support for Policy LB2	
Policy LB2	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3139	Supporting	Kent Wildlife Trust welcomes the protection afforded to the AHLV and the nature conservation interests within these areas. All of the areas identified contain high biodiversity value and this protection will help to safeguard the ecology using the areas.	
Policy LB2	780293	John & Kate Hills		3215	Supporting	We support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB2	780292	Mrs Marianne Fearnside		3221	Supporting	I also agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces. I therefore support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8	
Policy LB2	780314	Ms Helen Gardiner		3227	Supporting	The environment in Canterbury should be protected, including open spaces and views across the city from the University of Kent slopes. Therefore I support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8	
Policy LB2	780449	Daniel & Elizabeth Rikh		3325	Supporting	We support policy LB2 to protect views of the city from the southern slopes.	
Policy LB2	479400	Dr Doreen Rosman		3387	Supporting	Welcomes policies committed to protecting the landscape, views across the city, and existing open spaces within urban areas.	
Policy LB2	780207	Pru Cherry	The Whitstable Road Residents Association	3405	Supporting	We also support policies HE2, HE3, LB2, and OS8. We think views of, and from, the city, and its open spaces, should be protected at all costs.	
Policy LB2	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3416	Supporting	I support policies HE2, HE2, HE6, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	
Policy LB2	481630	Dr R B Mallion		3466	Supporting	I support Chapter 10, Policy LB2, concerning the landscape character of the Stour Valley as an 'Area of High Landscape Value'.	
Policy LB2	479719	Dr Robert Jupe		3502	Supporting	I support policy LB2 on environmental grounds.	
Policy LB2	780690	Ms Rosemary Cane		3518	Supporting	I support the policy LB2 which deal with protection of the environment and open spaces and views across the city from the University slopes.	
Policy LB2	780505	Dr Jeremy Kendall		3732	Supporting	Support the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and to protect these open spaces. Policy LB2 should be retained and indeed strengthened.	
Policy LB2	780518	Mr Ken Fox & Family		3799	Supporting	Support policy LB2 and proposals to protect the local environment.	
Policy LB2	780988	Ms Laura Leahy		3966	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces, write to say that you support policy LB2.	
Policy LB2	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4086	Supporting	Support this Policy	
Policy LB2	780731	Mr T J Patten		4205	Supporting	I support the proposals for the protection of the environment, views across the city etc.	
Policy LB2	780732	Mr Jonathan A Cane		4209	Supporting	I support the policies which deal with protection of the environment and open spaces and views across the city from the University slopes.	
Policy LB2	780983	Mr Martin Ward		4269	Supporting	Further to the above, I agree with the proposal to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces. Without these safeguards, the very essence which makes Canterbury unique will be destroyed. I support Policy LB2.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB2	781064	Mr Richard Grayson		4328	Supporting	I am pleased to see in Policy LB2 that the designation of 'Area of High landscape Value' has been kept from the 2006 local Plan. I agree with this policy to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes.	
Policy LB2	780968	Mr Simon Wall		4352	Objecting	What provisions are being made for environmental protection? Parts of Canterbury district have been designated as High Value Landscape Areas. Are roads going to be built through woodland?	
Policy LB2	780971	Mr Tom Cane		4359	Supporting	I support the policy LB2 which deals with protection of the environment and open spaces and views across the city from the University slopes.	
Policy LB2	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4453	Supporting	DIO supports this policy in principle, although the boundary of the area in the Barracks development should reflect the SHLAA submission and become part of the Development Opportunity site shown by Policy HD1 commented on earlier.	
Policy LB2	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4565	Supporting	I welcome the continued commitment to the protection of areas of high landscape value, including the Stour valley slopes. I emphasise that this policy would rule out any development on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus, and that this must be recognised in the Masterplan for the University campus (see our comments on EMP7). I also believe that the proposed development in South Canterbury would be incompatible with this policy. (See comments on SP3a.)	
Policy LB2	781413	Dr Adam Bartley		4587	Supporting	Support for Policy LB2 in relation to Chaucer Fields.	
Policy LB2	781637	Mr Brendan Power		4796	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces, so support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8.	
Policy LB2	781595	Ms Laura Jowers		4799	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces, so support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8.	
Policy LB2	782070	Julie Rowe		5040	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces. I support policy LB2.	
Policy LB2	782449	Ms Jayne Ward		5140	Supporting	I agree with the proposal to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces. Without these safeguards, the very essence which makes Canterbury unique will be destroyed.	
Policy LB2	784481	Fabio Hedayioglu		5254	Supporting	i,§ I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces.	
Policy LB2	421400	Mr Ben Knox		5299	Supporting	I support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment. However Canterbury residents are poorly served by open space and playgrounds within the city and this should be addressed.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB2	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5381	Objecting	It is important that policies to protect AONB do not unduly restrict provision of essential water supply and wastewater infrastructure should the need arise. The policy text should recognise that essential utility development will be permitted in exceptional circumstances, if no alternative site is available. Amend as outlined.	Add to policy LB2: Development will be allowed if the proposal is for essential utility infrastructure, and the benefit of the development outweighs any harm.
Policy LB2	781622	Mr T Whiting		5399	Supporting	I have attended all the meetings in the Guildhall with regard to St. Stephan's field and as a neutral observer who has played on those fields as a younger man I have been impressed with the arguments put forward by the public to save the fields as an open space for all to use. In contrast I have been shocked by the content and presentation put forward by the council, ill researched and blatantly incorrect. I therefore support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8.	
Policy LB2	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5436	Objecting	This appears to be very narrowly drawn up with no consideration to the surroundings of the designated areas limiting the policy to "within these areas". This is in despite of the comment at 10.12 b) regarding Blean Woods"particularly where it improves habitat connectivity of the Blean woodlands".	
Policy LB2	784807	Mr John Pike		5946	Supporting	I support policy LB2 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	
Policy LB2	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	6011	Supporting	We welcome the continued commitment to the protection of areas of high landscape value, including the Stour valley slopes. We wish to emphasise that this policy would rule out any development on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus, and that the proposed development in South Canterbury would be incompatible with this policy.	
Policy LB2	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6091	Objecting	There must be a clear understanding of what is meant by unacceptable. KCC suggest additional wording. NPPF 58 and European Landscape Convention refer to landscape character and history which should be integrated into planning policies. This approach is not reflected by map in Local Plan. Selective approach suggests landscape outside designations is unimportant - not the case. See 12 core planning principles in NPPF and this should be covered in plan.	KCC suggest something like; "development proposals which run contrary to landscape character (this includes settlement character), or impact directly or indirectly upon archaeological or nature conservation interests." The question needs to be "does the SPD help a planner make the decision about unacceptable harm to landscape character?" Or does it encourage an opinion rather than evidence to be used. If it relies on opinion, it will lead to inconsistent planning decisions in relation to landscape - which should be strongly resisted. The approach to landscape (all landscapes) needs to be robust and evidence-led and work hard (like the LCA process) to reduce subjectivity.
Policy LB2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6671	Supporting	Supported, particularly as:"Development proposals which would cause unacceptable harm to their landscape character, archaeological or nature conservation interest will not be permitted" In our opinion, the proposals in this Plan for Site 2 do cause"unacceptable harm" and should, therefore, not be permitted.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB2	784495	P Manser		6976	Objecting	This appears to be very narrowly drawn up with no consideration to the surroundings of the designated areas limiting the policy to "within these areas". This is in despite of the comment at 10.12 b) regarding Blean Woods"particularly where it improves habitat connectivity of the Blean woodlands".	
Policy LB3	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1365	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity -I agree with policy LB3 in this chapter.	
Policy LB3	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3140	Objecting	We are concerned that the need to protect the international and national designations along the undeveloped coast is not highlighted within this policy. It is our view that it is imperative that the designated sites are protected from development. We therefore recommend that the following clause be inserted within the policy:	Development will not be permitted if it detracts from the unspoilt scenic quality or scientific value of the undeveloped coast or impacts on the internationally or nationally designated sites as shown on the Proposals Map. Applicants must ensure that the proposed development does not alter coastal process along the coast
Policy LB3	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5382	Objecting	However, it is important that policies to protect the undeveloped coast do not unduly restrict provision of essential water supply and wastewater infrastructure should the need arise. The policy text should recognise that essential utility development will be permitted in exceptional circumstances, if no alternative site is available. Amend as outlined	Add to the end of policy LB3: ...unless the proposal is for essential utility infrastructure, and the benefit of the development outweighs any harm.
Policy LB3	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5641	Supporting	Whitstable The Council's concerns and policies re-the flood danger are welcome, as are the policies pertaining to the protection of the undeveloped coast at Seasalter and Swalecliffe.	
Policy LB3	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6101	Supporting	Support	
10.16	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1832	Supporting	Paragraphs 10.16 and 10.17 on tranquillity support the aims and policies of the Kent Downs Management plan and its supporting guidance.	
10.16	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5631	Objecting	Whitstable More could be done under 10.16 to ensure the tranquillity of Whitstable beaches.	
10.16	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6134	Objecting	The plan needs to encourage minimisation of water craft noise at beaches by specific mention of the beaches/coast as countryside and this issue	To maximise tranquillity, please action in the local plan the proposal approved by the Whitstable and Herne Bay Safety Committee to apply the inshore speed limit to all areas next to the beach for all craft not actually towing skiers by stating this is the local plan; if necessary for Whitstable only which has a charter completely different to Herne Bay ; despite this being inadequately set out in this plan. In addition make it a policy to prevent further deterioration in the tranquillity of beaches in the town that do not have launch sites. This is a Whitstable specific policy request

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
10.17	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6674	Objecting	'...Seeking and escape in urban areas is one of the main reasons for visits to the countryside'. It is also why many people want to LIVE there. They do not expect the urban area to move in as a permanent, unwanted resident !	
10.18	665473	Dr Richard Norman		576	Supporting	I agree that the landscape character of the district is an important asset. This means, in particular, that Canterbury cannot continue to grow indefinitely. Its character is that of a relatively small city within a rural landscape. It is not a metropolis. Any significant extension of the boundaries of the city would erode its distinctive character.	
10.19	13812	Mr N J Blake		5189	Objecting	The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal 2012 (LCBA) analyses the character and value of all the countryside in the District. It is felt that not enough weight has been given to the former and that the latter has been treated as a "tick box exercise" and then disasterously ignored. Unfortunately it appears that it has not been incorporated by those preparing the plan.	
10.20	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2948	Objecting	Para 10.20 states'Context and local distinctiveness must be considered in all proposals for new development and the Council will seek to ensure that the landscape character is reinforced, restored, conserved or improved as appropriate. This objective will be difficult to fully accommodate with either New Thanington or South Canterbury.	There will be inevitable change even though both have enhancements. This should be recognised and changes made to the text in the Preferred Option Draft Consultation to allow for the creation of new landscapes as a necessary requirement of strategic development .
10.22	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2949	Supporting	This objective is supported. It is considered that the site at New Thanington is capable of complying with this objective.	
Policy LB4	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		442	Supporting	We support the need that proposals for development must demonstrate that they are informed by and sympathetic to the landscape character of the locality (Policy LB4). My client has submitted Landscape & Visual Appraisal & Ecological Survey (cba 2009) and an Appraisal of Views from Golden Hill (cba 2012) to the Council on land north of Thanet Way, Whitstable (Policy SP3g).	
Policy LB4	665473	Dr Richard Norman		577	Supporting	I support the policy that all development proposals should be assessed for their impact on the landscape character of the area. This policy should be applied to the development proposal for South Canterbury, and should mean that the proposal is rejected.	
Policy LB4	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1367	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity -I agree with policy LB4 in this chapter.	
Policy LB4	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	1704	Objecting	The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal (LCBA) should be a descriptive document. It should recognise that individual sites vary in character. The guidelines for each area should be omitted. They are generally not relevant nor achievable. The tying of this policy to addressing the guidelines is therefore unsound. We also consider the application of Policy LB4 to be an inappropriate policy. The LCBA should be guidance rather than a policy.	This policy should be removed
Policy LB4	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2096	Objecting	Object- to the requirement to address development proposals against the Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal	remove this requirement

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB4	778777	Mr Nick Waldron	The Waldron Family	2131	Objecting	We would comment that the Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal should only be regarded as a descriptive assessment of landscapes and biodiversity as existing in the various parts of the District. The document should not have status as policy, particularly in terms of the guidelines for each character area.	
Policy LB4	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2950	Objecting	This policy requires inter alia a sensitive approach to minimise impact, safeguard tranquillity and enhance the character of the landscape. The proposals should also address the findings of the Landscape and Biodiversity Appraisal with regard to the sensitivity and condition of the particular character areas. Any significant development such as that proposed at New Thanington and South Canterbury will inevitably lead to change and some adverse effects alongside opportunities for enhancement.	This level of change from new development should be recognised by a revised wording in the policy.
Policy LB4	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3141	Supporting	This is an excellent policy which makes the linkages between landscape and ecological value. We welcome the Landscape and Biodiversity Appraisal. It is our view that this innovative document gives clear guidance to ensure that the design of the Green Infrastructure reflects the surrounding habitat which should provide biodiverse corridors and open spaces to aid the dispersal of species through the built environment.	
Policy LB4	777500	Mr & Mrs A R Pierce		4515	Objecting	Object to the application of Policy LB4 - Area of High Landscape Value to land north-west of Sturry Road, Canterbury.	Object to the application of Policy LB4 - Area of High Landscape Value to land north-west of Sturry Road, Canterbury.
Policy LB4	777500	Mr & Mrs A R Pierce		4518	Objecting	We object to the wording of Local Plan Policy LB4 which is not in accordance with the NPPF.	We object to the wording of Local Plan Policy LB4 which is not in accordance with the NPPF.
Policy LB4	784123	A E Estates Developers		5083	Objecting	We would, therefore, comment that inclusion of reference to the LCBA within Policy LB4 gives the document a level of importance beyond its purpose which is to describe the landscape character through the District. Whilst reference can be made to the document within the accompanying text we object to the requirement to address development proposals against the LCBA in Policy LB4.	
Policy LB4	380375	Wrentham Estates		5103	Objecting	Inclusion of reference to the LCBA within Policy LB4 gives the document a level of importance beyond its purpose which is to describe the landscape character through the District. Whilst reference can be made to the document within the accompanying text we object to the requirement to address development proposals against the LCBA in Policy LB4.	
Policy LB4	380258	Mr Mavaddat		5133	Objecting	We would comment that the Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal should only be regarded as a descriptive assessment of landscapes and biodiversity as existing in the various parts of the District. We would, therefore, comment that inclusion of reference to the LCBA within Policy LB4 gives the document a level of importance beyond its purpose. Whilst reference can be made to the document within the accompanying text we object to the requirement to address development proposals against t	Whilst reference can be made to the document within the accompanying text we object to the requirement to address development proposals against the LCBA in Policy LB4.

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB4	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5173	Supporting	The landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal 2012 - identifies the Herne Bay Golf Club as being in an area that is poor with few characteristics and is in need of improvement. The proposals have been developed in line with policy and include enhancements. Policy is considered sound.	
Policy LB4	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5383	Objecting	However, it is important that policies to protect the landscape character do not unduly restrict provision of essential water supply and wastewater infrastructure should the need arise. The policy text should recognise that essential utility development will be permitted in exceptional circumstances, if no alternative site is available.	Add criteria to policy LB4: f. Or if the proposal is for essential utility infrastructure, and the benefit of the development outweighs any harm.
Policy LB4	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6102	Objecting	We would suggest again, that this policy cannot be enabled without having a spatial understanding of landscape character: where are the gaps, which elements or features need enhancing or restoring? Are these enhancements in the right place? Little evidence in the policies of the historic landscape being used to inform developments. We suggest, inline with the Guidelines that historic landscape be recognised in the policies and therefore decisions being taken when determining planning applicatio	
Policy LB4	778733		The John Graham Centre	6618	Supporting	We consider the application of policy LB4 to be a more appropriate policy guidance in an assessment of the development impact on this site.	
Policy LB4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6675	Supporting	Policy LB4 -The statement that the "Council will take every opportunity to reinforce, restore, conserve or improve, as appropriate,the landscape character of the area in which they are proposed" is reassuring. Site 2 and also site 8 conflict with parts a, b, c and d of the policy. The proposals of the Plan contradict the aims of this Policy.	Development at Sites 2 and 9 should NOT BE PERMITTED.
Policy LB4	778739	Mr A Salvatori		6756	Supporting	We consider the application of policy LB4 to be a more appropriate policy guidance in an assessment of the development impact on this site.	
10.31	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5438	Objecting	It is disturbing that even one of the most highly protected rural areas will not be safe from intrusive development under the Draft Local Plan. Policy LB5 is very weak even acknowledging that a significant effect will be allowed on protected European sites. Again the policy is severely restricted to the site rather than also considering the setting and surrounding area of the European site.	
10.31	784495	P Manser		6977	Objecting	It is disturbing that even one of the most highly protected rural areas will not be safe from intrusive development under the Draft Local Plan. Policy LB5 is very weak even acknowledging that a significant effect will be allowed on protected European sites. Again the policy is severely restricted to the site rather than also considering the setting and surrounding area of the European site.	
Policy LB5	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1369	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity -I agree with policy LB5 in this chapter.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB5	779286	Mr Mark Aplin	Planning Policy Team Leader Shepway District Council	2077	Supporting	Shepway has internationally recognised habitats. Under Habitats Regulations, Canterbury's proposals should consider in combination effects of the plan with other proposals elsewhere on designated sites. It is noted in chapter 5 of the study produced for the consultation that whilst plans for several other districts are listed, it does not mention Shepway's proposals (although some sites in the area are noted).	
Policy LB5	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2955	Supporting	Fairly standard and appropriate	
Policy LB5	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3142	Objecting	Unfortunately Kent Wildlife Trust cannot support either the policy or the text in its present form as it does not provide adequate protection for the internationally designated sites within the area. Due to the level of impact on the Blean Complex, Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay and Stodmarsh it is our view that a significant amount of work is required to ensure that the integrity of the sites are not compromised.	As the in-combination impacts will stretch across many of the sites and district boundaries, it will be imperative that Sustainable Access Management and Monitoring Strategies are agreed with all developments likely to have an impact and all Local Authorities that contain sections of the site within their boundaries or are found to be contributing significantly to visitor numbers. The SAMMS will need to be based on up to date evidence regarding existing visitor numbers and bird disturbance, and provide a resilient strategy to ensure visitors are controlled and the site's resilience is strengthened.
Policy LB5	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3240	Supporting	RSPB supports the recommended amendments to the Core Strategy text as set out in the AA. RSPB welcomes the precautionary approach set out in this policy.	
Policy LB5	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4087	Objecting	Support this Policy, but in the second para delete "is unable to", put an s on "conclude" and alter "no" to "an"	In the second para delete "is unable to" , put an s on "conclude " and alter " no " to " an "
Policy LB5	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5175	Supporting	Consider LB5 to be sound, because the Herne Bay Golf Club is located within 1.6km of the Thanet Coast & Sandwich Bay SPA and Blean Complex SAC so the proposals for the Site will be supported by an Appropriate Assessment. Through securing appropriate mitigation measures on Site, the Assessment will demonstrate that the proposal, will not have an adverse impact on sites of international nature conservation.	
Policy LB5	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5440	Objecting	Policy LB5 should be amended so as not to allow development where there will likely be a significant effect on a protected site.	Policy LB5 should be amended so as not to allow development where there will likely be a significant effect on a protected site.
Policy LB5	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5805	Supporting	The importance of the internationally designated sites within the district is acknowledged and the potential impact of development on land at South Hersden on the Stodmarsh NNR (SAC, SPA, Ramsar) have been very carefully reviewed. A very detailed Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report is appended to these representations. As such these Habitat Regulations do not pose a barrier to achieving development on the Land at South Hersden in the short term.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB5	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5830	Supporting	The importance of the internationally designated sites within the district is acknowledged and the potential impact of development on land at South Hersden on the Stodmarsh NNR (SAC, SPA, Ramsar) have been very carefully reviewed. A very detailed Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report is appended to these representations. As such these Habitat Regulations do not pose a barrier to achieving development on the Land at South Hersden in the short term.	
Policy LB5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6676	Supporting	Excellent. (It is allways better, if in doubt, to do now't)	
Policy LB5	784495	P Manser		6979	Objecting	Policy LB5 should be amended so as not to allow development where there will likely be a significant effect on a protected site.	Policy LB5 should be amended so as not to allow development where there will likely be a significant effect on a protected site.
10.32	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3144	Objecting	Concerned that little reference is made to the in-combination impacts on Stodmarsh and the Blean Complex as a result of the development planned. We have calculated that there is likely to be an impact on Stodmarsh from the Strategic sites alone of at least 5800 houses with this pressure increasing significantly if Howe Barracks and Land South of the A28 Hersden are developed. There are 4200 houses planned on strategic sites within 2.5km of the Blean Complex SAC.	Resilient mitigation strategies also need to be formulated for these site to ensure visitor pressure and urbanising impacts such as fire setting, off roading and rubbish disposal do not impact on the biodiversity for which the sites are designated.
10.33	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5439	Objecting	This is not translated into a policy statement.	
10.33	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6731	Objecting	In farm practice, the repeated use of insecticides and pesticides in combination with changes in weather patterns, has resulted in the decimation of insect life. Habitat restoration programmes can form part of land-use planning but for such programmes to be effective it is essential to implement planning policies aimed at reducing the disturbance that is having an impact on the smaller species.	
10.33	784495	P Manser		6978	Objecting	This is not translated into a policy statement.	
10.34	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2952	Objecting	If the assessment which is undertaken at the time of a planning application shows that the development has an adverse effect upon the integrity of the North Kent Marshes SPA which cannot be mitigated, the development may not be given planning permission. The draft Local Plan therefore does not have certainty that strategic sites are deliverable.	
10.35	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2951	Objecting	The Council is required under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 to assess the impacts of the Local Plan upon all European sites. Paragraph 10.35 of the draft Local Plan shows that there has been no assessment of impacts upon Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA. The plan therefore fails to meet regulatory requirements.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
10.35	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3143	Objecting	we would urge Dover, Thanet and Canterbury Councils to work in partnership with other statutory and non-statutory organisations to ensure an up to date evidence base in relations to existing visitor pressure and bird disturbance and agree a cross boundary strategy in relation to Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay SPA and Ramsar Site. Studies have been undertaken by Dover District Council, Thanet Coast Project and Kent Wildlife Trust that can be used to inform the strategy, however there is likely to	It is unlikely that alternative natural open space be sufficient to entirely alleviate pressure, however the open space will play an important role in deflecting some visitors from using the coast. It is likely that on-site measures such as wardening will be required to ensure visitors are controlled and birds are not disturbed.
Policy LB6	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	253	Objecting	Policies LB6(b) and LB7: We are strongly critical of these: SSSIs and other important sites are not unequivocally protected. There should be an absolute commitment to the preservations of these sites by ruling out any development proposals. The whole chapter appears to be aimed at generating "get-out" clauses and negates many of the avowed good intentions of the overall Plan.	
Policy LB6	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1149	Supporting	The Parish of Waltham includes Yocketts Bank within its curtilage, which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and is particularly important for its population of the Lady orchid. WPC welcomes the first part of Policy LB6 which states that"planning permission will not be granted for development which would materially harm the scientific or nature conservation interest, either directly, indirectly or cumulatively, of sites designated for their nature conservation".	
Policy LB6	763696	Mrs Lynn Saxby	Parish Clerk Waltham Parish	1151	Objecting	WPC is concerned that the policy includes an easement that developments affecting an SSSI could be permitted where an appraisal has demonstrated that "any significant adverse effects on the qualities for which the area has been designated are clearly outweighed by social or economic benefits of national importance and a substitute site of at least equal value can be proposed".	WPC would like to see this easement removed as it is often difficult to relocate rare plants. In common with Policy HE8, Policy LB6 makes reference to the loss of an asset could be justified if it is outweighed by social or economic benefits of national importance but there is insufficient indication as to how the social or economic benefits would be judged to outweigh the loss of biodiversity in an SSSI if it were affected by a development. Therefore if this easement is retained in Policy LB6, a much higher bar should be set to any judgemental test.
Policy LB6	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1370	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity - I agree with policy LB6 in this chapter.	
Policy LB6	778931	Miss Gemma Avory	Water Resources Planner South East Water	1526	Objecting	It is considered that this policy conflicts with the requirements of the NPPF and as such is unsound.	Bring the policy in line with the NPPF requirements
Policy LB6	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2959	Supporting	Fairly standard and appropriate	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB6	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3146	Objecting	We have identified that a number of SSSIs are likely to be indirectly impacted by the plan which do not have European status. As many of these SSSIs contain ancient woodland then section b of the policy could not be delivered. This is due to ancient woodland being irreplaceable. We cannot support SSSIs being impacted if replaced as SSSIs are identified as they contain the best habitat or species populations within Britain. It is unlikely that a site of equal biodiversity value could be identified	
Policy LB6	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3241	Objecting	The RSPB welcomes this policy but recommend changes to wording to bring in line with the NPPF 2012.	"Development that affects a Site of Special Scientific Interest or associated National Nature Reserve will only be permitted where an appraisal has demonstrated: a. The objectives and features of the designated area and overall integrity of the area would not be compromised, or b. Any significant adverse effects on the qualities for which the area has been designated cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts) or adequately mitigated, and these adverse effects are clearly outweighed by social or economic benefits of national importance and a compensatory site of at least equal value can be proposed." Delete'substitute'.
Policy LB6	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4088	Objecting	Support this Policy, but delete "significant" from b.	Delete " significant " from b.
Policy LB6	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5176	Supporting	The Former Herne Bay Golf Club is not located within close vicinity to a SSSI or National Nature Reserve. The development will therefore not result in harm to these designations. The policy as currently worded is supported and is considered to be 'Sound'.	
Policy LB6	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5443	Objecting	Policy LB6 will not allow development that causes material harm of designated sites. Material harm is not defined. The expectation is given that development will be permitted following an appraisal. This policy should be strengthened by removing the word 'materially' from "materially harm" and paragraph 2 should be removed.	Policy LB6 should be strengthened by removing the word 'materially' from "materially harm" and paragraph 2 should be removed.
Policy LB6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6677	Supporting	Supported, with reservations. Who compiles the appraisal? Who pays them? Is their impartiality guaranteed?	
Policy LB6	784495	P Manser		6982	Objecting	Policy LB6 will not allow development that causes material harm of designated sites. Material harm is not defined. The expectation is given that development will be permitted following an appraisal. This policy should be strengthened by removing the word 'materially' from "materially harm" and paragraph 2 should be removed.	Policy LB6 should be strengthened by removing the word 'materially' from "materially harm" and paragraph 2 should be removed.

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
10.40	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4090	Objecting	Add to the end: "The Council proposals also include "Green Gaps" which too play an important part in conserving and assisting biodiversity, and in maintaining the difference between the built environment and the countryside. The Council will ensure that the integrity of these Gaps remains and will not permit development within them."	Add to the end: "The Council proposals also include "Green Gaps" which too play an important part in conserving and assisting biodiversity, and in maintaining the difference between the built environment and the countryside. The Council will ensure that the integrity of these Gaps remains and will not permit development within them."
Policy LB7	771947	Mr Tony O'Sullivan	Chairman Wickambreaux Parish Council	255	Objecting	Policies LB6(b) and LB7: We are strongly critical of these: SSSIs and other important sites are not unequivocally protected. There should be an absolute commitment to the preservations of these sites by ruling out any development proposals. The whole chapter appears to be aimed at generating "get-out" clauses and negates many of the avowed good intentions of the overall Plan.	
Policy LB7	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		443	Supporting	We support Policy LB7 and believe Policy SP3g fully complies with the objectives set out in this policy. We have engaged with FODD and the local community from the outset and have taken on board many of the points raised and through this process have their general support on the benefits offered through Policy SP3g.	
Policy LB7	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1372	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity - I agree with policy LB7 in this chapter.	
Policy LB7	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2960	Supporting	Fairly standard and appropriate	
Policy LB7	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3148	Objecting	As administrators of the LWS network we cannot support this policy as it does not provide adequate protection for the network. We would not agree that any LWS habitat should be lost to development and do not support the criteria that development can occur if the justification for the proposals clearly outweighs any harm to the intrinsic nature conservation and/or scientific value of the site. It is not possible to provide habitat of a similar value and therefore impacts cannot be alleviated.	
Policy LB7	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4089	Objecting	Support this Policy, but: in the second sentence delete "the" and replace with "any". In the third sentence delete "measures.....required." Add at end "development will not be permitted."	in the second sentence delete " the " and replace with " any ". In the third sentence delete " measures.....required ." Add at end " development will not be permitted."
Policy LB7	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5179	Supporting	The Former Herne Bay Golf Club, is located within 1.1km of Curtis Wood, which is a Local Nature Reserve. It is positioned to the south of the Site and is separated by a number of minor and major roads. The Site is not positioned close to any Local Wildlife Sites or regionally important geological/geomorphological sites. The development will therefore not result in harm to these designations. The policy as currently worded is supported and is considered to be'Sound'.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB7	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5444	Objecting	This policy as currently written is very weak. It reads as written from a pro developments stance without appropriate checks and balances. This policy should be clarified to explain how the balance between protection and justification for development is to be struck.	This policy should be clarified to explain how the balance between protection and justification for development is to be struck.
Policy LB7	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5806	Objecting	KWT have acknowledged that the masterplan for South Hersden will result in very real ecological benefits for the site overall and will safeguard the long term future of the important species on the site notably the lichen heath colony, which without professional management is likely to disappear from the site altogether. In terms of the RIGS designation the local Kent RIGS group have confirmed in writing that they have no objection to the former colliery site being redeveloped.	It is requested that the LWS and RIGS designations identified within the Proposals Map on the former colliery site should be deleted accordingly.
Policy LB7	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5831	Objecting	KWT have acknowledged that the masterplan for South Hersden will result in very real ecological benefits for the site overall and will safeguard the long term future of the important species on the site notably the lichen heath colony, which without professional management is likely to disappear from the site altogether. In terms of the RIGS designation the local Kent RIGS group have confirmed in writing that they have no objection to the former colliery site being redeveloped.	It is requested that the LWS and RIGS designations identified within the Proposals Map on the former colliery site should be deleted accordingly.
Policy LB7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6678	Supporting	Policy LB7 - Supported with reservations. "... will only be permitted if the justification for the proposals clearly outweighs any harm to the intrinsic conservation and/or scientific value of the site. ..." Who is making this judgement? Can their impartiality be guaranteed? Who is paying them?	
Policy LB7	784495	P Manser		6983	Objecting	This policy as currently written is very weak. It reads as written from a pro developments stance without appropriate checks and balances. This policy should be clarified to explain how the balance between protection and justification for development is to be struck.	This policy should be clarified to explain how the balance between protection and justification for development is to be struck.
10.43	779087	Mr Paul McNally	Acting Chair Whitstable Beach Campaign	4528	Supporting	We support paragraph 11.43, in recognition of the beach as an important amenity open space.	
10.43	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5597	Objecting	Applicable to all the above chapters: We need explicit protection of the remaining undisturbed track-bed and embankment of the former Crab and Winkle Railway Line in Whitstable i.e. the sections from the end of the existing cycleway in the vicinity of All Saints Close and along the rear of Clare road to the Sidings development.	This wooded corridor should be protected as a crucial green buffer with important biodiversity features
10.44	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4773	Supporting	Support messages and policies dealing with Landscape Scale Biodiversity Networks.	
10.44	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5445	Objecting	The further fragmentation through destruction of 'nature corridors' by allowing large scale development in rural agriculture areas is not covered by a policy statement.	The further fragmentation through destruction of 'nature corridors' by allowing large scale development in rural agriculture areas is not covered by a policy statement.

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
10.44	784495	P Manser		6985	Objecting	The further fragmentation through destruction of 'nature corridors' by allowing large scale development in rural agriculture areas is not covered by a policy statement.	The further fragmentation through destruction of 'nature corridors' by allowing large scale development in rural agriculture areas is not covered by a policy statement.
10.45	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5446	Objecting	Acknowledges the importance of "improving, connecting and extending wildlife rich areas". This is not translated into a policy statement.	
10.45	784495	P Manser		6987	Objecting	Acknowledges the importance of "improving, connecting and extending wildlife rich areas". This is not translated into a policy statement.	
10.48	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4770	Supporting	Support reference to "connectivity of habitats" and the link to GI (para 10.49).	
10.48	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5447	Objecting	Encouragingly this paragraph highlights the importance of the connectivity of habitats. However, the phrasing is blunted by the inclusion of the words "where possible". This is not translated into a policy statement.	
10.48	784495	P Manser		6990	Objecting	Encouragingly this paragraph highlights the importance of the connectivity of habitats. However, the phrasing is blunted by the inclusion of the words "where possible". This is not translated into a policy statement.	
Policy LB8	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		444	Supporting	We support the Policy LB8 and the need to avoid fragmentation of existing habitats and through Policy Sp3g we will create a coherent ecological network through urban and rural areas by extending the existing Duncan Down site and by retaining notable ecological features such as Benarce Wood and also providing additional open space and allotments as part of the Biodiversity Opportunity Area Plan.	
Policy LB8	665473	Dr Richard Norman		578	Supporting	I agree with the importance of preserving the connectivity of habitats and ecological networks.	
Policy LB8	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1373	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity - I agree with policy LB8 in this chapter.	
Policy LB8	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1791	Supporting	This policy is to be supported, as it is all too easy to loose areas gradually and end up with isolated pockets of habitat.	
Policy LB8	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2962	Supporting	Fairly standard and appropriate	
Policy LB8	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3150	Supporting	This is an excellent policy. We welcome the commitment to the delivery of the Biodiversity Opportunity Areas and the protection given to the BOAs within the policy. It will be important within the Green Infrastructure Strategy that delivery mechanisms are identified to ensure that at least some parts of the BOAs are enhanced and managed within the Plan period. We, as partners, will work with the council to ensure the BOAs are delivered.	We recommend that the BOAs within Canterbury are mapped within the final Local Plan.

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB8	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4099	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but add to b. "Any lighting that is harmful/disruptive to such species will not be permitted".	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but add to b. " Any lighting that is harmful/disruptive to such species will not be permitted" .
Policy LB8	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4771	Supporting	We welcome the commitments made in Policy LB8.	
Policy LB8	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6103	Objecting	KCC would like to highlight the conflict between the presence of ancient woodland within'Site 2 Land at Sturry / Broad Oak' and Policies LB8 and LB12 which provides for the protection of ancient woodland. Although ancient woodland retained, when surrounded by development and a new link road there is high potential for a detrimental impact, contrary to NPPF. There are also fragmented areas which need to assessed. Need to reference the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.	
Policy LB8	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6679	Supporting	Excellent	
10.50	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4775	Supporting	Support messages and policies dealing with Protected Habitats Outside Designated Areas.	
10.50	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5448	Objecting	This is not translated into a policy statement. Policy LB9 is weakly drafted"wherever possible" /"where this is not possible".	
10.50	784495	P Manser		6991	Objecting	This is not translated into a policy statement. Policy LB9 is weakly drafted"wherever possible" /"where this is not possible".	
Policy LB9	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1374	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity - I agree with policy LB9 in this chapter.	
Policy LB9	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2963	Supporting	Fairly standard and appropriate. Policy LB11 duplicates LB9 and LB10.	
Policy LB9	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3159	Supporting	This is an excellent policy providing protection for Habitats of Principal Importance. This is the first time we have seen a policy which gives such strong protection to these habitats and we welcome and endorse Canterbury City Council's vision.	
Policy LB9	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5183	Supporting	On the Former Herne Bay Golf Club there are Habitats of Principle Importance, such as hedgerow. However the development proposals will secure measures to mitigate any impact the proposals may have on these features, as is currently required by the policy. The policy as currently worded is supported and is considered to be'Sound'.	
Policy LB9	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6105	Objecting	KCC would like to highlight the conflict between the presence of ancient woodland within'Site 2 Land at Sturry / Broad Oak' and Policies LB8 and LB12 which provides for the protection of ancient woodland. Although ancient woodland retained, when surrounded by development and a new link road there is high potential for a detrimental impact, contrary to NPPF. There are also fragmented areas which need to assessed. Need to reference the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB9	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6680	Supporting	Excellent	
10.56	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4772	Objecting	There is a need for data on protected species prior to considering development proposals. The same principle should apply to the allocation process in order to avoid sites which will prove difficult to develop.	
10.56	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4777	Supporting	Support messages and policies dealing with Protected Species.	
10.56	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5449	Objecting	This stance is commendable but it is disappointing that CCC itself has A) Prepared the Draft Local Plan without the benefit of the Kent Wildlife Habitat Survey which will be available in 2013 B) Designated specific proposed sites in the local Draft Local Plan without undertaking ecological baseline surveys specific to the sites. It is disappointing that CCC do not undertake to go beyond their basic minimum legal duty toward protected species.	
10.56	784495	P Manser		6992	Objecting	This stance is commendable but it is disappointing that CCC itself has A) Prepared the Draft Local Plan without the benefit of the Kent Wildlife Habitat Survey which will be available in 2013 B) Designated specific proposed sites in the local Draft Local Plan without undertaking ecological baseline surveys specific to the sites. It is disappointing that CCC do not undertake to go beyond their basic minimum legal duty toward protected species.	
10.57	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6733	Objecting	It should be of major concern that the various guides to faunal protection are likely not to be comprehensive i.e. there is no guidance for the protection of UK species of amphibians, bee and other pollinators. Of equal concern is the decline of flies, beetles, moths and butterflies. The Council must have a Policy stating that they will work in partnership with local and national nature conservation organisations to help ensure the survival and continued sustainability of the range of wildlife	
Policy LB10	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1375	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity - I agree with policy LB10 in this chapter.	
Policy LB10	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2097	Objecting	Object- to the irrelevancy of the first sentence of the second paragraph.	delete
Policy LB10	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2965	Supporting	Fairly standard and appropriate. Policy LB11 duplicates LB9 and LB10.	
Policy LB10	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3160	Supporting	This is an excellent policy providing good protection for Species protected under the law and Species of Principal Importance. This is the first time we have seen a policy which gives such strong protection to these species and we welcome and endorse Canterbury City Council's vision.	
Policy LB10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4101	Objecting	Support this Policy, but in the first para after "enhancement" insert "and to lodge these with planning applications."	In the first para after " enhancement " insert " and to lodge these with planning applications ."

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB10	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5186	Objecting	Object to relocation of development as an appropriate mitigation measure in policy LB10 because: it does not accord with NPPF (sec 11); sites identified by LDP may need to be relocated, this should be assessed/determined in advance/outset of plan as stated in NPPF (117, 165); policy is unsound because it is not effective and not consistent with national policy. Amend as outlined.	Amend paragraph 2 of policy LB10 by deleting first sentence as follows: 'In some cases it may be necessary to find an alternative location for the development, to avoid harm to wildlife and geological interests.' and in second sentence deleting 'also'
Policy LB10	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5450	Objecting	As drafted, this policy permits damaging development as long as there are compensation measures through "offsite contributions". For example, development that destroys protected species could be allowed in lieu of a financial contribution to say a nature reserve?	
Policy LB10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6681	Supporting	Supported with reservations. Can the independence of the ecological survey be guaranteed? It will be in the interest of the developers who have commissioned the survey for the findings to be in their favour.	
Policy LB10	784495	P Manser		6993	Objecting	As drafted, this policy permits damaging development as long as there are compensation measures through "offsite contributions". For example, development that destroys protected species could be allowed in lieu of a financial contribution to say a nature reserve?	
10.6	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6682	Supporting	'Excessive external lighting can be a particular issue...'. Relieved that this point is included here. It has considerable relevance for Den Grove Wood.	
Policy LB11	380257	Devine Homes Strand Lucchesi Buchan		445	Supporting	All development should avoid a net loss of biodiversity and actively pursue opportunities to achieve a net gain. We support this objective and this principle is applied to site 7 Policy SP3g (Thanet Way, Whitstable) where the site has been evaluated and has identified opportunities to improve and enhance the nature conservation as part of the development proposal particularly where a connected series of sites can be achieved i.e. Duncan Down (and its enlargement) and Benarce Wood.	
Policy LB11	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1376	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity - I agree with policy LB11 in this chapter.	
Policy LB11	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2967	Supporting	Fairly standard and appropriate. Policy LB11 duplicates LB9 and LB10.	
Policy LB11	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3161	Supporting	This again is an excellent policy and fully conforms to the vision to protect habitats and species within development. We welcome the requirement to undertake surveys, protect land that is valuable for biodiversity and provide adequate mitigation and compensation if harm occurs.	
Policy LB11	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3242	Objecting	The RSPB would suggest that the following is amended to clarify its meaning:	"Any mitigating measures that may be provided must be within the control of the developer".

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB11	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5191	Objecting	Policy LB11 conflicts with LB10, where point b requires both compensation and mitigation measures to be secured, where a development proposal would harm habitats or species of principal importance. Policy LB10 states that only where a development results in 'significant harm', that compensation measures may be required. This accords with NPPF (118) and the approach is considered to be 'Sound'. Amend Policy LB11 to reflect National Policy.	Amend policy LB11 b) as follows: insert at beginning 'If a development results in significant harm' delete words ' compensation and' after mitigation include words ' or compensation' after measures include words 'shall be' and delete word 'are'
Policy LB11	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5451	Objecting	This policy permits development which is known will harm habitats or species of Principal importance if there are no reasonable alternatives and there are social or economic benefits. This policy wording should be strengthened to provide robust protection.	This policy wording should be strengthened to provide robust protection.
Policy LB11	14131	Mr M Preston	The MHP Partnership	5807	Supporting	The principles for the development of land at South Hersden have specifically sought to ensure a comprehensive network of habitats are created and preserved within the site in perpetuity. There is a demonstrable net gain in biodiversity features on the site coupled with ongoing management which will ensure these species rich habitat will remain in the long term. Development of land at South Hersden will be fully compliant with Policy LB11.	
Policy LB11	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5832	Supporting	The principles for the development of land at South Hersden have specifically sought to ensure a comprehensive network of habitats are created and preserved within the site in perpetuity. There is a demonstrable net gain in biodiversity features on the site coupled with ongoing management which will ensure these species rich habitat will remain in the long term. Development of land at South Hersden will be fully compliant with Policy LB11.	
Policy LB11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6683	Supporting	Policy LB11 - Opening sentence has support, but then reservations: (a) "ensuring that site evaluation is undertaken" Who is making the evaluation? Who is paying them? Can impartiality be guaranteed?	
Policy LB11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6684	Objecting	"Developments which may harm€ will only be permitted if€ . b. adequate compensation and mitigation measures are provided€ ." What exactly does "adequate compensation" mean in this context? Where is the compensation directed? Who decides if it is "adequate"?	
Policy LB11	784495	P Manser		6994	Objecting	This policy permits development which is known will harm habitats or species of Principal importance if there are no reasonable alternatives and there are social or economic benefits. This policy wording should be strengthened to provide robust protection.	This policy wording should be strengthened to provide robust protection.
10.64	778374	Mr John Lister	Lead Adviser Natural England	4780	Supporting	Support messages and policies dealing with Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows.	
10.64	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6686	Supporting	!0.64 - 10.66 The recognition of the importance of trees, woodland and hedgerows is greatly appreciated.	
10.64	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6701	Objecting	There are so many Policies making reference to trees, woodland and hedgerows in different Chapters and sections, perhaps they could be pulled together somehow, or at least listed eg DBE 13, HE13, LB12, LB13 and LB14 (and there are possibly more)	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
10.65	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4103	Objecting	Add at the end "Resist KCC's recommendations from its "A New Tree Policy for Kent Highways 2007" in respect of tree conservation and planting in urban areas in order to foster social well-being and help reduce air pollution."	Add at the end "Resist KCC's recommendations from its "A New Tree Policy for Kent Highways 2007" in respect of tree conservation and planting in urban areas in order to foster social well-being and help reduce air pollution."
Policy LB12	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	938	Objecting	This, as worded, is aspiratory rather than practical and will achieve nothing unless backed by a determination to enforce.	Accordingly I ask that the following be added: f. taking enforcement action where there are blatant breaches of the law relating to the protection and preservation of trees, woodland and hedgerows.
Policy LB12	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1377	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity - I agree with policy LB12 in this chapter.	
Policy LB12	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1792	Objecting	The Council need to be consistant and firm in their approach to people who remove important hedges and trees in order to support their stance in this policy. If even the illegal removal of an ancient hedge has no further action taken other than its replanting elsewhere on site, there is no real incentive to stick to these rules it would appear.	
Policy LB12	777655	Ms Emily Shirley	Director Kent Environment & Community Network	2232	Objecting	Climate recovery requires a reduction of carbon consumption by 6%+ each year from the adoption of and throughout the life of the Plan. In addition to this, extensive woodland planting has to occur. This prescription is the best available scientific evidence assembled by the world's leading climatologist Dr Hansen and his colleagues.	Extensive woodland planting has to occur.
Policy LB12	114812	Mr S Fawke	SPOKES	2426	Objecting	A district wide climate recovery plan must be made part of the Local Plan. This will require a 6%+ reduction of carbon each year with massive tree planting across the district.	
Policy LB12	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3162	Supporting	Excellent policy providing protection trees, woodland and hedgerows.	However as mentioned within our comments to the site specific policies this protection needs to be linked into site specific policies with specific mitigation required when ancient woodland is to be impacted directly or indirectly.
Policy LB12	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4104	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but there needs to be a definition of'important' in point a)	Define'important' in point a)
Policy LB12	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5194	Objecting	Support the retention of hedgerows but only if the retention of such features is informed by survey evidence, rather than all hedgerows being retain regardless of quality or lifespan. Policy does not allow the flexibility of mitigation measures which goes against NPPF (152). Approach is not justified as retention may not be the most appropriate option and mitigation measure are not considered. Plan is not effective, justified and consistent with national policy. Amend as outlined.	Add the following paragraph to Policy LB12 : 'Unless it can be demonstrated that hedgerows and woodland are not worthy of retention, having undertaken an up to date survey or the loss of such features is unavoidable, then the City Council will need to be satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures can be secured to sufficiently compensate for their loss.'
Policy LB12	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6106	Objecting	KCC would like to highlight the conflict between the presence of ancient woodland within'Site 2 Land at Sturry / Broad Oak' and Policies LB8 and LB12 which provides for the protection of ancient woodland. Although ancient woodland retained, when surrounded by development and a new link road there is high potential for a detrimental impact, contrary to NPPF. There are also fragmented areas which need to assessed. Need to reference the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB12	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6687	Supporting	Excellent	
10.67	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4106	Objecting	After "settlements" insert "reduce air pollution in urban areas, promote social well-being,".	After " settlements " insert " reduce air pollution in urban areas, promote social well-being, ".
10.67	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6688	Objecting	Mention that any new planting needs to be appropriate with native species appears to have been omitted from this point and Policy LB13.	
10.67	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6690	Objecting	Where the new planting is to provide screening from the new development, as in Site 2 just north of the railway line, the planting would need to be well established before the need for the screening exists and/or be made with already mature specimens.	
10.67	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6910	Supporting	Particularly encouraged that the City Council will require adequate space to be reserved within new developments for trees or other appropriate landscaping, and that Policy LB13 will support this.	
10.68	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		301	Supporting	As above	
10.68	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6691	Supporting	€ Tree Preservation Orders€ '. Good.	
Policy LB13	774999	Mrs Christine Le Jeune		300	Supporting	As above	
Policy LB13	109652	CLlr Michael Dixey		1378	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity - I agree with policy LB13 in this chapter.	
Policy LB13	779262	Mr John Bailey		1978	Supporting	Fully support this especially as against the removal of double hedge on University of Kent land in area known as Chaucer fields or indeed any of their hedges on this land. Biodiversity is vital.	
Policy LB13	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2098	Objecting	Object- to the negative stance of the policy which fails to recognise that vegetation loss may, in some cases, be outweighed by other benefits or that mitigation through re-planting may better serve the amenities of the site and surrounding area.	revise
Policy LB13	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3163	Supporting	Excellent policy providing protection trees, woodland and hedgerows.	However as mentioned within our comments to the site specific policies this protection needs to be linked into site specific policies with specific mitigation required when ancient woodland is to be impacted directly or indirectly.
Policy LB13	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3418	Supporting	I support policy LB13 which calls on the use of tree planting as an integral element of landscaping schemes. I would wish this part of LB13 to be also included as part of any proposal for new housing developments.	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB13	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5200	Objecting	It is not most appropriate strategy, as the retention of trees and hedgerows may not be the most appropriate option, having had regard to survey evidence. Also, it does not allow for potential mitigation measures to be weighted in the balance. This approach does not make the plan flexible, as required by the NPPF, (para 152) and could stop otherwise suitable developments from coming forward, which is inconsistent with NPPF. It fails to be Effective, justified and consistent with national policy.	At the end of the first paragraph of LB13 add 'Unless it can be demonstrated that the trees, hedgerows and woodland are not worthy of retention, having undertaken an up to date survey or the loss of such features is unavoidable, then the City Council will need to be satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures can be secured to sufficiently compensate for their loss.'
Policy LB13	784807	Mr John Pike		5947	Supporting	I also support policy LB13 which calls on the use of tree planting as an integral element of landscaping schemes. I would wish this part of LB13 to be also included as part of any proposal for new housing developments.	I also support policy LB13 which calls on the use of tree planting as an integral element of landscaping schemes. I would wish this part of LB13 to be also included as part of any proposal for new housing developments.
Policy LB13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6693	Objecting	Good,	but please include para 10.67 comment about native species.
Policy LB13	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6746	Objecting	It is necessary to provide a more definitive indication as to the extent of any tree planting required. Failure to do so is likely to mean that only very minimal quantities of trees will be delivered to any development.	
10.69	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6692	Objecting	.. submit a tree survey€!'. This is also mentioned in para 8.76.	
10.70	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6695	Objecting	Where new woodland is allowed to grow....This has been the case on the land south of the A28 between the Staines Road and the railway line and is now an attractive feature of the Sturry landscape. If there is loss of trees at woodland at Den Grove Wood this newer growth deserves protection for the future, as it acts as a buffer between Sturry and Westbere.	
Policy LB14	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1379	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity - I agree with policy LB14 in this chapter.	
Policy LB14	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3164	Objecting	We welcome the support given to the enhancement of the Blean Complex within this policy, however as stated earlier as the policies contain inadequate protection for the SAC from indirect impacts, it is our view that further protection and mitigation is required.	
Policy LB14	784593	Ms Lorraine Manser		5453	Objecting	Whilst this policy states the council will support projects that restore and enhance the Blean woodlands, it does not state that the Council will refuse development that causes damage to the Blean woods or their surroundings.	
Policy LB14	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6111	Objecting	Should promote access and enjoyment to support development of Herne Bay to Canterbury green corridor and Faversham to Canterbury green corridor	

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB14	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6696	Supporting	Excellent	
Policy LB14	784495	P Manser		6996	Objecting	Whilst this policy states the council will support projects that restore and enhance the Blean woodlands, it does not state that the Council will refuse development that causes damage to the Blean woods or their surroundings.	
Policy LB15	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1380	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity - I agree with policy LB15 in this chapter.	
Policy LB15	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3165	Supporting	We welcome and support the vision to enhance and extend the habitats within Seasalter. This will provide true landscape scale enhancement.	
Policy LB15	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3243	Supporting	The RSPB welcomes the inclusion of this policy.	
Policy LB15	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6697	Supporting	Supported	
10.75	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6698	Supporting	Good	
10.76	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6699	Objecting	What about mentioning developments which may affect the amount of water draining into the River Stour? This would be the situation at Site 2 if the proposed scale of development goes ahead it will cover almost all of Sturry Hill and rainwater will no longer be able to seep into the land and then drain into the river.	
Policy LB16	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1381	Supporting	Chapter 10: Landscape and Biodiversity - I agree with policy LB16 in this chapter.	
Policy LB16	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3167	Objecting	We fully endorse the vision to conserve and enhance the river corridors; however the plans within the rest of the Local Plan do not appear to provide this protection at this time. In some areas along the Great Stour areas of LWS habitat are to be lost with developments positioned adjacent to the river with no specification regarding the protection required to ensure no damage to the river corridors.	
Policy LB16	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4857	Objecting	As it stands Policy LB16 will need further elaboration. This will almost certainly be in conflict with paragraph 10.74, which encourages increasing public access to river corridors, and to paragraph 11.79 which notes "The riverside strategy aims to create a network of access routes including long distance walks, town centre footpath links, riverside paths and cycle routes from Chartham to Sturry".	Policy LB16 will need further elaboration.

Summary Chapter 10 - Landscape and Biodiversity

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy LB16	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5201	Supporting	Development proposals for Herne Bay Golf Club, will retain the Plenty Brook corridor running through the centre of the Site. To improve hydraulic function, it is proposed that the alignment of the Brook is straightened. Increases to the bank gradients and other landscaping works, will enhance its ecological value. Increased bank steepness, will specifically improve habitat for water voles. The proposals comply with Policy LB16 so it is considered sound and is supported.	
Policy LB16	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6700	Supporting	Policy LB16 - The environment within river corridors and river catchments, including the landscape, water environment and wildlife habitats will be conserved and enhanced..... AN EXCELLENT POLICY. Where is the money coming from? Who is taking the work on board to deliver it? What, and where, is the programme for this?	
Policy LB16	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6702	Objecting	The river Stour in Canterbury and to the east hardly looks as though anyone cares that much about it. Whose responsibility is it to manage this important, but under-valued aspect of Canterbury District's character?	
Policy LB16	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6748	Objecting	Whilst supportive of the conservation and enhancement of river corridors and catchments and therefore giving promotion to nature and aquatic ecosystems, this policy will almost certainly conflict with increasing public access. It is suggested that some of the rarer ecosystems are offered complete protection from public access in much the same way as applies to Bus Company Island.	The rarer ecosystems should be offered complete protection from public access in much the same way as applies to Bus Company Island.

Comments Summary:

Chapter 11: Open Space



Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.1	777839	Miss Margaret Stirling	Secretart Craddock Road Residents Association	1746	Supporting	Open space is needed for children and adults to be able to rest and play on. It is also for the diverse fauna and flora of the city.	
11.1	779228	Miss Margaret Stirling		1767	Supporting	Attendees were told at a meeting some time ago that there were plans to open up a walkway from Nothgate to Vauxhall Road. When is this going to happen? When plans are made, residents need to be kept informed and the targets need to be achievable	
11.1	779228	Miss Margaret Stirling		1773	Objecting	Brown field sites need to be used to build houses to leave green fields alone for people to enjoy, and to use	
11.1	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1794	Supporting	We would fully support this as it adds to the quality of life for residents. Open Spaces in urban areas are particularly important as it is these areas that people see on a day to day basis and are therefore the most influential in terms of contribution to a healthy human habitat.	
11.1	779262	Mr John Bailey		1980	Supporting	I agree fully with all of this whole section on open spaces. It is excellent.	
11.1	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3719	Supporting	Similarly, we appreciate and support the main thrust of this Chapter.	
11.1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4117	Objecting	The chapter places emphasis on the recreational and public health functions of open space, but very little on the environmental services which open space provides in terms of biodiversity habitat, flood protection etc. This dimension needs strengthening.Much more emphasis should be placed elsewhere in the chapter on the Ecosystem Services which open space provides.	Much more emphasis should be placed on the Ecosystem Services which open space provides.
11.1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4865	Supporting	The chapter on Open Space contains a great deal of excellent material about good practice in the provision of open space of different types and about current provision in the district. We would like it to say more about how the recommended standards can be achieved and about what should be provided in the future.	
11.1	781716	Mr Stephen Hurren	Secretary Whitstable Green Lung	5010	Supporting	Support the section on Open Spaces and the safeguards being put in place to protect the environment for the local communities, and the need for development to be sympathetic. The protection of green corridors and the need to retain green spaces for amenity purposes is also supported.	
11.1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5660	Supporting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:· Open Space chapter 11	
11.1	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6463	Supporting	We support the Council's vision for creating and protecting a comprehensive network of quality accessible open space across the District but we find this is one of the weakest chapters in the whole policy.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6704	Objecting	The Council's vision for open spaces is to..."Develop and interconnected network ... Commendable aim, but how practical and realistic is this? Are funds available? Will it be delivered? Open Space Strategy -Para 1.45: 'the focus for resources of time, funding and partnership working'.	
11.2	779053		Brett Group	1649	Objecting	Object to non-identification/allocation of Public Open Space Object to lack of consideration for the needs of north-western Canterbury's residents Land should be re-allocated at Folly Farm as detailed below	<p>A small enabling development of 13 houses will be required in order to facilitate the laying out of the playing fields and a small car-park and to provide a commuted sum for the future maintenance of the facility. This will ensure that the playing fields can be sustained without being a drain on the financial resources of the City Council. Vehicular access would be via Kemsing Gardens.</p> <p>A Plan is attached showing how the area might be laid out. This is however for illustrative purposes only. The proposed site could accommodate either one full sized football pitch or two junior pitches. The latter is the preferred option providing the better alternative for local community use.</p> <p>The objectors therefore seek the inclusion of the following policy in Chapter 11, the Open Space section of the Plan: Policy OS Land is allocated at Folly Farm, Canterbury as shown on the Proposals Map (Inset 1) for public playing fields, together with an enabling development of 13 dwelling units.</p>
11.2	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1810	Objecting	The Council in its desire for quality open space and its protection, needs to recognise open space which has a high visual amenity value and therefore makes an important contribution to our human habitat. The OSS unfortunately is limited in its scope in that it only includes publically accessible open space and therefore does not include any land which makes an important contribution as visual amenity alone. The strategy on open space needs to consider these non publically accessible spaces.	Include non publically accessible open space in the strategy.
11.2	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1811	Objecting	The Council in its desire for quality open space and its protection, needs to recognise open space which has a high visual amenity value and therefore makes an important contribution to our human habitat. The OSS unfortunately is limited in its scope in that it only includes publically accessible open space and therefore does not include any land which makes an important contribution as visual amenity alone. The strategy on open space needs to consider these non publically accessible spaces.	Include non publically accessible open space in the strategy.
11.2	780985	Ms Jennifer Keaveney		4283	Supporting	I support the Open Space Quality Standard (OS 11.2) "Everyone should have access to a space where children can play within 300 metres of their home(this includes amenity open space"	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4637	Supporting	We welcome the attention the Local Plan gives to the natural environment, including the provision of open spaces, landscape and biodiversity.	
11.2	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4871	Objecting	Suggests various additional proposals relating to protection of existing open space; expanding provision for teens/young adults; opening up school and college playing fields; ensuring the proper maintenance and management of existing parks and playgrounds;and tackling the under-supply of allotments in the city.	Suggests various additional proposals relating to protection of existing open space; expanding provision for teens/young adults; opening up school and college playing fields; ensuring the proper maintenance and management of existing parks and playgrounds;and tackling the under-supply of allotments in the city.
11.2	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6465	Objecting	The gaps in provision (11.24) are of very long standing and Barton Ward for one doesn't need an audit to reveal the value of open space (11.4) or how far short of its own open space quality standard the District falls (11.25). The policy statements reveal complacency, lack of urgency and a weakness of resolve. The vision also appears disingenuous in the light of the proposal to cover the Kingsmead Field with houses.	
11.2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6706	Objecting	The Council has a desire for quality open space to protect, enhance and promote the use of open spaces. The Open Space Strategy ... will set out various objectives to achieve this. A complete circle? 'The Council's open space strategy is 'currently being reviewed and will be updated in line with the adoption of the Local Plan'.	
11.3	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1795	Objecting	Need to add the value of Visual amenity of open space - see comments 1.47 Undeveloped land which has visual amenity should be protected by the planning system	Add value of Visual amenity. Undeveloped land which has visual amenity should be protected by the planning system.
11.4	665473	Dr Richard Norman		579	Supporting	I strongly agree with this statement of the value of open space.	
11.4	777842	Mrs Maria Thomas	Secretary Market Way Area Residents Association	1556	Supporting	The foregoing detailed comments highlight the importance in Kingsmead Field being retained for the benefit of disadvantaged communities and in the preservation of established ecosystem services.	
11.4	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4120	Objecting	We welcome this paragraph, but much more emphasis should be placed elsewhere in the chapter on the Ecosystem Services which open space provides.	
11.4	781400	Charlie Mount		4899	Objecting	Kingsmead field is an important part of the local habitat and should be named for protection in Paragraph 11.4.	Kingsmead Field should be named for protection in Paragraph 11.4
11.4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6709	Objecting	See . Provides ecosystem services . Place setting/visual appeal	Cross reference with 10.13 and Policy DBE 3 Re-check policy SP3 - Site 2 with this aim for 'visual appeal'.
11.5	777842	Mrs Maria Thomas	Secretary Market Way Area Residents Association	1557	Supporting	The preservation of Kingsmead Field would help preserve the balance in the open space distribution in Northgate.	
11.5	781400	Charlie Mount		4900	Objecting	Kingsmead Field should be named for protection in paragraph 11.5 as it is an important resource for Northgate	Kingsmead Field should be named for protection in Paragraph 11.5

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.6	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4121	Objecting	The need for new open space as part of the new developments proposed is noted, but for each of the development sites proposed there needs to be a detailed breakdown of new open space, stating where each new area will be, how large it will be and what its main function will be. See our comment also on Paras 1.56 & 1.57 and policies SP3a-h, which highlight the need for more site specific details about what is proposed.	
11.6	784612	Mr Dale Greetham	Planner Sport England	5758	Objecting	Although it is acknowledged that the Canterbury Open Space and Playing Pitch Strategy has been undertaken, this document does not constitute, in Sport England's opinion, a robust assessment of need. As such, there is a risk that the policies contained in the Core Strategy may be found to be unsound as they are not fully justified.	
11.7	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4122	Supporting	We agree with this point, but the incorporation of open space in new residential areas should not be used to justify the removal of open space in existing residential areas.	
11.7	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6112	Objecting	KCC would draw the Council's attention to the issue that safeguarding issues on school sites means that playing fields at schools cannot be made public space. It may, however, be possible to create community agreements for some sports facilities to enable greater use to be made out of hours where there is demand.	
11.8	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1287	Supporting	We particularly support pledges 1,2,6,9, and 10. It is vital that the plan gets the right number of houses in the right places. At the moment, we do not believe that this has happened. This point directly relates to pledge 9 greater involvement of local people. Canterbury City Council has been judged and found lacking. It is no good just asking our views in something like the consultation on the Local Plan, we wish to be involved and listened to, throughout the life of this plan.	
11.8	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1941	Supporting	Support the commitment to create a comprehensive network of open space across the district, and to protect existing open space. The protection of all the categories of open space listed in 11.19 is essential. There is also support for the statement in 11.58 that the open space to be preserved includes both publicly-owned and privately-owned open space. The proposed building of 100 houses on Kingsmead Field would be incompatible with these policies.	
11.8	781400	Charlie Mount		4901	Objecting	The idea that a series of landscaped pocket areas of grass and planting within the proposed development [of Kingsmead Field] will effectively replace a large green open space is nonsensical. Kingsmead Field should be named in Pledge 5 as an example of a "greener place" as an ecological and educational resource.	Kingsmead Field should be named in Pledge 5 as an example of a "greener place".
11.8	784612	Mr Dale Greetham	Planner Sport England	5752	Supporting	Support - Sport England welcomes the inclusion of Pledge 10 - A broad range of sporting and fitness facilities and activities.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.9	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1288	Supporting	Although the Plan identifies open spaces within housing developments, the spaces involved are small, and designed to give an attractive appearance. No provision has been made for larger spaces which afford free and noisy activities, nor team and ball games. We would strongly urge that Kingsmead field is retained, as it fulfills exactly the ideals contained within this section.	
11.10	777842	Mrs Maria Thomas	Secretary Market Way Area Residents Association	1559	Supporting	This is a wonderful objective and entirely compatible with the retention of Kingsmead Field.	
11.10	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1833	Objecting	Where within, or within the setting of the AONB financial contribution to the management of the AONB which will be impacted by pressures from the new development will be sought. We raise this point under para 1.86 and SP7	Add text as indicated in BOLD: Where within the AONB or its setting a financial contribution to the management of PRow and boundary treatments in perpetuity will be required to mitigate recreational pressures on the AONB's farmed landscape
11.10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6710	Objecting	The Local Plan aims to protect and enhance the existing open space and green infrastructure network ...'. CONTRADICTION! The Plan ensures that acres of 'existing' 'open' greenfield countryside 'space' will be lost to housing development. What does 'open space and green infrastructure network' really mean? Is it realistic and deliverable? If so, good.	
11.12	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	914	Objecting	The growth of the University over recent decades has been exponential. I concur with policy EMP7 but it does not go far enough. I fear that with unchecked development the University could be seen as a cuckoo in Canterbury's nest and this would be counter productive to both the City and the University. Economic contribution made by the University is recognised but it sits in an AHLV that can affect the setting of the cathedral, preservation of Blean Woods and amenity value of open space.	With this in mind I would wish to see the area of Campus to the south of University Road shown on the Proposals Map as designated as Local Green Space (NPPF para 76)
11.12	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6113	Objecting	KCC would draw the Council's attention to the issue that safeguarding issues on school sites means that playing fields at schools cannot be made public space. It may, however, be possible to create community agreements for some sports facilities to enable greater use to be made out of hours where there is demand.	
11.13	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4123	Objecting	These paragraphs present various, and different, definitions of open space which causes confusion. Just one definition should be used.	Just use one definition.
11.13	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6114	Objecting	KCC would draw the Council's attention to the issue that safeguarding issues on school sites means that playing fields at schools cannot be made public space. It may, however, be possible to create community agreements for some sports facilities to enable greater use to be made out of hours where there is demand.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6711	Objecting	Urban Green space - "land that consists predominantly of permeable, soft surfaces such as soil, grass, shrubs or trees". Public open space - " both green spaces and hard 'civic' spaces to which there is public access even though the land may not necessarily be in public ownership"NOTE: THIS RELATES TO WHERE DEVELOPMENT IS PLANNED ON SITE 2	
11.14	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	940	Objecting	I note that cemeteries get but 3 lines notwithstanding the large area that they represent within our District. Unfortunately many of our cemeteries are littered with broken marble and stone - a tasteless mishmash of different styles coupled with the green and blue crystals that were fashionable in the 60's and they do nothing to enhance the areas for biodiversity or wildlife conservation.	I would like to see a policy that states: "Our cemeteries are valuable areas for quiet contemplation and reflection. We will manage them in a way that is sympathetic to this objective and in a way that encourages conservation and biodiversity with planting of trees for their architectural and wildlife value. We will encourage the use of appropriate areas for green burial".
11.14	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	942	Objecting	The expression "informal recreation"would appear to be inappropriate in the draft document although bird watching, poetry recitals, flower arranging, historical research and photography might come within this category.	
11.14	780271	Councillor Alison O'Dea	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3294	Objecting	The proposed policies drafted by my colleague in respect of cemeteries and allotments should be included as what is currently stated fails to give appropriate weight to these important facilities (11.14)	
11.14	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4124	Objecting	These paragraphs present various, and different, definitions of open space which causes confusion. Just one definition should be used.	Just use one definition.
11.14	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5602	Objecting	Green Corridors often have an intrinsic value unrelated to any potential amenity recreational uses and this needs to be acknowledged as well here. They may also contain important and fragile habitats for flora and fauna that require careful and on-going protection and a restriction on human interference. In the case of certain green corridors their ecological, biodiversity and green buffer/ screening value would be seriously compromised and possibly deroyed by recreational incursion.	That fact also needs to be recognised. Their importance and value as ecological 'stepping-stones' also should be made explicit. They often provide crucial links to and/or between other biodiverse sites and, for example, essential flight-paths and foraging routes for bats.
11.14	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6115	Objecting	KCC would draw the Council's attention to the issue that safeguarding issues on school sites means that playing fields at schools cannot be made public space. It may, however, be possible to create community agreements for some sports facilities to enable greater use to be made out of hours where there is demand.	
11.15	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1289	Supporting	Kingsmead field should be retained and developed as both a place of recreation and sport.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.15	777842	Mrs Maria Thomas	Secretary Market Way Area Residents Association	1563	Supporting	The National Planning Policy Framework states that existing open space should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which clearly shows that the open space is surplus to requirements or that the loss resulting from any proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity or quality in a suitable location.	
11.15	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4132	Objecting	This paragraph is out of place in this part of the chapter which is focussing on the definition and typology of open space. It would be more relevant to Policy OS 1, OS 8 and OS 9.	Move to Policy OS 1, OS 8 and OS 9.
11.15	781400	Charlie Mount		4902	Objecting	Kingsmead Field should be included in Paragraph 11.15 as an example of protection of open space within the urban environment.	Kingsmead Field should be included in Paragraph 11.15 as an example of protection of open space within the urban environment.
11.15	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6108	Objecting	This not a workable policy in planning terms as the policy needs to be fleshed out to show different rankings. For example a sports field can genuinely be replaced by another field . But a Local Green Space providing the 'lung' for an area of housing simply cannot be replaced by a site elsewhere.	Flesh out to show ranking of green spaces which exist in practice; especially with NPPF designations.
11.15	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6712	Supporting	NPPF ..."Access to high quality spacescan make an important contribution to health and well being of communities ... Totally endorsed	
11.16	777842	Mrs Maria Thomas	Secretary Market Way Area Residents Association	1565	Supporting	Kingsmead Field fulfills all three conditions of Para 11.16. It would therefore be far more appropriate for the field to be designated as a 'Local Green Space' than allocated for house building. Kingsmead Field is far more valuable in this respect than for any housing development.	
11.16	779087	Mr Paul McNally	Acting Chair Whitstable Beach Campaign	1729	Objecting	Recognition of Whitstable beach as a significant amenity open space should be strengthened by heightening the designation from 'Protected Existing Open Space' to 'Local Green Space' under the terms of the provisions set out in paragraphs 76 to 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Seasalter / Whitstable/ beaches meet all of the qualifying criteria prescribed by the NPPF & set out in DLP paragraph 11.16. The designation should extend from The Sportsman in Seasalter to the Green Gap.	The designation of Whitstable Beach as "Local Green Space" in the CCC Local Plan, rather than the proposed designation of "Protected Existing Open Space" in the Draft Local Plan.
11.16	779246	Mr Paul McNally		1847	Objecting	In order to preserve the unspoilt nature of Whitstable Beach in line with its SSSI status and to prevent development on it Local Green Space designation for Whitstable Beach should be included in the Local Plan as it meets all of the criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework Para 77.	Designate Whitstable Beach as Local Green Space
11.16	779244	Ms Sonia McNally		2014	Objecting	In order to preserve the unspoilt nature of Whitstable Beach in line with its SSSI status and to prevent development on it Local Green Space designation for Whitstable Beach should be included in the Local Plan as it meets all of the criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework Para 77.	To designate Whitstable Beach as Local Green Space in the CCC Local Plan.

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.16	778936	Ms Sally Newcombe	Secretary West Beach PACT & Residents Association	2615	Supporting	We note the designation of "Protection of Existing Open Space" that has been proposed for Whitstable beach. But feel a more appropriate designation would be "Local Green Space" (Para 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework) as the beach meets all of the criteria set out in the NPPF. The area of beach afforded 'Local Green Space designation' should ideally extend from the Sportsman's Public House in Seasalter to the Green Gap as it meets all the requirements in the NPPF.	Whitstable Beach should be identified as a Local Green Space.
11.16	779694	Sian Pettman	Save Kingsmead Field Campaign	2975	Objecting	The National Planning Policy Framework provides communities with the option of identifying land as 'Local Green Space'. Kingsmead Field fulfils all of these conditions. It would, therefore, be far more appropriate for the draft Local Plan to designate Kingsmead Field as a Local Green Space.	It would, therefore, be far more appropriate for the draft Local Plan to designate Kingsmead Field as a Local Green Space.
11.16	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4133	Objecting	Disagree that local green space designations are inappropriate for most green areas - they are the areas where the designation would apply, and would comply with. The Council should invite local communities to put sites forward for designation, and consider designating some of the narrow green gaps between settlements, i.e. between: Sturry and Canterbury; Sturry and Broad Oak; Blean and Rough Common; and Canterbury and Tyler Hill	Invite local communities to put sites forward for designation. Consider designating some of the narrow green gaps between settlements, i.e. between: Sturry and Canterbury; Sturry and Broad Oak; Blean and Rough Common; and Canterbury and Tyler Hill
11.16	782035	Ms Joyce Epps		4990	Objecting	The National Planning Policy Framework provides communities with the option of identifying land as 'Local Green Space'. Kingsmead Field fulfils all of these conditions.	It would, therefore, be far more appropriate for the draft Local Plan to designate Kingsmead Field as a Local Green Space. Kingsmead Field is simply the wrong place for residential development.
11.16	784589	Huei-Rong Wang		5304	Supporting	The National Planning Policy Framework provides communities with the option of identifying land as 'Local Green Space'. Kingsmead Field fulfils all of the conditions. It would, therefore, be far more appropriate for the draft Local Plan to designate Kingsmead Field as a Local Green Space.	It would, therefore, be far more appropriate for the draft Local Plan to designate Kingsmead Field as a Local Green Space.
11.16	784598	V Pamnani		5306	Supporting	The National Planning Policy Framework provides communities with the option of identifying land as 'Local Green Space'. Kingsmead Field fulfils all of the conditions. It would, therefore, be far more appropriate for the draft Local Plan to designate Kingsmead Field as a Local Green Space.	It would, therefore, be far more appropriate for the draft Local Plan to designate Kingsmead Field as a Local Green Space.
11.16	784626	Mrs Maureen Smith		5486	Objecting	Request designation of two Whitstable sites as Local Green Space: 1. Church Street Playing Fields - vital green space used by whole community for sports, leisure, markets, exercise, only park area at southern end of whitstable.	Request site in Whitstable be designated as "Local Green Space": 1. Church Street Playing Fields. Church Street Whitstable.
11.16	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5599	Objecting	Applicable to all the above chapters: We need explicit protection of the remaining undisturbed track-bed and embankment of the former Crab and Winkle Railway Line in Whitstable i.e. the sections from the end of the existing cycleway in the vicinity of All Saints Close and along the rear of Clare road to the Sidings development.	This wooded corridor should be protected as an urban Local Green Space

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.16	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5606	Objecting	Recognition of Whitstable beach as a significant amenity open space should be strengthened by heightening the designation from 'Protected Existing Open Space' to 'Local Green Space' under the terms of the provisions set out in paragraphs 76 to 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The beach meets all of the qualifying criteria prescribed by the NPPF. The designation should extend from The Sportsman in Seasalter to the Coastguard Cottages at Swalecliffe.	I suggest an addendum to Policy OS9 or an extra OS policy to embody and enforce this 'Seasalter-Whitstable-Swalecliffe Beach Local Green Space' designation
11.16	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5636	Objecting	There are additional opportunities to designate more Local Green Spaces. I support the proposals being lodged by the Whitstable Society to request that the following be so designated: (ii) Church Street Playing Fields.	
11.16	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5637	Objecting	There are additional opportunities to designate more Local Green Spaces. I support the proposals being lodged by the Whitstable Society to request that the following be so designated: (iii) Tankerton Slopes	
11.16	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5638	Objecting	There are additional opportunities to designate more Local Green Spaces. I support the proposals being lodged by the Whitstable Society to request that the following be so designated: (v) Prospect Field	
11.16	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5639	Objecting	There are additional opportunities to designate more Local Green Spaces. I support the proposals being lodged by the Whitstable Society to request that the following be so designated: (vi) Westcliff Meadow.	
11.16	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6174	Objecting	Local Green space proposals: - Westcliff Meadow between Westcliff and its ROW extension to the railway bridge to the south and the boundary with the golf links to the north a Local Green Space; because it: satisfies the conditions under the NPPF, is rich in wildlife, is the nearest green space for local houses, used for dog walking and is the ancient river cliff of the river Swale.	Please make Westcliff Meadow between Westcliff and its ROW extension to the railway bridge to the south and the boundary with the golf links to the north a Local Green Space.
11.16	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6177	Objecting	Please add a request for Local Green Space designations for Westmeads Rd and Columbia recreation parks and the Cornwallis Circle grassed area and playground. All serve the very local community, which surrounds them on four sides as a recreational area from children's play through to informal sports as well as dog walking. They are all irreplaceable and match the definition of a Local Green Space	Please add a request for Local Green Space designations for Westmeads Rd recreation park.
11.16	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6178	Objecting	Please add a request for Local Green Space designations for Westmeads Rd and Columbia recreation parks and the Cornwallis Circle grassed area and playground. All serve the very local community, which surrounds them on four sides as a recreational area from children's play through to informal sports as well as dog walking. They are all irreplaceable and match the definition of a Local Green Space	Please add a request for Local Green Space designations for Columbia recreation park.

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.16	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6179	Objecting	Please add a request for Local Green Space designations for Westmeads Rd and Columbia recreation parks and the Cornwallis Circle grassed area and playground. All serve the very local community, which surrounds them on four sides as a recreational area from children's play through to informal sports as well as dog walking. They are all irreplaceable and match the definition of a Local Green Space	Please add a request for Local Green Space designations for the Cornwallis Circle grassed area and playground.
11.16	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6180	Objecting	Seasalter Beach from western end of the Seasalter village green to the point where the Faversham Rd moves from the beach side to the landward side going west and to include the grass slopes / promenade between Preston Parade and the beach be designated as Local Green Space. The beach is of high recreational value for sailing, swimming and other exercise. It has developed typical marine flora in some area and is used by birds in some areas. The whole is SSSI	Seasalter Beach from western end of the Seasalter village green to the point where the Faversham Rd moves from the beach side to the landward side going west and to include the grass slopes / promenade between Preston Parade and the beach be designated as Local Green Space.
11.16	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6181	Objecting	West Beach from the current West Quay up to the caravan park at the eastern end of the Seasalter village green be designated as Local Green Space. The beach is of high recreational value for sailing, swimming and other exercise. It is notably tranquil due to no road and no breaks in the inshore speed limit zone. It has developed typical marine flora. The whole is SSSI. The beach was the site of the boat building industry that lasted for several hundred years .	We request that West Beach from the current West Quay up to the caravan park at the eastern end of the Seasalter village green be designated as Local Green Space.
11.16	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6182	Objecting	The Church St playing fields be designated as Local Green Space. This area has high recreational value for local residents of southern Whitstable and for local teams and is in essence the park of local people and there is no alternative. It also provides a well used area for dog walking It is not extensive.	The Church St playing fields be designated as Local Green Space.
11.16	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6183	Objecting	Tankerton Slopes Prospect Field area between Tower Hill/Marine Parade and Marine Crescent to the south and the high tide mark top the north and from just east of the Continental Hotel in the west to just east of the skateboard park in the east be designated as Local Green Space: to exclude the two houses whose plots are entirely within the area. High recreational value. It is Tranquil. It is the park Tankerton was built around. Beautiful sea views. Historic Copperas industry.	Tankerton Slopes Prospect Field area between Tower Hill/Marine Parade and Marine Crescent to the south and the high tide mark top the north and from just east of the Continental Hotel in the west to just east of the skateboard park in the east be designated as Local Green Space: to exclude the two houses whose plots are entirely within the area.
11.16	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6184	Objecting	Prospect Field, as defined by the Council, and the allotments as well as the strip of land by the railway that runs further east be designated Local Green Space. High recreational value for local residents and visitors. The flora and fauna are carefully protected and their habitat enhanced by the Friends of Prospect Field and the Council. It is beautiful with lovely views. It is the park for east Seasalter. It contains a walking route called the Saxon Shore Way .	Prospect Field , as defined by the Council, and the allotments as well as the strip of land by the railway that runs further east be designated Local Green Space.
11.16	323690	Ms Sian Pettman		6351	Objecting	Kingsmead Field should be designated as a Local Green Space in line with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.	Kingsmead Field should be designated as a Local Green Space in line with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.16	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6713	Objecting	NPPF ...enables local communities, through local and neighbourhood plans, to identify land as 'Local Green Space'. Sturry Parish is without neighbourhood plans due to the failings of the then PC when this was raised with them by CCC on 07.04.2011. Sturry Residents have been completely unaware of this situation. CCC was aware of this. Where is representation of the people? See Introduction to these notes, page 3	
11.16	784626	Mrs Maureen Smith		6758	Objecting	Request designation of two Whitstable sites as Local Green Space: 2. The green land on the corner of Station Rd and Railway Ave - houses commemorative stone and is picturesque piece of green, a seat would be good, has issues with illegal parking.	Request site in Whitstable be designated as "Local Green Space": 1. The green apex of land on the corner of Station Road and Railway Avenue, Whitstable
11.16	785234	Mr John Bayes		6958	Objecting	It has come to our attention that The Open Spaces Society is backing the Whitstable Beach Campaigns submission for Whitstable and Seasalter Beach to become a 'local green space' in Canterbury City Council's local plan. Object to this proposal. Our company is directly concerned with much of this land and owns a significant proportion of it so we require to be kept informed as to what is proposed.	
11.17	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	953	Objecting	I am minded that paragraph 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework creates an additional designation of Local Green Space and paragraph 77 explains that this should relate to areas where the green space is in close proximity to the community it serves, is special and holds local significance because of historic or recreational value.	Accordingly I ask that the following area be afforded Local Green Space designation as it fits the criteria outlined in paragraph 77. Westcliffe Meadow
11.17	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	955	Objecting	I am minded that paragraph 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework creates an additional designation of Local Green Space and paragraph 77 explains that this should relate to areas where the green space is in close proximity to the community it serves, is special and holds local significance because of historic or recreational value.	Accordingly I ask that the following area be afforded Local Green Space designation as it fits the criteria outlined in paragraph 77. The beach from the Sportsman Public House to the Green Gap. In particular the beach is unique to the community of Whitstable. It is used for recreation all year round. It is special to the people of Whitstable as a significant number use it as an alternative walking route as Whitstable uniquely has no seafront roadway. Local Schools use it for educational purposes. Parts of it have SSSI classification. Historically it is linked to the shellfish industry and provides a stimulus for the artistic side of the town. The beach has featured in numerous television productions and films eg the Coast series, Tipping the Velvet etc. The town goes right up to the beach (it couldn't be any closer) and it cannot be regarded as extensive given that it is a narrow strip considerably less than 50 metres wide in many areas. If one wants something extensive look to Dartmoor.

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.17	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	958	Objecting	I am minded that paragraph 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework creates an additional designation of Local Green Space and paragraph 77 explains that this should relate to areas where the green space is in close proximity to the community it serves, is special and holds local significance because of historic or recreational value.	Accordingly I ask that the following area be afforded Local Green Space designation as it fits the criteria outlined in paragraph 77. In Canterbury: Chaucer Fields
11.17	779088	mr james green	director Whitstable Oyster co	1642	Supporting	The areas of beach in the whitstable oyster company's and that of seasalter shellfish's ownership should not have any further designation to local green space as it is an extensive area of land that fulfils many puposes both leisure and commercial within Whitstable. Any further designation may effect the ability of the landowners to utilise the beach for traditional activities such as boat storage and oyster farming. It may well affect the ability to carry out beach replenishment.	
11.17	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	2112	Objecting	This does not make sense as no Local Green Spaces are designated in plan. Substantially reword.	State 'There are no Local Green Spaces marked at this stage as none have yet been proposed'.
11.17	778530	Ms Kate Ashbrook	General Secretary The Open Spaces Society	2754	Objecting	While we are pleased that it is proposed that it should be awarded the designation of 'protection of existing open space', we believe that it should also be designated as Local Green Space as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework. We consider that it fulfils all the criteria for Local Green Space, as explained by the Whitstable Beach Campaign.	We believ that Whitstable Beach should also be designated as Local Green Space as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework.
11.17	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4134	Objecting	Disagree that local green space designations are inappropriate for most green areas - they are the areas where the designation would apply, and would comply with. The Council should invite local communities to put sites forward for designation, and consider designating some of the narrow green gaps between settlements, i.e. between: Sturry and Canterbury; Sturry and Broad Oak; Blean and Rough Common; and Canterbury and Tyler Hill	Invite local communities to put sites forward for designation. Consider designating some of the narrow green gaps between settlements, i.e. between: Sturry and Canterbury; Sturry and Broad Oak; Blean and Rough Common; and Canterbury and Tyler Hill
11.17	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6715	Objecting	This Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces as areas identified for protection are in policy and in shown on the proposed maps.	
11.17	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6717	Objecting	What is the situation for: (a) areas which should have Local Green Space designation if a neighbourhood plan existed for a community? (b) areas of 'open space' shown on proposal maps, but which also have SHLAA interest but are not included As development sites in this Plan? Eg Land south of the A28 at Hersden - see Plan page 15	
11.18	665473	Dr Richard Norman		580	Supporting	I strongly agree with the policy of creating a comprehensive and attractive network of open spaces, the need for a district-wide audit of open space, and the commitment to protect and improve the quality of existing open space.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.18	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1232	Supporting	We welcome the commitment to create a comprehensive network of open space across the district, and to protect existing open space. We believe that the protection of all the categories of open space listed in 11.19 is essential, for the reasons given in that chapter. We welcome the statement in 11.58 that the open space to be	
11.18	777842	Mrs Maria Thomas	Secretary Market Way Area Residents Association	1560	Supporting	The proposed development of Kingsmead Field is totally incompatible with the objectives in Para 11.18.	
11.18	780986	Mr Peter Taylor-Gooby		4302	Objecting	In short it appears that the planning process has been misled by the desire to generate income to the Council through large-scale development. It is unlikely to succeed in this, is likely to damage further the charm and character of Canterbury through more congestion, poorer air and deteriorating environment, and perhaps show a net cost to the Council. Much greater attention to public open space is required.	
11.18	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4566	Supporting	Welcomes the creation of a network of open space across the district, and protection of existing open space. Protection of all the categories of open space in 11.19 is essential. Welcomes 11.58 preserving public and private open space. The semi natural open spaces on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus is of value to the local community. Development must be ruled out in master plan. Development on Kingsmead field conflicts with these policies.	
11.18	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5603	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'sustainable environment'. This includes a concern to expand open spaces.	
11.18	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6726	Objecting	The Council will seek ...a district wide audit€. When has/will this audit take place? How was/is it conducted? By whom? Where are the results in relation to this Local Plan? How often will it be reviewed?	
11.18	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6871	Supporting	Supportive of the objective of creating "a comprehensive and attractive network of formal and informal recreational facilities and open space, which is informed by a district wide audit, to identify areas of need for all forms of open and recreational space".	
11.19	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4125	Objecting	These paragraphs present various, and different, definitions of open space which causes confusion. Just one definition should be used.	Just use one definition.
11.21	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4126	Objecting	These paragraphs present various, and different, definitions of open space which causes confusion. Just one definition should be used.	Just use one definition.
11.22	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4127	Objecting	These paragraphs present various, and different, definitions of open space which causes confusion. Just one definition should be used.	Just use one definition.
11.23	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3071	Supporting	Support for Paragraph 11.23	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.23	479400	Dr Doreen Rosman		3388	Supporting	Welcomes policies committed to protecting the landscape, views across the city, and existing open spaces within urban areas.	
11.23	481630	Dr R B Mallion		3471	Supporting	I support the provisions which shall protect existing open space within the urban boundaries	
11.24	268778	Mrs Janet Hall		174	Objecting	I imagine play areas for children will be included in the housing sites but what about what we have now? These badly need expanding. Telford Council have already done what would be absolutely great in Herne Bay. Play areas at the town park have been developed to suit a range of ages and abilities, and delivered by partnership working and maximising funding sources from grants, short breaks capital and 106 monies. A new water play area has recently been built. Photos and costings available.	
11.24	778376	Ms Susi Brain		1034	Objecting	*On no site plan can I find any specific reference to play areas , only "commercial/leisure" or " community /leisure" etc. There is not at this stage any commitment to playgrounds for children of different ages. The council needs to make additional provision to address the existing appalling deficiency of CHILDREN'S PLAY AREAS in South Canterbury (Wincheap and South Barton wards.)	
11.24	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1290	Supporting	Kingsmead field would provide an ideal area for a mini football pitch in the north of the city. This would also continue the historical association with sport on this ancient site.	
11.24	778880	Ms Sarah Guest		2576	Objecting	What we do need in Canterbury are: . A park and playing field in South Canterbury, including activities for older children. The park at Whitstable Castle is a good example of an area suited to young children (the play park) and older people (the surrounding gardens and tea room). Indeed, park and garden help the businesses there (the café, the venue of Whitstable Castle for weddings etc, the tea garden across the road)	
11.24	404737	Mr Richard Guest		3838	Objecting	What we do need in South Canterbury is: A park and playing field in South Canterbury, including activities for older children. The park at Whitstable Castle is a good example of an area suited to young children (the play park) and older people (the surrounding gardens and tea room). Indeed, park and garden help the businesses there (the café, the venue of Whitstable Castle for weddings etc., the tea garden across the road)	
11.24	781400	Charlie Mount		4903	Objecting	Kingsmead Field should be included in Paragraph 11.24 as an example of protection of open space within the urban environment.	Kingsmead Field should be included in Paragraph 11.24 as an example of protection of open space within the urban environment.
11.24	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5607	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'sustainable environment'. This includes a commitment to preserving the Green corridor to Bridge.	
11.24	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6116	Supporting	KCC would welcome the opportunity to consider with the City Council whether there are any vacant sites in our ownership which might be appropriate	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.24	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6728	Objecting	With the possibility of errors as highlighted in para 11.18 is this list definitive? There is a major gap in provision for Sturry, which has not even been identified. By the calculation in para 11.25 Sturry should have 8.86 ha. Where exactly is this? The populations of each of the three villages of Sturry Parish should be seen separately, just as Fordwich and Westbere communities are.	
11.24	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6925	Objecting	There is very little open space for Sturry residents in the Park View estate area and this is already at risk of further erosion by a planning application which will reduce the recreational/play area. This should be reviewed in light of the Plan's proposals. The developers mention a cricket pitch and a football pitch for Site 2. A replacement cricket pitch would be welcomed. It is unclear what would happen to the existing football club and pitch.	
11.25	771040	Mrs Liz Fairclough		143	Supporting	Whitstable - I fully support the development of outdoor pitches. There are currently insufficient football pitches available, Tankerton FC a registered childrens charity has 30 teams with over 300 children playing football from u6 - u21s, as well as a vets team. We currently incur considerable cost utilising CCW for training 3 evenings per week to attempt to cater for all the teams; we are now having to send some of our young people across to Canterbury twice weekly to utilise astro facilities.	
11.25	778376	Ms Susi Brain		1036	Objecting	*On no site plan can I find any specific reference to play areas , only "commercial/leisure" or " community /leisure" etc. There is not at this stage any commitment to playgrounds for children of different ages. The council needs to make additional provision to address the existing appalling deficiency of CHILDREN'S PLAY AREAS in South Canterbury (Wincheap and South Barton wards.)	
11.25	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2864	Supporting	Support having access to space where children can play within 300 metres of homes; although it certainly has not applied in Broomfield. There should be guarantees that once properties are occupied these areas are retained. In the past play equipment etc has been removed, due to complaints from residents. support Policy OS8	
11.25	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4135	Objecting	We welcome the identification of quality standards, but the plan should explain how these will be monitored.	Explain how quality standards will be monitored.
11.25	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4866	Objecting	The Plan sets a standard by which all children should have a place to play within 300 metres of their homes and there should be 1.3 hectares of open space for every thousand people. However, there are no maps which would enable us to judge how near the city is to achieving this standard. Canterbury residents know that many recent developments have allowed no space for play at all.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.25	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6730	Objecting	What are the population estimates for each development site? They are not in SP3. Where are they stated in relation to this plan? Without them how has the provision been made? No specific area of land, as listed in paras 11.14 or 11.19, has been mentioned or indicated, apart from allotments, for SP3 Site 2 Sturry/Broad Oak. It is believed that the present Sturry and Broad Oak would be under-provided if the 'Local Quantity Open Space Provision Standards' were to be applied as per the Local Plan.	
11.25	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6873	Supporting	Supportive of the objectives that children should have a place to play within 300 metres of their homes and that there should be 1.3 hectares of open space for every thousand people. There are no maps available which show how near the city is to achieving this standard. Wincheap and Barton wards have little open space available. One solution would be for the Council to ensure school and college playing fields in these areas are made accessible for local residents' use.	The Council should ensure that school and college playing fields are made accessible for local residents' use.
11.26	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6732	Objecting	An observation: Can the District's residents not be able to have greater, and freer, access to the School and University provision which exists in the area? For many weeks of the year these are not in use by these institutions, many of which have 'Charitable status'.	
11.27	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4454	Objecting	Whilst DIO supports this text in principle, the Barracks are over provided in relation to the resident population and take account of the specific training and fitness requirements placed on MOD personnel. DIO's Vision includes not only formal and informal open space related to the development but also the enhancement of the open space and creation of a linear park opening up historic views to the City. DIO will provide a range of open space to the Council open space standard through the dvpmt.	In light of the over-provision DIO suggests that the Proposals Map shows a hatched area of protected open space, which is subject to more detailed studies as a planning application is brought forward.
11.27	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6117	Objecting	Wherever possible KCC will seek to protect playing fields but with increasing pressure for school expansion and the need to maximise the use made of land and facilities we anticipate some sports facilities being developed in different ways. In addition, there may be occasions where the use can be replaced more effectively elsewhere and KCC would anticipate being able to discuss these issues creatively with CCC.	
11.28	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4456	Objecting	Whilst DIO supports this text in principle, the Barracks are over provided in relation to the resident population and take account of the specific training and fitness requirements placed on MOD personnel. DIO's Vision includes not only formal and informal open space related to the development but also the enhancement of the open space and creation of a linear park opening up historic views to the City. DIO will provide a range of open space to the Council open space standard through the dvpmt.	In light of the over-provision DIO suggests that the Proposals Map shows a hatched area of protected open space, which is subject to more detailed studies as a planning application is brought forward.

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.28	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6118	Objecting	Wherever possible KCC will seek to protect playing fields but with increasing pressure for school expansion and the need to maximise the use made of land and facilities we anticipate some sports facilities being developed in different ways. In addition, there may be occasions where the use can be replaced more effectively elsewhere and KCC would anticipate being able to discuss these issues creatively with CCC.	
11.28	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6734	Objecting	.. the Council will expect the developer to make alternative provision..'. Could it be strengthened to 'the Council will insist that the developer ...? It seems to be the case in Policy OS1	
11.29	766193	Mr Paul Barrow	Chairman Whitstable Town Junior F.C	31	Supporting	In supporting the "provision of sport and leisure facilities" the Council is encouraging participation in sport in the community.	
11.29	766193	Mr Paul Barrow	Chairman Whitstable Town Junior F.C	32	Objecting	The maintenance of existing sites, such as the pavillion at Radfall Recreation Ground, or the provision of a new pavillion with working toilets and storage facilities for training equipment would help benefit the 200+ children who belong to our club. We would also like to discuss development of radfall with the Council.	Improve or replace the pavillion at Radfall Recreation Ground
11.29	777538	Mr P Barton		937	Supporting	Supports allocation of this land for use as junior football pitches. There is a shortage of pitches and Council ones are not always available and Tankerton FC is often unable to play at home due to standing water and dangerous cracks in dry weather. If TFC could lease the land they could invest in the pitches and give 300 children a safe place to play football.	
11.29	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6119	Objecting	Wherever possible KCC will seek to protect playing fields but with increasing pressure for school expansion and the need to maximise the use made of land and facilities we anticipate some sports facilities being developed in different ways. In addition, there may be occasions where the use can be replaced more effectively elsewhere and KCC would anticipate being able to discuss these issues creatively with CCC.	
11.29	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6738	Objecting	NOTE: NO POLICIES RELATE TO THE PARISH OF STURRY, yet the developers talk of a football and cricket pitch. Where is there a guarantee for the community of Sturry that these would actually be delivered?	
Policy OS1	772593	Mr David McGovarin		224	Supporting	I fully support the proposal which will ensure the green area is maintained as well as helping to reduce the requirement for additional outdoor playing fields needed in the area. I feel that Tankerton Football Club as the local FA Charter Standard Community Club are in the best position to take on and run this facility for the good of the local community. Tankerton are a well run local club with over 300 children playing football so the use of the land for this purpose would be utilised well.	
Policy OS1	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1382	Supporting	Chapter 11: Open Space - I agree with policy OS1 in this chapter.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS1	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2099	Objecting	Object - to the policy providing a more stringent approach to the loss of playing fields than is provided for by Government at the NPPF. We refer to paragraph 74 of the NPPF:	revise
Policy OS1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4136	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support the Policy but it is unclear whether all conditions need to be met or only one condition. The 'and' and 'or' at the end of each criterion needs to be reviewed.	review use of 'or' and 'and'
Policy OS1	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4457	Objecting	DIO objects to this policy as it takes no account of the over-provision and exceptional circumstances relating to the open space at Howe Barracks. DIO will provide the required quantum of open space directly related to the development.	
Policy OS1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4867	Objecting	The Plan should include a specific recommendation about the provision of play places and open spaces, both within existing settlements and in new developments. It should be made clear under (e) what proportion of a development site must be left as open space.	The Plan should include a specific recommendation about the provision of play places and open spaces, both within existing settlements and in new developments. It should be made clear under (e) what proportion of a development site must be left as open space.
Policy OS1	784612	Mr Dale Greetham	Planner Sport England	5753	Objecting	Sport England would object to the loss of any playing fields in line with Sport England policy and the Para 74 of the NPPF. This policy should therefore be revised in line with Sport England's Playing Fields Policy.	This policy should be revised in line with Sport England's Playing Fields Policy.
Policy OS1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6735	Supporting	Good	
Policy OS1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6872	Objecting	The policy sets the conditions to be met before development can be allowed which would result in the loss of playing fields. However, it is clear that they are relatively easy for the Council to circumvent. In particular Clause b). This Policy should also specify what proportion of a development site must be left as open space. Specific recommendations about the provision of play places and open spaces ~ both within existing settlements and in new developments - should be included as well.	The following should be included within Policy OS1: This Policy should also specify what proportion of a development site must be left as open space. Specific recommendations about the provision of play places and open spaces ~ both within existing settlements and in new developments ~ should be included as well.
Policy OS1	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6911	Supporting	supporting	
Policy OS1	781036	Brother Austin SSF	EastBridge Hospital	6948	Objecting	None of this land [Eastbridge Hospital and Fransican Gardens] is used as a playing field, so policy OS1 is inappropriate.	Noted
Policy OS2	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1383	Supporting	Chapter 11: Open Space-I agree with policy OS2 in this chapter.	
Policy OS2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6736	Supporting	Good for Greenhill, if this is what the residents there want.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS3	400960	Mr Tim Elgar		46	Supporting	There is a large number of children playing football and partaking in out door sport in the whitstable area but there is a shocking lack of provision as born out by recent working parties of which I have been a member. This site, one of a number assessed by the working party, was found to be one of the most ideal sites, meeting set criteria and Tankerton FC the local FA Charter Standard Community Club (24+ teams and 300 children) would be a strong candidate to manage this facility for the area.	
Policy OS3	768693	Mr Terry Whyte		47	Supporting	We need more football pitches, Tankerton FC is on the doorstep, is an FA Charter Standard Community Club and best placed to run this facility.	
Policy OS3	769781	Mr Graham Cable		104	Supporting	I feel very strongly that Tankerton FC as the local FA Charter Standard Community Club* is in the best position to take on and run this facility. I say this as I have directly experienced the benefits this club brings to young people as a father of an active female member. Naturally, we are striving to provide activities for our youth, and participation in an organised and activity team sport has to be supported due to the huge benefits this brings to our young people and community.	
Policy OS3	768597	Mr Tom Sharp		135	Supporting	Supports allocation of land for junior football pitches for Tankerton Football Club.	
Policy OS3	768594	Ms Lynsey Cole		136	Supporting	Supports the allocation of land for football pitches for Tankerton Football Club.	
Policy OS3	768871	Miss Caroline Gibbs		137	Supporting	Supports allocation of football pitches for the use of Tankerton Football Club.	
Policy OS3	768621	MR STEVE BARNES		138	Supporting	Supports allocation of land for junior football pitches for Tankerton Football club	
Policy OS3	768875	Mr Kevin Askham		144	Supporting	With respect to the land that is allocated adjacent to St Augustine's Business Park in Swalecliffe for junior football pitches, I support the proposal and feel Tankerton FC, as the local FA Charter Standard Community Club is in the best possible position to take on and run this facility.	
Policy OS3	769852	Ms Liz Buckwell		181	Supporting	3 of my grandsons have spent many years playing at Tankerton Football club. The club is very well run and provides healthy exercise and competitive fun for the youngsters. it is very popular and well attended in all weathers. I therefore support the proposal that the above land is allocated to Tankerton FC as the local FA Charter Standard Community Club.	
Policy OS3	770136	Mr Jim Amos		185	Supporting	Please accept this email as support for Tankerton Football Club obtaining the above land. This is pivotal for our children who have suffered a horrendous year at Seaview due to the poor weather.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS3	770174	Dr WL Duffy		186	Supporting	I wish to express my support for Option Policy OS3 in Chapter 11.29, namely that land adjacent to St Augustine's Business Park, Swalecliffe, be allocated for junior football pitches. I would contend moreover that the most suitable organisation to take over and run such an eventual facility is Tankerton Football Club, which is the local FA Charter Standard Community Club, i.e. it has been recognized for its commitment to the inclusive provision of football for all.	
Policy OS3	769837	Mrs S Sampson		205	Supporting	Supports allocation of football pitches for the use of Tankerton Football Club.	
Policy OS3	777538	Mr P Barton		943	Supporting	Supports allocation of this land for use as junior football pitches. There is a shortage of pitches and Council ones are not always available and Tankerton FC is often unable to play at home due to standing water and dangerous cracks in dry weather. If TFC could lease the land they could invest in the pitches and give 300 children a safe place to play football.	
Policy OS3	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1395	Supporting	Chapter 11: Open Space- I agree with policy OS3 in this chapter.	
Policy OS3	692152	Mr Bob Pullen		1693	Supporting	I fully support this land being designated as junior football pitches.	
Policy OS3	779233	Mr Brett Remington		1793	Supporting	Football pitches are needed in our area for both kids and adults. Also I would rather see something that would benefit the community rather than more warehouses on the land.	
Policy OS3	779279	Mrs Sarah Davis		1916	Supporting	TFC has been looking for more permanent premises for some time, and as this area is so close to where they are based now it would be ideal. As the local FA Charter Standard Community Club, TFC is in the best position to take on and run this facility. The club has been growing recently, with teams for girls football, adult football, and joining with organisations that deal with disabled children and other community partners. Football pitches on this land would be a great asset to the community.	
Policy OS3	779278	mr sean mcgrath		1948	Supporting	Two of the council's aims would be achieved and Tankerton FC as the local FA Charter Standard Community Club is in the best position to take on and run this facility. (The FA Standard Community Club Award recognises the time effort and commitment the club is putting in to place in the areas of provision for girls football, adult football and links with organisations that deal with disabled children and other partners and places us alongside some of the Major clubs in the South East.)	
Policy OS3	778076	Mrs Tina Ismail		2198	Supporting	I am writing to express my thoughts on what to do with the proposed land available as stated below. "Land is allocated adjacent to St Augustine's Business Park, Swalecliffe for Junior football Pitches" I know that some of the Tankerton teams are doing very well and the numbers are growing in size. It would be very nice to see an area for this wonderful club to grow and shine from their achievements. I would be very proud to have a permanent ground for all three of my boys to do training on	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS3	780747	Abigail Murray & Family		3459	Supporting	Support for the allocation of land for junior football pitches adjacent to St Augustine's Business park Swalecliffe. Tankerton Football Club should be allowed to obtain this land	
Policy OS3	780754	Mrs V Webb		3480	Supporting	Support for playing filed allocation adjacent to St Augustine's Business Park Swalecliffe. Support for Tankerton Football Club using this space they are important in the local community.	
Policy OS3	780755	Ms Sophie Edmonds		3481	Supporting	Support for junior football pitches allocation adjacent to ST Augustine's business park, Swalecliffe. Support in particular Tankerton FC proposal to run this facility.	
Policy OS3	780760	Ms Emma Swan		3483	Supporting	Support for junior football pitches allocation adjacent to St Augustine's business park Swalecliffe. Support Tankerton FC proposal to run this facility	
Policy OS3	780656	Mr Ian D Tapsell		3509	Supporting	I am writing to you to offer my support to the proposal that this land be developed for use by Tankerton Football Club.The future of Tankerton Football Club is currently uncertain as it does not at present have a permanent, long-term base.	
Policy OS3	780715	Ms Juliette Beaumont		3843	Supporting	I am writing as a parent of a child who currently attends Tankerton football club. I understand that there is a current proposal to use an area adjacent to Seaview in Colebrook Road/Whitstable Road next to the St Augustine Business Parkf or Leisure and recreation activities in the proposed Local Plan, 2013 with specific recommendation for the provision of football pitches. As the area is so close to the current land used by the club, I feel that this will greatly improve the current facilities.	
Policy OS3	780991	Ms Veronica Buttayotee		4005	Supporting	I am writing in support of the proposal to allocate the land adjacent to St Augustine's Business Park, Swalecliffe for Junior football Pitches and I feel that Tankerton FC as the local FA Charter Standard Community Club is in the best position to take on and run this facility..	
Policy OS3	780737	Mr Jim Holgate		4214	Supporting	Can I thow my weight behind Tankerton FC's proposed use of this land. Tankerton FC is the main sports oprganisation in that area providing team sport for scores of local youngsters. I can think of no better organisation to take on the use of the proposed football pitches. Tankerton FC has my wholehearted support.	
Policy OS3	781250	Mr Richard Shaw		4344	Supporting	Concerning the proposed Land adjacent to St Augustines business park, Swalecliffe for Junior Football I strongly support this application and feel that as a FA charter standard community club Tankerton FC are in the best position to use and support this facility. This would give children an opportunity within the local community to have much needed active sport and would serve the local area for many years to come.	
Policy OS3	781391	Ms Teresa Gibbs		4553	Supporting	Support Policy OS3 for the allocation of land adjacent to St Augustine's Business Park, Swalecliffe for Junior Football Pitches.	
Policy OS3	781401	Mr Simon Pout		4592	Supporting	Support Policy OS3 for the allocation of land adjacent to St Augustine's Business Park, Swalecliffe for Junior Football Pitches.	
Policy OS3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6737	Supporting	Good for Swalecliffe, if this is want the residents there want	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS3	781036	Brother Austin SSF	EastBridge Hospital	6949	Objecting	This land [Eastbridge Hospital and Fransican Gardens] is not sited in Swalecliffe, so policy OS3 is inappropriate.	Noted
11.30	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4869	Objecting	Now that the plan for a Football Hub at Ridlands Farm has been cancelled we hope that space will be found elsewhere for sports facilities. We would support using space at the old Barracks along Littlebourne Road, to redress the lack of sports facilities in the city, and especially in South Canterbury.	Now that the plan for a Football Hub at Ridlands Farm has been cancelled we hope that space will be found elsewhere for sports facilities. We would support using space at the old Barracks along Littlebourne Road, to redress the lack of sports facilities in the city, and especially in South Canterbury.
11.30	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6739	Objecting	Is there still the need for a football club? The District has been without for so long. Where is Ridlands Farm? Could this be clarified in the text, please. What do nearby residents think to the idea? What does the foot-balling community think? An interesting consultation.	
11.31	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6740	Objecting Minimum capacity of 1,000 spectators....Will be enclosed by a 1.83 perimeter fence ...some car parking.'. What league would this be? What provision would this mean for players and spectators? The fence sounds awful! - What happened to 'open' and 'quality space'? Car parking for whom? How would the spectators be expected to get there?	
Policy OS4	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1396	Objecting	Policy OS4 on locating Canterbury City Football Club at Ridlands Farm has already been overtaken by events.	
Policy OS4	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2803	Objecting	Howe Barracks should now be considered for the site of the football club.	Howe Barracks should now be considered for the site of the football club.
Policy OS4	778384	Nicholas and Deborah Wells		3003	Objecting	The football hub is not to be built. Want reassurance that the land will not be built on, as it is well used.	
Policy OS4	780289	Mr Jon Linnane	Co Chair Langton and Nackington Residents Association	3059	Objecting	Ridlands farm should revert public open recreational space.	Ridlands farm should revert public open recreational space.
Policy OS4	408497	Mr C Mills		3756	Objecting	I welcome an open space strategy and notes the distinct lack of such public open space provision in South Canterbury.	
Policy OS4	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4137	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent object to this allocation, as we consider it is the wrong location for such a use. Delete Policy and supporting text.	Delete Policy and supporting text.
Policy OS4	780986	Mr Peter Taylor-Gooby		4289	Objecting	I congratulate the council on its decision not to proceed with the Ridlands Farm Football Hub/Private Club development. This was an unwanted drain on public resources and is an unsuitable site. South Canterbury lacks adequate public open space. The plan will not provide this and CCC must develop a serious policy on this issue. Part of Ridlands Farm could be dedicated to such use.	
Policy OS4	781786	D H Evans		5015	Objecting	The existing pitches at Howe Barracks would be a far more suitable and accessible location for Canterbury City Football Club.	Canterbury City Football Club should be sited on existing pitches at Howe Barracks.
Policy OS4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6741	Objecting	To await the result of the consultation mentioned in para 11.30	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS4	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6865	Objecting	Ridlands Farm (Policy OS4 - SHLAA 190) This 9.3 Ha site will be the subject of a redrafted policy, as CCC have withdrawn their support for the proposed football club use. While it is most likely that both the community and the council will favour its retention as public open space (for recreation), there must be a possibility if balanced development across Canterbury is being sought, of some of the land being allocated to housing use.	
Policy OS4	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6874	Objecting	As plans for a Football Hub at Ridlands Farm have been rejected, It is suggested that the Council provide land for a similar use at Howe Barracks. It is certainly important that more provision is made in the city for children and young adults, especially for playing sports.	Provide land for a Football Hub and other community / recreational facilities at Howe Barracks.
Policy OS4	784494	Mr R I Vane-Wright	South Canterbury Residents Association	6913	Objecting	Whilst it is appreciated that this Policy was written before the decision was taken by the Executive not to proceed with providing Canterbury City Football Club with a new football ground (and would expect this Policy to be rewritten to reflect this), we nevertheless wish to formally record our objections to this proposal as it appears in the DLP.	That all reference to the City Council providing Canterbury City Football Club with a new ground at Ridlands Farm to be deleted completely from Policy OS4.
Policy OS4	781036	Brother Austin SSF	EastBridge Hospital	6950	Objecting	This land [Eastbridge Hospital and Fransican Gardens] is not sited at Ridlands Farm, so policy OS4 is inappropriate.	Noted
11.33	692152	Mr Bob Pullen		1695	Supporting	I fully support the conclusion given in the supporting material that site SHLAA/191 - land to the rear of Swalecliffe Primary School - is unsuitable for housing as it is within an area for the Protection of Open Space.	
11.33	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1796	Objecting	Open spaces act as a visual amenity, but do not necessary have to have public access. Visual amenity should be included otherwise developers could say that because their land is not accessed by the public it can be built on.	Insert the word CAN into the following sentence: They fulfil a number of visual, recreational and amenity functions that help to improve quality of life, the urban fabric and CAN provide accessible recreation facilities. Insert the words AND VISUAL into the following: Open spaces make a valuable contribution to the townscape in the urban areas and development of them would lead to the loss of residential , leisure AND VISUAL amenity, and be detrimental to the quality of the built environment.
11.33	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4128	Objecting	These paragraphs present various, and different, definitions of open space which causes confusion. Just one definition should be used.	Just use one definition.
11.34	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4138	Objecting	We agree with these paragraphs, but they would fit better under the section on 'The Need for Open Space'.	Move to section on 'The Need for Open Space'.
11.35	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4139	Objecting	We agree with these paragraphs, but they would fit better under the section on 'The Need for Open Space'.	Move to section on 'The Need for Open Space'.
11.36	415830	Ms Gillian Northcott Liles	Vice-Chairman and Secretary Oaten Hill and District Society	2303	Objecting	There is no statement about the importance of Dane John and Westgate gardens (other than mentioning them as historic sites). Canterbury's public gardens and green spaces are not given the recognition they deserve. Does the Council support the use of these two sites as venues for festivals (food or music), markets, or any other form of entertainment? What is the plan for their development and how do they fit in the Council's view of Canterbury town centre.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.36	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4141	Objecting	The list of significant recreational space should include Kingsmead.	Include Kingsmead.
11.36	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4870	Supporting	Finally we very much welcome the plans to regenerate the Westgate Parks and to set up the Friends of the River Stour in Canterbury. The Canterbury Society will give its whole-hearted support to both these initiatives.	
11.37	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4140	Objecting	We find this paragraph to be misleading as the Sturry Road Community Park suffers from a number of serious disadvantages which limit its usage: its isolated location; position on the eastern edge of the city; and close proximity to the sewage plant with its associated unpleasant smells. We find it disingenuous for the Council to use the large size of the park as a justification to remove open space elsewhere in Northgate (e.g. Kingsmead Field in the west of the ward).	
11.37	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4868	Objecting	This is described as one of the largest community-led regeneration projects in the UK. It covers 18 hectares and was created largely by the efforts of local people. The existence of the Sturry Community Park enables the local authority to claim that it provides a wide range of leisure provision within the geographical city. In reality there are now many problems with the park, reflecting long-term neglect.	
11.37	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6742	Supporting	Sturry Road Community Park is one of the largest community-led greenspace regeneration projects in the UK... ..part managed and funded solely by a charitable trust ... Something of which all involved can be very proud. Will this be sustainable in the long term?	
11.37	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6875	Objecting	Sturry Road Community Park provides a wide range of leisure provision within Canterbury. However, as it is located on the very edge of the city, it is not accessible to many local residents. Moreover, many of its facilities are now in a state of serious neglect and must be renovated. Its future regular maintenance ^' as well as that of all the District's parks and play places ^' should be enshrined in policy.	Add a new policy which sets out the regular maintenance of Sturry Road Community Gardens ^' as well as that of all the District's parks and play places.
11.38	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6743	Objecting	Riverside pathway ...Canterbury Fordwich...'. Elsewhere in the Plan there was mention of Canterbury / Sturry riverside walk. Are these the same thing? The route for a 'Riverside Pathway' in the Vauxhall Road /Sturry Road area will need real attention, money and imagination! Is this deliverable?	
11.38	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6877	Objecting	Sturry Road Community Park provides a wide range of leisure provision within Canterbury. However, as it is located on the very edge of the city, it is not accessible to many local residents. Moreover, many of its facilities are now in a state of serious neglect and must be renovated. Its future regular maintenance ^' as well as that of all the District's parks and play places ^' should be enshrined in policy.	Add a new policy which sets out the regular maintenance of Sturry Road Community Gardens ^' as well as that of all the District's parks and play places.

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.38	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6882	Supporting	"The riverside pathways and corridors in and around Canterbury from Chartham to Fordwich provide links to more than 25 hectares of open space along the river and provide pocket parks. The Riverside Strategy aims to protect and enhance the land alongside the River Stour corridors and Policy OS11 seeks to implement this." Canterbury & District Green Party trust that this commitment on the part of the Council will mean protection of the Great Stour Way for public access and use if the land is sold	
11.42	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4129	Objecting	These paragraphs present various, and different, definitions of open space which causes confusion. Just one definition should be used.	Just use one definition.
11.42	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5624	Objecting	The unique features and pressures in Whitstable warrant that more rigorous treatment in the DLP. This must go far beyond the unsatisfactory informal characterisations of the town in 5.70, 6.50 and 11.49, which it has to be said are also unhelpful and far too narrow as they mask underlying problems.	The big issues and difficulties facing Whitstable need to be more clearly identified and addressed in a focussed and determined manner. A proper recognition of the past level of growth here and an acknowledgement of the sustainability constraints on further growth must inform future plans for the town.
11.43	779087	Mr Paul McNally	Acting Chair Whitstable Beach Campaign	1708	Objecting	Recognition of Whitstable beach as a significant amenity open space should be strengthened by heightening the designation from 'Protected Existing Open Space' to 'Local Green Space' under the terms of the provisions set out in paragraphs 76 to 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Seasalter / Whitstable/ beaches meet all of the qualifying criteria prescribed by the NPPF & set out in DLP paragraph 11.16. The designation should extend from The Sportsman in Seasalter to the Green Gap.	The designation of Whitstable Beach as "Local Green Space" in the CCC Local Plan, rather than the proposed designation of "Protected Existing Open Space".
11.43	779246	Mr Paul McNally		1850	Objecting	The designation of Protected Open Space for Whitstable Beach is welcomed as it is a valuable asset to the community with various wildlife designations - SSSI, RAMSAR etc. However, to increase the level of protection from development and preserve its unspoilt nature the beach should have Local Green Space designation in the Local Plan, a measure that is supported widely locally. The beach meets all of the criteria for Local Green Space set out in NPPF Paragraphs 76 & 77.	That the designation in the new Local Plan for Whitstable Beach should be amended - from Protected Open Space to Local Green Space.
11.43	779244	Ms Sonia McNally		2021	Objecting	The designation of Protected Open Space for Whitstable Beach is welcomed, as it is a valuable asset to the community with various wildlife designations - SSSI, RAMSAR etc. However, to increase the level of protection from development and preserve its unspoilt nature the beach should have Local Green Space designation in the Local Plan, a measure that is supported widely locally. The beach meets all of the criteria for Local Green Space set out in National Planning Policy Framework Para 76 & 77	The designation of Whitstable Beach as Local Green Space.
11.43	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4130	Objecting	These paragraphs present various, and different, definitions of open space which causes confusion. Just one definition should be used.	Just use one definition.

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.43	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5605	Objecting	Recognition of Whitstable beach as a significant amenity open space should be strengthened by heightening the designation from 'Protected Existing Open Space' to 'Local Green Space' under the terms of the provisions set out in paragraphs 76 to 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The beach meets all of the qualifying criteria prescribed by the NPPF. The designation should extend from The Sportsman in Seasalter to the Coastguard Cottages at Swalecliffe.	
11.43	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6109	Objecting	Missing large protected open spaces in the list	Please put in Propsect Field and Westcliff Meadow.
11.44	778582	Mr Laurence Muston		1328	Supporting	This policy should apply to Herne, so Herne should be included in the list of villages as it is indeed a settlement independant of Herne Bay.	
11.44	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2865	Objecting	Herne & Broomfield should have been included as a large village in the Rural Settlement Hierarchy. Herne needs to maintain separation from Greenhill and Herne Bay, Strode Farm is the green gap between these and this separation should be maintained. 11.44 will not be achieved in Herne Village.	
11.44	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3615	Objecting	Paragraph 11.44 to retain separate identities of existing settlements. Protect the identity of Herne Village with a Green Gap between it and urban Herne Bay.	
11.44	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patricbourne Parish Council	4679	Supporting	Support the objective of the Green Gap Policy as set out in Paragraph 11.44.	
11.44	380375	Wrentham Estates		5093	Objecting	Land at Green Hill (SHLAA71). The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal described the condition of the Landscape (within which this site lies) as poor. The Green Gap is therefore not justified by landscape character. Separation of settlements can be achieved through planning policies, such as urban boundaries on the Proposals Map and National and Local Planning Policies which resist development beyond such boundaries.	
11.44	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6751	Objecting	Addition to the Plan: Commitments to landscape and biodiversity protection should be more seriously demonstrated through the designation of some of Canterbury's rural hinterland as "Green Belt".	Addition to the Plan: Commitments to landscape and biodiversity protection should be more seriously demonstrated through the designation of some of Canterbury's rural hinterland as "Green Belt".
11.45	380375	Wrentham Estates		5094	Objecting	Land at Green Hill (SHLAA71). The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal described the condition of the Landscape (within which this site lies) as poor. The Green Gap is therefore not justified by landscape character. Separation of settlements can be achieved through planning policies, such as urban boundaries on the Proposals Map and National and Local Planning Policies which resist development beyond such boundaries.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.45	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6929	Objecting	For Sturry there are no areas of existing open space shaded on the large proposals map. Why not? The Sturry cricket ground is still shown on the map. This is misleading. It no longer exists as such.	
11.46	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1797	Objecting	This is also true for the new realigned A299 which was built into Open Countryside. Building is gradually eroding the benefits for the A2990 created by this new road being built. If development is not restricted, the old A2990 will see traffic levels increase to those seen prior to the new A299 being built (see technical paper 3 CDLP)	Include restrictions to building along the old Thanet Way A2990.
11.46	771556	Mr Phil Rose		2119	Objecting	The four biggest housing development sites of the five being proposed join Herne Bay to Herne village. In the east, Herne Bay will go south from the sea, through Hillborough, Broomfield and Hunters Forstal to Herne. In the west the town will stretch south from Hampton, through Greenhill to Herne. CANTERBURY City Council is introducing green gaps around CANTERBURY to prevent "coalescence", but offers no such protection to Herne Bay.	The developer-led nature of this Plan has resulted in proposals that will destroy the nature of the villages that fringe Herne Bay. A resident-led Plan would (probably) call for more use brownfield sites, more in-fill, and a more dispersed, organic growth across the whole District.
11.46	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4144	Supporting	Support Policy OS5 concept of Green Gaps . The word significantly should be removed. Find 11.46 incredulous considering strategic allocations which close the green gaps between Sturry and Broadoak and Herne and Herne Bay. Rectify this by amending plan strategy as outline in part 1 or our response.	amend plan strategy as outline in part 1 or our response.
11.46	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4145	Objecting	Support Policy OS5 concept of Green Gaps . The word significantly should be removed. Find 11.46 incredulous considering strategic allocations which close the green gaps between Sturry and Broadoak and Herne and Herne Bay. Rectify this by amending plan strategy as outline in part 1 or our response.	amend plan strategy as outline in part 1 or our response.
11.46	780985	Ms Jennifer Keaveney		4287	Objecting	I would also note that the proposed "new 'green gap' between Canterbury and Bridge to ensure the countryside between these areas is protected (11.46) replaces a wide green space which it is now proposed to cover with a housing development and is no more than a figleaf which attempts to mitigate this large-scale development.	
11.46	380375	Wrentham Estates		5095	Objecting	Land at Green Hill (SHLAA71). The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal described the condition of the Landscape (within which this site lies) as poor. The Green Gap is therefore not justified by landscape character. Separation of settlements can be achieved through planning policies, such as urban boundaries on the Proposals Map and National and Local Planning Policies which resist development beyond such boundaries.	
11.46	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6744	Objecting	...this local plan has proposed an extension to the green gap between Sturry and Broad Oak ... This local plan proposes 1,000 houses on the present green open space land between them, so this is an IMPOSSIBILITY!	
11.47	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1042	Objecting	Green gaps should be maintained between Herne and Herne Bay. This plan will merge the two together in one conurbation. Three Herne Bay wards - Reculver; West Bay and Heron - have an inadequate provision of green space. The plan will build large housing estates on existing green space to the south of the ton, exacerbating this underprovision of green space	Green gaps should be maintained between Herne and Herne Bay.

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.47	380375	Wrentham Estates		5096	Objecting	Land at Green Hill (SHLAA71). The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal described the condition of the Landscape (within which this site lies) as poor. The Green Gap is therefore not justified by landscape character. Separation of settlements can be achieved through planning policies, such as urban boundaries on the Proposals Map and National and Local Planning Policies which resist development beyond such boundaries.	
11.48	380375	Wrentham Estates		5097	Objecting	Land at Green Hill (SHLAA71). The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal described the condition of the Landscape (within which this site lies) as poor. The Green Gap is therefore not justified by landscape character. Separation of settlements can be achieved through planning policies, such as urban boundaries on the Proposals Map and National and Local Planning Policies which resist development beyond such boundaries.	
11.49	380375	Wrentham Estates		5098	Objecting	Land at Green Hill (SHLAA71). The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal described the condition of the Landscape (within which this site lies) as poor. The Green Gap is therefore not justified by landscape character. Separation of settlements can be achieved through planning policies, such as urban boundaries on the Proposals Map and National and Local Planning Policies which resist development beyond such boundaries.	
11.50	405809	Mrs Denise Horswell	Clerk Hackington Parish Council	3297	Supporting	The Green Gap proposal is welcomed although the Parish Council proposes that it is extended to include the area between Tyler Hill and Downs Road and Little Hall Farm. Also, West of Tyler Hill Road as far as the Crab & Winkle railway line.	Extend the green gap to include the area between Tyler Hill and Downs Road and Little Hall Farm. Also, West of Tyler Hill Road as far as the Crab & Winkle railway line.
11.50	13738	Mrs Denise Horswell	Clerk Blean Parish Council	3298	Objecting	Propose that a Green Buffer Zone should be created North of the University playing fields to Tyler Hill Road, eastwards to the Crab & Winkle railway and onto Tyler Hill, and westwards to the gardens on the east of Tile Kiln Hill.	A Green Buffer Zone be created North of the University playing fields to Tyler Hill Road, eastwards to the Crab & Winkle railway and onto Tyler Hill, and westwards to the gardens on the east of Tile Kiln Hill.
11.50	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3616	Objecting	Protect the identity of Herne Village with a Green Gap between it and urban Herne Bay.	Include a green gap between Herne village and urban Herne Bay.
11.50	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3720	Objecting	However, we believe that the proposal for a Green Gap between Canterbury and Bridge (11.57) is inadequate and requires revision in accordance with a radically reduced number of houses.	
11.50	380375	Wrentham Estates		5099	Objecting	Land at Green Hill (SHLAA71). The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal described the condition of the Landscape (within which this site lies) as poor. The Green Gap is therefore not justified by landscape character. Separation of settlements can be achieved through planning policies, such as urban boundaries on the Proposals Map and National and Local Planning Policies which resist development beyond such boundaries.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.50	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6446	Objecting	Designate the Bogshole valley as an important Green Gap which it was in effect under the previous plan as a landscape unit. The Bogshole Valley should be recognised as a green gap to add to the existing list and compliment the green gap recognised between Whitstable and Herne Bay. There is no difference in need for a green gap between the two areas and green gaps around Canterbury and hence to leave out the Bogshole Valley green gap is also inconsistent.	Mark the Bogshole Valley from the Pean Hill ridge up to the valley's northerly watershed as a Green Gap on the allocations map.If this area is not recognised as a green gap it should be as an AHLV.
11.50	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6745	Supporting	All very much appreciated, particularly as the Local Plan promises 'high quality green space'	
11.50	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6750	SupportingGreen Gaps..... Sturry and Westbere Appreciated - this has been a site of SHLAA interest and is in need of protection.	
11.50	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6752	Objecting	...this local plan has proposed an extension to the green gap between Sturry and Broad Oak ... This local plan proposes 1,000 houses on the present green open space land between them, so this is an IMPOSSIBILITY!	
11.50	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6883	Supporting	Supportive of the provision of Green Gaps and hope this will develop into a robustly protected Green Belt around the City.	
Policy OS5	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1397	Supporting	Chapter 11: Open Space - I agree with policy OS5 in this chapter	
Policy OS5	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1460	Objecting	there is no mention of a Green Gap between Westbere and the old Chislet Colliery brownfield site, to the South of the A28. It is essential that this space is retained too.Any development within this Green Gap, and in particular on Hoplands Farm, would have a serious adverse impact on the SSSI immediately to the South. As a Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation and a Ramsar site, this land is environmentally the highest grade in the world.	WPC therefore requests that " * Between Westbere and the former Chislet Colliery site." is added to both this list and to the District Map.
Policy OS5	779255		Brett Group	1895	Objecting	This representation seeks a change to the proposed strategic gap at Westbere and the allocation of land at Westbere for a mixed-use development incorporating housing and a residential care home. It is made on behalf of the Brett Group, owners of the land.	We request the inclusion of the site at Island Road Westbere outlined on the attached plan, within the Proposals Map for a housing development of 175 dwellings, together with a residential care home, open space, playing fields and retained woodland. In addition the site should be included in the list of allocated strategic sites in paragraph 2.3 of Chapter 2 of the draft Local Plan and in the Schedule of allocated sites in Appendix 2. The indicative layout, which accompanies this representation should be included in Appendix 1 of the Plan.
Policy OS5	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		2377	Objecting	Policy OS5 - green gaps are different sizes.I assume Herne Bay & Whitstable green gap is included in this policy. Policies OS 5 & 6 both refer to green gaps, it is unclear why different wording has been adopted. Policies OS5, OS6 & OS7 - " On a detail point, it would be helpful to know the differences between the various sport, leisure / recreational uses / facilities.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS5	779274	Mr Graham Duplock	Parish Councillor Parish Councillor Beskesbourne	2829	Objecting	I would like to emphasise the need for a Green Gap all around the City, to protect the integrity of the villages. Especially where the industrial development approaches the outskirts of Bridge. Where possible high quality agricultural land should be preserved.	The need for a Green Gap all around the City, to protect the integrity of the villages.
Policy OS5	778925		Pentland Properties and Crest Strategic Projects	2970	Supporting	The main area of identified Green Gap relates to the area east of South Canterbury between Canterbury and Bridge. This is a logical Policy if the South Canterbury allocation is adopted in part or whole.	
Policy OS5	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3168	Supporting	Many of the Policies within this section relate to amenity space and so are outside our remit. However amenity space if enhanced for biodiversity along the boundaries by incorporating hedgerows or wildflower and rough grassland can provide routes for species to disperse through the open space. We welcome the protection of existing open space and the green gaps, as this will ensure that any open space provided is a direct gain to the district.	
Policy OS5	13837	Mr William Leetham		3279	Objecting	A green zone between the villages of Tyler Hill and Blean and Canterbury. The area being north of the University playing fields, west from the rear of the properties along Tile Kiln Hill, south of the Blean to Tyler Hill Road and east from Tyler Hill.	A green zone between the villages of Tyler Hill and Blean and Canterbury. The area being north of the University playing fields, west from the rear of the properties along Tile Kiln Hill, south of the Blean to Tyler Hill Road and east from Tyler Hill.
Policy OS5	383359	Ms Judy Seymour - Ure		3311	Supporting	There MUST be open land between Canterbury and Bridge. Otherwise they will just run into each other and create one large conurbation - most unattractive, and Bridge would lose all its present charm.	
Policy OS5	780449	Daniel & Elizabeth Rikh		3330	Objecting	We believe the green gap between Canterbury and Bridge must be kept.	
Policy OS5	482063	Mr Barrie Gore	Chairman Protect Kent	3511	Objecting	In para. 11.50, we should like added to the Green Gap proposals the following: Between Herne Bay and Herne Between Westbere and the former colliery site to the south of Hersden Between Hersden and Upstreet Between Upstreet and Chislet Between Upstreet and Sarre Between Canterbury and Harbledown Parish Between Rough Common and Upper Harbledown.	
Policy OS5	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4142	Supporting	Support Policy OS5 concept of Green Gaps . The word significantly should be removed. Find 11.46 incredulous considering strategic allocations which close the green gaps between Sturry and Broadoak and Herne and Herne Bay. Rectify this by amending plan strategy as outline in part 1 or our response.	The word 'significantly' in part a.should be removed.
Policy OS5	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4143	Objecting	Support Policy OS5 concept of Green Gaps . The word significantly should be removed. Find 11.46 incredulous considering strategic allocations which close the green gaps between Sturry and Broadoak and Herne and Herne Bay. Rectify this by amending plan strategy as outline in part 1 or our response.	The word 'significantly' in part a.should be removed.
Policy OS5	777500	Mr & Mrs A R Pierce		4481	Objecting	Object to the application of Policy OS5 - Green Gap - to land north-west of Sturry Road. The Green Gap Policy needs to be reviewed in the content of the NPPF and local circumstances	Object to the application of Policy OS5 - Green Gap - to land north-west of Sturry Road. The Green Gap Policy needs to be reviewed in the content of the NPPF and local circumstances

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS5	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council	4573	Supporting	We would like to emphasise the need for a Green Gap all around the City, to protect the integrity of the villages. This is especially vital where the industrial development by the Gate Inn approaches the outskirts of Bridge. Where possible high quality agricultural land should be preserved.	
Policy OS5	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council	4681	Supporting	Support for Policy OS5 which sets out the policy within the Green Gaps identified.	
Policy OS5	380375	Wrentham Estates		5088	Objecting	Land at Green Hill (SHLAA71). The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal described the condition of the Landscape (within which this site lies) as poor. The Green Gap is therefore not justified by landscape character. Separation of settlements can be achieved through planning policies, such as urban boundaries on the Proposals Map and National and Local Planning Policies which resist development beyond such boundaries.	
Policy OS5	781734	Mr Chris Lowe		5111	Objecting	The area north of the line that starts at the path on the northern edge of Blean Primary school going east to join the northern boundary of the Wolff College site should be included within the Green Gap policy OS5. If this is not changed, then the university could potentially develop right up to Tyler Hill Road which would change the area completely.	The area north of the line that starts at the path on the northern edge of Blean Primary school going east to join the northern boundary of the Wolff College site should join the Green Gap at the eastern end of that line.
Policy OS5	380258	Mr Mavaddat		5132	Objecting	The Planning Authority's justification for the Green Gap policy approach is to maintain the separation of settlements. We would submit that this objective can be achieved through planning policies such as definition of urban and village boundaries on the Proposals Map and National and Local planning policies which resist development beyond such boundaries, other than where justified by other planning policies. We, therefore, object to and oppose Proposed Local Plan Policy OS5 and the related te	We, therefore, object to and oppose Proposed Local Plan Policy OS5 and the related text in Paragraphs 11.44 and 11.49.
Policy OS5	784575	Kent College		5296	Objecting	The Local Authority in continuing to identify that the majority of this part of the School site as a Green Gap has unnecessarily restricted the School in the proper and prudent management of its own site. The inflexibility of the Policy by prohibiting the extension and expansion of the School site for approved educational purposes identified above stifles the logical and necessary expansion plans of the School and limits the School's ability to provide an improved range of educational facilities.	Given the specific nature of the Policy and the reasons set out above, the Council's support for the deletion of this part of the School's site as a Green Gap is sought.
Policy OS5	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5642	Objecting	Whitstable The protection of green gaps needs to take into account and protect the Bogshole Valley.	
Policy OS5	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6187	Objecting	Object	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6753	Supporting	Welcomed The sense of separate villages is very important to Sturry Parishioners, and It is an aspect everyone wishes to retain, but also want to continue sharing activities, for example those involving Church & Chapel.	
Policy OS5	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6884	Supporting	Supportive of the provision of Green Gaps and hope this will develop into a robustly protected Green Belt around the City.	
11.51	380375	Wrentham Estates		5100	Objecting	Land at Green Hill (SHLAA71). The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal described the condition of the Landscape (within which this site lies) as poor. The Green Gap is therefore not justified by landscape character. Separation of settlements can be achieved through planning policies, such as urban boundaries on the Proposals Map and National and Local Planning Policies which resist development beyond such boundaries.	
11.52	380375	Wrentham Estates		5101	Objecting	Land at Green Hill (SHLAA71). The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal described the condition of the Landscape (within which this site lies) as poor. The Green Gap is therefore not justified by landscape character. Separation of settlements can be achieved through planning policies, such as urban boundaries on the Proposals Map and National and Local Planning Policies which resist development beyond such boundaries.	
Policy OS6	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1398	Supporting	Chapter 11: Open Space -I agree with policy OS6 in this chapter	
Policy OS6	603535	Mr John Bowles	Partner Porta Planning LLP	1740	Objecting	Criterion a. of Policy OS6 should be deleted.	Criterion a. of Policy OS6 should be deleted.
Policy OS6	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		2378	Objecting	The "Herne Bay and Whitstable" Green Gap is also referred to under this policy. Is it intended that both policies should refer to the "Herne Bay and Whitstable" Green Gap in which case there would be considerable overlap between them? If not, then I suggest this needs to be clarified.Allotments should be promoted in other green gap locations.Policy DBE3 should be added to Policy OS6 in order to strengthen this policy to a similar level approved under the 2006 Local Plan.	Policy DBE3 should be added to Policy OS6 in order to strengthen this policy to a similar level approved under the 2006 Local Plan.
Policy OS6	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3169	Supporting	Many of the Policies within this section relate to amenity space and so are outside our remit. However amenity space if enhanced for biodiversity along the boundaries by incorporating hedgerows or wildflower and rough grassland can provide routes for species to disperse through the open space. We welcome the protection of existing open space and the green gaps, as this will ensure that any open space provided is a direct gain to the district.	
Policy OS6	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4146	Objecting	Support this Policy, but the word 'significantly' in part b. should be removed.	The word 'significantly' in part b. should be removed.
Policy OS6	380375	Wrentham Estates		5102	Objecting	Land at Green Hill (SHLAA71). The Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal described the condition of the Landscape (within which this site lies) as poor. The Green Gap is therefore not justified by landscape character. Separation of settlements can be achieved through planning policies, such as urban boundaries on the Proposals Map and National and Local Planning Policies which resist development beyond such boundaries.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS6	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6124	Supporting	KCC supports the possibility of some education development within the Green Gap between Herne Bay and Whitstable, to support the local communities	
11.53	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6754	Supporting	'In the rural areas there is access via open land and public rights of way to an existing asset of visual and informal open space.....'. This describes the situation in Sturry village and the access to Den Grove Wood exactly.	
11.54	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6755	Objecting	'The Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000)'. There is great concern in Sturry Parish how ancient footpaths will fare under the Plans proposals eg between Sturry to Broad Oak and the closure of the foot crossing over the railway at the Hamels.	
11.56	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5874	Objecting	There is no reference to National Policy Framework Section 75, "Planning policies should look to protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users wherever possible". KCC's Local Transport Plan (LTP3) is referred to however, KCC's Countryside and Coastal Access Improvement Plan is not evidenced. It is crucial that this is referred to as a statutory policy document for PROW and acts as an appendix to LTP3.	
11.56	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6127	Objecting	Welcome the mention of protection and enhancement of public access. However, please can you specifically mention the under lying policy which is the Countryside and Coastal Access Improvement Plan	
Policy OS7	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1399	Supporting	Chapter 11: Open Space -I agree with policy OS7 in this chapter	
Policy OS7	323680	Mr Cliff Brown		2389	Objecting	Policies OS5, OS6 & OS7 - These three policies refer respectively to: (a) "Proposals for open sports and recreational uses..." (b) "...where education, leisure uses or allotments are promoted,..." (c) "Proposals for sports and recreation facilities..." On a detail point, it would be helpful to know the differences between the various sport, leisure / recreational uses / facilities.	
Policy OS7	780750	Ms Sophie Flax	Conservation Officer RSPB	3244	Supporting	RSPB supports the recommended amendments to the Core Strategy text as set out in the AA:	For clarity, the following policy wording should be included in relation to permitting development: "No development will be permitted which may have an adverse effect on the integrity of any SAC, SPA or Ramsar site alone, or in combination, with other plans or projects."
Policy OS7	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3721	Objecting	We suggest that the Council designate as a Protected Open Space the field to the south of the Swimming Pool in Kingsmead Road.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS7	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4147	Objecting	Support this Policy, but add the following sentence at the end: "Proposals that involve floodlighting will not be permitted."	Add the following sentence at the end: "Proposals that involve floodlighting will not be permitted."
Policy OS7	784612	Mr Dale Greetham	Planner Sport England	5754	Objecting	Sport England would recommend that this policy is revised in line with the below policy objective (related policy approaches can be found at the following link: http://www.sportengland.org/media/121906/document-7-spatial-planning-for-sport-development-control-guidance-note-.pdf):	Sport England would recommend that this policy is revised in line with the below policy objective (related policy approaches can be found at the following link: http://www.sportengland.org/media/121906/document-7-spatial-planning-for-sport-development-control-guidance-note-.pdf):
Policy OS7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6757	Supporting	Seems fine, but in an odd place in the Chapter.	
Policy OS7	785163	Canterbury Christ Church University		6980	Objecting	CCCU have an interest in Polo Farm Sports Club (PFSC) and along with the Sports Club are committed to the improvement and expansion of sporting and leisure facilities on the site. PFSC is located in the countryside to the east of Canterbury and as such falls within the remit of Policy OS7. Policy OS7 should be amended by adding to end of criteria a) or existing, well established sporting facilities	Policy OS7 should be amended by adding to end of criteria a) or existing, well established sporting facilities
11.58	665473	Dr Richard Norman		581	Supporting	I strongly support the policy of preventing the loss of existing open space within the urban boundaries, whether publicly or privately owned. This policy must be rigorously adhered to. It would rule out two controversial proposals for Canterbury: (a) the University of Kent's 'Chaucer Fields' proposal to build on the southern slopes of the University, and (b) the Council's proposal to build on Kingsmead Field.	
11.58	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1182	Supporting	We welcome the whole section on Protection of Existing Open Space	
11.58	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1233	Supporting	We welcome the commitment to create a comprehensive network of open space across the district, and to protect existing open space. We believe that the protection of all the categories of open space listed in 11.19 is essential. We welcome the statement in 11.58 that the open space to be preserved includes both publicly-owned and privately-owned open space. The southern slopes of the University of Kent campus are a prime example of semi-natural open space	
11.58	777842	Mrs Maria Thomas	Secretary Market Way Area Residents Association	1561	Supporting	The proposed development of Kingsmead Field is totally incompatible with the objectives of Para 11.58.	
11.58	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1798	Supporting	These areas of protection of existing open space within the urban boundary are particularly valuable considering the lack of open space and when you look at the lack of open space within the town itself. Development of these spaces would take open space further from not only those living next to it, but those in the town. It is also against the planned approach for all new traffic to be directed onto the new aligned A299 (see technical paper 3).	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.58	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1942	Supporting	Support the commitment to create a comprehensive network of open space across the district, and to protect existing open space. The protection of all the categories of open space listed in 11.19 is essential. There is also support for the statement in 11.58 that the open space to be preserved includes both publicly-owned and privately-owned open space. The proposed building of 100 houses on Kingsmead Field would be incompatible with these policies.	
11.58	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2867	Objecting	Does this not apply to Strode Farm and the Golf Course site?	
11.58	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4567	Supporting	Welcomes the creation of a network of open space across the district, and protection of existing open space. Protection of all the categories of open space in 11.19 is essential. Welcomes 11.58 preserving public and private open space. The semi natural open spaces on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus is of value to the local community. Development must be ruled out in master plan. Development on Kingsmead field conflicts with these policies.	
11.58	781400	Charlie Mount		4904	Objecting	Kingsmead Field should be included in Paragraph 11.58 as an example of protection of open space within the urban environment.	Kingsmead Field should be included in Paragraph 11.58 as an example of protection of open space within the urban environment.
11.58	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5250	Objecting	There are other sites, some of which are brownfield, which have not been included - for example, the colliery site at Hersden.	
11.58	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6110	Supporting	Support	
11.58	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6771	Objecting	para 11.58 - 11.63 '€ existing open space'. Are these points relating to existing 'protected' open space areas? Are they referring to the remaining open space outside the development proposals of the Plan?	
11.59	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1183	Supporting	We welcome the whole section on Protection of Existing Open Space	
11.59	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1234	Supporting	We welcome the commitment to create a comprehensive network of open space across the district, and to protect existing open space. We believe that the protection of all the categories of open space listed in 11.19 is essential, for the reasons given in that chapter. We welcome the statement in 11.58 that the open space to be preserved includes both publicly-owned and privately-owned open space.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.59	777842	Mrs Maria Thomas	Secretary Market Way Area Residents Association	1562	Supporting	The proposed development of Kingsmead Field is totally incompatible with this objective. For over 60 years Kingsmead Field has provided a valuable recreational area for the surrounding community. Given the commitment made in Policy OS8 to refuse development of open space within residential areas and the commitment made in Policy OS11(b) to protect existing open space as part of green space networks, it is inconsistent with the Draft Local Plan to allocate Kingsmead Field for housing.	
11.59	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1800	Supporting	These areas of protection of existing open space within the urban boundary are particularly valuable considering the lack of open space and when you look at the lack of open space within the town itself. Development of these spaces would take open space further from not only those living next to it, but those in the town. It is also against the planned approach for all new traffic to be directed onto the new aligned A299 (see technical paper 3).	
11.59	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1943	Supporting	Support the commitment to create a comprehensive network of open space across the district, and to protect existing open space. The protection of all the categories of open space listed in 11.19 is essential. There is also support for the statement in 11.58 that the open space to be preserved includes both publicly-owned and privately-owned open space. The proposed building of 100 houses on Kingsmead Field would be incompatible with these policies.	
11.59	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4458	Objecting	The existing open space which is pitches, at the Barracks site has been identified as an area where the open space has been protected. There is an over supply of pitches at the Barracks.	
11.59	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4568	Supporting	Welcomes the creation of a network of open space across the district, and protection of existing open space. Protection of all the categories of open space in 11.19 is essential. Welcomes 11.58 preserving public and private open space. The semi natural open spaces on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus is of value to the local community. Development must be ruled out in master plan. Development on Kingsmead field conflicts with these policies.	
11.59	781400	Charlie Mount		4905	Objecting	Kingsmead Field should be included in Paragraph 11.59 as an example of protection of open space within the urban environment.	Kingsmead Field should be included in Paragraph 11.59 as an example of protection of open space within the urban environment.
11.60	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1184	Supporting	We welcome the whole section on Protection of Existing Open Space	
11.61	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	948	Objecting	I find that paragraphs 11.61 is excellent and ask that it is formally incorporated into policy. In that respect paragraph 11.61 is absolutely vital.	
11.61	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1185	Supporting	We welcome the whole section on Protection of Existing Open Space	
11.61	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1802	Supporting	It is especially important that any replacement land be in the vicinity of land that is to be lost, but it is equally important that this land is only developed in exceptional circumstances as the amount of land protected is so small and there is a need for more provision already without the loss of existing sites.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.61	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6120	Objecting	Separate Local Green Spaces from other open space. The compensatory open space option does not exist by definition for LGSs	As mentioned elsewhere, OS8 and OS 9 need to be combined due to overlap and confusion. The hurdles for development must not be linked with Local Green Space as they are not in the NPPF. Alternatively and perhaps better, OS8 could be for open space other than Local Green Spaces and OS 9 be for Local Green Space or vice versa.
11.62	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	949	Objecting	I find that paragraphs 11.62 is excellent and ask that it is formally incorporated into policy.	
11.62	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1186	Supporting	We welcome the whole section on Protection of Existing Open Space	
11.62	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5251	Objecting	There are other sites, some of which are brownfield, which have not been included - for example, Howe Barracks.	
11.63	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	951	Objecting	I find that paragraphs 11.63 is excellent and ask that it is formally incorporated into policy.	
11.63	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1187	Supporting	We welcome the whole section on Protection of Existing Open Space	
Policy OS8	778485	St Michael's Road Area R A	Vice-Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	1235	Supporting	We welcome the commitment to create a comprehensive network of open space across the district, and to protect existing open space. We believe that the protection of all the categories of open space listed in 11.19 is essential, for the reasons given in that chapter. We welcome the statement in 11.58 that the open space	
Policy OS8	778563	Mrs Susan Langdown		1316	Supporting	As Kingsmead Field is such an area, it should be removed from the list of allocated housing, as it is disingenuous to include it, given that any planning application would have to be refused.	
Policy OS8	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1401	Supporting	Chapter 11: Open Space -I agree with policy OS8 in this chapter	
Policy OS8	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1804	Supporting	It is important that loss of open space is resisted especially within urban areas where there is a shortfall anyway.	
Policy OS8	779264	Mr Tony Pringle	Member HIMN	1944	Supporting	Support the commitment to create a comprehensive network of open space across the district, and to protect existing open space. The protection of all the categories of open space listed in 11.19 is essential. There is also support for the statement in 11.58 that the open space to be preserved includes both publicly-owned and privately-owned open space. The proposed building of 100 houses on Kingsmead Field would be incompatible with these policies.	
Policy OS8	779262	Mr John Bailey		1981	Supporting	Fully support.	
Policy OS8	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	2121	Objecting	This is not an objection to policy but to the map showing protected open space as a space has been omitted	Please include the space detailed
Policy OS8	778680	Mark & Dawn Walsh		2142	Supporting	support	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS8	778683	Ms Sarah Wood		2148	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces, so I support policies OS8.	
Policy OS8	778716	Ms Sue Pratt		2172	Supporting	We need to protect our open spaces, as we have many young people in the City, who are very poorly provided with exercise opportunities.	
Policy OS8	778712	Mr Robert Keen		2184	Supporting	I support Policy OS8 of the Draft Local Plan	
Policy OS8	778531	Mr Richard Norman	Vice Chair St Michael's Road Area Residents Association	2215	Supporting	We welcome the commitment to create a comprehensive network of open space across the district, and to protect existing open space. We believe that the protection of all the categories of open space listed in 11.19 is essential, for the reasons given in that chapter.	
Policy OS8	778801	A C Strange		2346	Supporting	The environment should be carefully protected, including views across the city from the University slopes and the open spaces used by residents (including students). I support these policies.	
Policy OS8	778657	Prof J H Strange		2420	Supporting	Support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8 the environment should be carefully protected, including views across the city from the University and the open spaces	
Policy OS8	778686	Alan & Britta Pearlman		2435	Supporting	Support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8. It is crucial to productive life in the city and the wider community that the environment and open spaces, including views across this historic city, be protected.	
Policy OS8	778956	Dr Michael Forrester		2482	Supporting	I support policy OS2 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	
Policy OS8	778868	Mr Tom Tomaszewski		2507	Supporting	I support Policy OS8	
Policy OS8	778870	Leigh Derbyshire		2531	Supporting	I support Policy LB2 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein	
Policy OS8	779099	Ms Jennifer Lennard		2643	Supporting	I would like to support policy OS8.	
Policy OS8	779572	Ms Margaret Derbyshire		2771	Supporting	I support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein	
Policy OS8	405193	Cllr Charlotte MacCaul		2799	Supporting	Residents wishes regarding Kingsmead Field should be respected (and it is also on a flood plain). I therefore support policy OS8 protecting residential open space and play areas. We need to retain and if possible expand the green spaces in and near the City.	
Policy OS8	780332	Ms Lucinda Malster		2899	Supporting	I support policies HE2 LB2 OS8 which protect the environment.	
Policy OS8	780293	John & Kate Hills		3216	Supporting	We support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	
Policy OS8	780292	Mrs Marianne Fearnside		3222	Supporting	I also agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces. I therefore support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8	
Policy OS8	780314	Ms Helen Gardiner		3228	Supporting	The environment in Canterbury should be protected, including open spaces and views across the city from the University of Kent slopes. Therefore I support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS8	780449	Daniel & Elizabeth Rikh		3326	Supporting	We support policy OS8 to protect views of the city from the southern slopes.	
Policy OS8	780207	Pru Cherry	The Whitstable Road Residents Association	3406	Supporting	We also support policies HE2, HE3, LB2, and OS8. We think views of, and from, the city, and its open spaces, should be protected at all costs.	
Policy OS8	778698	Mr Huw Kyffin and Sheila Kurowska		3417	Supporting	I support policies HE2, HE2, HE6, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	
Policy OS8	481630	Dr R B Mallion		3475	Supporting	I support the provisions which shall protect existing open space within the urban boundaries	
Policy OS8	479719	Dr Robert Jupe		3503	Supporting	I support policy OS8 on environmental grounds.	
Policy OS8	780690	Ms Rosemary Cane		3519	Supporting	I support the policy OS8 which deal with protection of the environment and open spaces and views across the city from the University slopes.	
Policy OS8	780505	Dr Jeremy Kendall		3733	Supporting	Support the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and to protect these open spaces. Policy OS8 should be retained and indeed strengthened.	
Policy OS8	780518	Mr Ken Fox & Family		3800	Supporting	Support policy OS8 and proposals to protect the local environment.	
Policy OS8	780988	Ms Laura Leahy		3968	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces, write to say that you support policy OS8.	
Policy OS8	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4148	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy and the comments made about the importance of existing open space in the supporting text. However, these are hollow words given the Council's decision to allocate the Kingsmead Field for development. This decision fundamentally contravenes the objectives of this Policy undermining any confidence in the Council's convictions as stated. The Kingsmead Field should be shown as an area of open space on the Proposals map, not as a site allocated for development.	
Policy OS8	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4149	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy and the comments made about the importance of existing open space in the supporting text. However, these are hollow words given the Council's decision to allocate the Kingsmead Field for development. This decision fundamentally contravenes the objectives of this Policy undermining any confidence in the Council's convictions as stated. The Kingsmead Field should be shown as an area of open space on the Proposals map, not as a site allocated for development.	Show Kingsmead Field as Open Space.
Policy OS8	780731	Mr T J Patten		4206	Supporting	I support the proposals for the protection of the environment, views across the city etc.	
Policy OS8	780732	Mr Jonathan A Cane		4210	Supporting	I support the policies which deal with protection of the environment and open spaces and views across the city from the University slopes.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS8	780983	Mr Martin Ward		4270	Supporting	Further to the above, I agree with the proposal to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces. Without these safeguards, the very essence which makes Canterbury unique will be destroyed. I support Policy OS8 .	
Policy OS8	780985	Ms Jennifer Keaveney		4284	Supporting	OS8 "Development which would involve the loss of open spaces and play areas within residential areas which contribute to the visual or recreational amenity of the area will be refused."	but would more fully support a wider statement that "Development which would involve the loss of open spaces and play areas which contribute to the visual or recreational amenity of the area will be refused."
Policy OS8	781064	Mr Richard Grayson		4330	Supporting	Policy OS8 states that permission to develop open spaces and play areas which contribute to the visual or recreational amenity in residential areas be refused. This certainly applies to both the University slopes and Kingsmead Field.	
Policy OS8	780971	Mr Tom Cane		4360	Supporting	I support the policy OS8 which deals with protection of the environment and open spaces and views across the city from the University slopes.	
Policy OS8	779600	Ms Clare Benfield		4569	Supporting	Welcomes the creation of a network of open space across the district, and protection of existing open space. Protection of all the categories of open space in 11.19 is essential. Welcomes 11.58 preserving public and private open space. The semi natural open spaces on the southern slopes of the University of Kent campus is of value to the local community. Development must be ruled out in master plan. Development on Kingsmead field conflicts with these policies.	
Policy OS8	781413	Dr Adam Bartley		4588	Supporting	Support for Policy OS8 in relation to Chaucer Fields.	
Policy OS8	781637	Mr Brendan Power		4797	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces, so support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8.	
Policy OS8	781595	Ms Laura Jowers		4798	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces, so support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8.	
Policy OS8	781400	Charlie Mount		4906	Objecting	Kingsmead Field should be included in Policy OS8 as an example of protection of open space within the urban environment.	Kingsmead Field should be included in Policy OS8 as an example of protection of open space within the urban environment.
Policy OS8	782070	Julie Rowe		5041	Supporting	I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces. I support policy OS8.	
Policy OS8	782449	Ms Jayne Ward		5141	Supporting	I agree with the proposal to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces. Without these safeguards, the very essence which makes Canterbury unique will be destroyed.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS8	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5205	Objecting	Policy OL8 is not consistent with National policy (NPPF 203-4), because: It sets a blanket requirement for development to provide for healthcare facilities arising from development which fails to reflect NPPF test that it be fairly and reasonably related to the development; It doesn't distinguish only developments that have an unacceptable impact on health facilities; it applies to all new development. Amend as outlined to make sound.	Amend Policy QL8 as follows : At the beginning add ' Where new development will have an unacceptable impact on health facilities', Delete: 'adequate provision is made for health facilities arising from the impact of new development, and that' At the end add 'and these will be of a scale and kind that is fairly and reasonably associated to the development.'
Policy OS8	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5248	Supporting	I strongly support the protection of existing Open Spaces across the District, and to this end support Policy OS8. However, in supporting this policy I believe it is vital to retain Kingsmead Field as public open space, land which contributes to the visual and recreational amenity of the area.	
Policy OS8	784481	Fabio Hedayioglu		5255	Supporting	ı,§ I agree with the proposals to protect the environment, including views across the city from the University slopes, and protecting open spaces.	
Policy OS8	421400	Mr Ben Knox		5301	Supporting	I support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment. However Canterbury residents are poorly served by open space and playgrounds within the city and this should be addressed.	
Policy OS8	781696	Sarah Harrison	Planning Analyst Southern Water	5384	Objecting	However, it is important that policies to protect open space and play areas within residential areas do not unduly restrict provision of essential water supply and wastewater infrastructure should the need arise. The policy text should recognise that essential utility development will be permitted in exceptional circumstances, if no alternative site is available.	Add text to the end of policy LOS8: ...unless the proposal is for essential utility infrastructure, and the benefit of the development outweighs any harm.
Policy OS8	781622	Mr T Whiting		5400	Supporting	I have attended all the meetings in the Guildhall with regard to St. Stephan's field and as a neutral observer who has played on those fields as a younger man I have been impressed with the arguments put forward by the public to save the fields as an open space for all to use. In contrast I have been shocked by the content and presentation put forward by the council, ill researched and blatantly incorrect. I therefore support policies HE2, LB2 and OS8.	
Policy OS8	380265	Pavilion Property group	Pavillion Property	5788	Objecting	Land North of Stour Promenade, Glenside Avenue - proposal for Protected Open Space and Student Accommodation. There is no reason why the site will come forward for open space purposes - no financial justification without enabling development .Compulsory purchase action is improbable. Our proposals are sound and financially viable. They would facilitate the delivery of high quality open space, including equipped play space. The need to student accommodation is recognised.	Propose this site is amended to show the site part as Open Space and part for student purpose-built student accommodation.
Policy OS8	784807	Mr John Pike		5948	Supporting	I support policy OS8 and the proposals to protect the local environment therein.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS8	779237	Mrs Ursula Harris	secretary Harkness area Residents Association	6012	Supporting	We welcome the commitment to create a comprehensive network of open space across the district, and to protect existing open space. We welcome the statement in 11.58 that the open space to be preserved includes both publicly owned and privately-owned open space. We also believe that the proposed building of 100 houses on Kingsmead Field, and any development on the southern slopes, would be incompatible with these policies.	
Policy OS8	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6169	Objecting	The Plan ignores Local Green Spaces, defined for special protection in the NPPF.	Combine OS8 and OS9 or allocated one to protected open space and one for Local Green Spaces and make it clear that the hurdles do not apply in their standard form; in particular about substituting alternative open space. Remove the special focus on Field in Trust whose protection if any over and above other protected open space comes via the trust deed. Feature NPPF hurdles for development as stated in OS8 and the best of any elements the hurdles C24 where they enhance protection.
Policy OS8	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6772	Supporting	EXCELLENT - Under this Policy most Strategic Development Sites would have been excluded! Can it be retrospective?	
11.64	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1188	Supporting	We welcome the whole section on Protection of Existing Open Space	
11.65	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1189	Supporting	We welcome the whole section on Protection of Existing Open Space	
11.65	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3072	Supporting	Support for Paragraph 11.65	
11.65	481630	Dr R B Mallion		3472	Supporting	I support the provisions which shall protect existing open space within the urban boundaries	
11.65	789283	Cllr James Flanagan	Westgate Ward	5249	Supporting	Furthermore, paragraph 11.65 states that, "The overall deficiency in Open Space in the District, as previously mentioned, means that the City Council is especially determined to prevent the loss of existing open space within the urban boundaries...". Under the requirements of policy OS8, development ought to be refused on Kingsmead field.	
11.66	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1190	Supporting	We welcome the whole section on Protection of Existing Open Space	
11.66	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3074	Supporting	Support for Paragraph 11.66	
11.66	481630	Dr R B Mallion		3473	Supporting	I support the provisions which shall protect existing open space within the urban boundaries	
11.66	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6133	Objecting	'Tankerton slopes, Whitstable' is incorrect: It should be ' Tankerton Slopes(excluding beach hut sites and sites that the council wants to build beach huts on , Whitstable'.	'Tankerton slopes, Whitstable' is incorrect: It should be ' Tankerton Slopes(excluding beach hut sites and sites that the council wants to build beach huts on , Whitstable'.
11.67	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1191	Supporting	We welcome the whole section on Protection of Existing Open Space	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS9	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	3	Objecting	Local Green space proposals: - Westcliff Meadow. Westmeads Rd recreation Park Columbia recreation park Cornwallis Circle Seasalter beach West Beach Church St playing fields Tankerton Slopes Prospect field Prospect field	Please make these sites Local Green Spaces: Westcliff Meadow. Westmeads Rd recreation Park Columbia recreation park Cornwallis Circle Seasalter beach West Beach Church St playing fields Tankerton Slopes Prospect field Prospect field
Policy OS9	771779	Mrs Patricia Kane		400	Supporting	I fully support this policy and the need to protect open space within residential areas. I particularly hope this policy will give protection to Chaucer Fields and Kingsmead Fields as they are both open spaces which are highly valued by local people in two densely populated parts of the city.	
Policy OS9	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	912	Objecting	The growth of the University over recent decades has been exponential. I concur with policy EMP7 but it does not go far enough. I fear that with unchecked development the University could be seen as a cuckoo in Canterbury's nest and this would be counter productive to both the City and the University. Economic contribution made by the University is recognised but it sits in an AHLV that can affect the setting of the cathedral, preservation of Blean Woods and amenity value of open space.	With this in mind I would wish to see the area of Campus to the south of University Road shown on the Proposals Map as "Protection of Existing Open Space"
Policy OS9	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	960	Supporting	This is absolutely vital and is to be applauded	
Policy OS9	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	1005	Objecting	I object to Policy OS 9 as I feel it does not go far enough. It fails to mention the special designation of Local Green Space provided under the auspices of para. 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	Accordingly we ask that the following be added: e). In respect of land designated "Local Green Space" there will be no development permitted other than in extreme circumstances and in the public interest or where there is an overriding requirement to install devices to protect the land from degradation or loss eg sea defences, erosion prevention.
Policy OS9	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	1009	Objecting	I also object to sub paragraph (d) on the grounds that it is ambiguous as the word Council has not been defined. It is unclear as to whether here that such a decision is to be delegated to a single unelected officer or whether the matter would be decided by the Full Council.	Accordingly we ask that the following be added: d) before the word "Council" add the word "Full"
Policy OS9	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1177	Supporting	We welcome Policy OS9	
Policy OS9	500218	Robert & Helen Atkins		1178	Objecting	We regard it as vital that the southern slopes of the University of Kent's campus should enjoy this kind of protection from development. The proposed 'Chaucer Fields' development is in our view not compatible with points a) and c) of Policy OS9, in that there would clearly be 'material harm' to the 'visual or recreational amenity of the area', and that the proposed development could well be accommodated in another part of the university's very extensive campus.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS9	778387	Mr David Smith		1342	Supporting	I support the Council's commitment to protect existing open space (as existing Policy C24), and to make improved provision where there is a shortfall, wether it be on private or publicly owned land. I am concerned to ensure that the Open Space Strategy will continue to designate the Southen Slopes of the University of Kent's campus as Amenity Greenspace and that all development proposals will be rejected.	
Policy OS9	772683	Mr Bruce Woodcock		1348	Supporting	Recently the university has built extensively on buffer zone land. If the south side of University Road is also built upon, there will be no green space left between City and University. There is strong opposition to such a development from local residents and also the Student Union which found that students were also overwhelmingly against this development. Many students choose the university because of its beautiful campus so the university would destroy its key selling point to applicants.	
Policy OS9	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1405	Supporting	Chapter 11: Open Space -I agree with policy OS9 in this chapter	
Policy OS9	778305	Ms Ros McIntyre		1635	Objecting	The beach at Herne Bay and the Downs should more properly be designated as Local Green Space. Full reasons are in the attached letter from Friends of the Downs.	Designate the beach at Herne Bay from Hampton to Bishopstone as Local Green Soace and include in that designation the Downs from Canterbury Road to Bishopstone.
Policy OS9	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1805	Objecting	c) replacement in the locality. Can you please define how far away 'in the locality' is. Is it anywhere in the CCC area, or is close to site where space is being lost? With the acknowledged lack of open space in the district and the overriding benefits of having it within urban areas. The need must surely be in the vicinity of the land to be lost rather than locality. d) open space is assessed as making no positive contribution to the OSS. - This is a weak clause and should be made stronger.	c) Clarify how far 'locality' is or change to close proximity d) amend this clause to read: The open space has been assessed by the Council and has clearly shown it makes no positive contribution to its overall strategy on open space and it is surplus to requirements.
Policy OS9	779262	Mr John Bailey		1982	Supporting	Fully agree esp about urban open spaces.	
Policy OS9	778936	Ms Sally Newcombe	Secretary West Beach PACT & Residents Association	2617	Objecting	Lastly we would like to register an objection to Policy OS9, which we feel does not offer the same level of protection as afforded by Local Green Space designation, particularly to the beach, and therefore is not in line with the guidance in the NPPF.	
Policy OS9	778304	O W Presland		2665	Objecting	The site south of John Wilson Business Park should be omitted from the OS9 category because its inclusion does not contribute to the open space strategy. (See attached plan)	
Policy OS9	778530	Ms Kate Ashbrook	General Secretary The Open Spaces Society	2751	Supporting	The Open Spaces Society writes in support of the Whitstable Beach Campaign's submission regarding the designation of Whitstable Beach.	
Policy OS9	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2868	Objecting	Policy OS9 is not supported, what point is there in protecting open space if the council can then make exceptions.	
Policy OS9	779319	Roisin Bresnihan		3077	Supporting	Support for Policy OS9	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS9	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3170	Supporting	Many of the Policies within this section relate to amenity space and so are outside our remit. However amenity space if enhanced for biodiversity along the boundaries by incorporating hedgerows or wildflower and rough grassland can provide routes for species to disperse through the open space. We welcome the protection of existing open space and the green gaps, as this will ensure that any open space provided is a direct gain to the district.	
Policy OS9	779277	Mr Richard Amos		3287	Supporting	The draft Local Plan seems to disregard a firm commitment made by KCC & CCC during the consultation regarding the options to improve the A299 Thanet Way. This was that there would be 'no subsequent development infill between the Blue Route and the then existing Thanet Way' (now the A2990).	
Policy OS9	780271	Councillor Alison O'Dea	Councillor Canterbury City Council	3295	Objecting	Policy OS9. This is inadequate as it fails to deal with the new designation of Local Green Space and the designation of Whitstable Beach under this category is too good an opportunity to miss with this local plan.	
Policy OS9	481630	Dr R B Mallion		3476	Supporting	I support the provisions which shall protect existing open space within the urban boundaries	
Policy OS9	780762	Mrs Carol Davis		3567	Objecting	I request that the fields of Strode Farm be safeguarded as open space to protect the setting of Herne Village to the east and Blean Woods to the south. I further request that the land between 'Canterbury Fields' estate (the former Herne Hospital) and Herne Village (Carden's Field) be designated as protected open space to safeguard the tree lined approach to our historic village; complimenting Curtis Wood Park on the other side of Canterbury Road.	I request that the fields of Strode Farm be safeguarded as open space to protect the setting of Herne Village to the east and Blean Woods to the south. I further request that the land between 'Canterbury Fields' estate (the former Herne Hospital) and Herne Village (Carden's Field) be designated as protected open space.
Policy OS9	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4152	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent object to this Policy, as it is the complete opposite to the approach advocated in Policy OS8, which would see any development proposed on open space being refused. The Policy should be deleted and its supporting text included before Policy OS8.	The Policy should be deleted and its supporting text included before Policy OS8.
Policy OS9	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4459	Objecting	The Barracks are over provided in relation to the resident population and take account of the specific training and fitness requirements placed on MOD personnel. DIO's Vision includes not only formal and informal open space related to the development but also the enhancement of the open space and creation of a linear park opening up historic views to the City. DIO will provide a range of open space to the Council open space standard. To retain them would prejudice the proper planning of the area	In light of the over-provision DIO suggests that the Proposals Map shows a hatched area of protected open space, which is subject to more detailed studies as a planning application is brought forward.
Policy OS9	121776	Hendersons	Hendersons Global Investors	4997	Objecting	On the Proposals Map three parts of the Whitefriars pedestrian thoroughfare and seating areas are identified as 'Existing Open Space'. These areas do not perform a specific open space function and should not be controlled as such. To do so would introduce an unnecessarily high level of control on the operation of the centre. This could impact on our day to day management and / or future growth functions.	Remove defined areas of Open Space from proposals Map. The function of these areas can be adequately controlled through policy based design criteria should any schemes emerge.

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS9	781351	Mr George Wilson	George Wilson Developments	5265	Objecting	We request the council to remove the Protected Open Space designation covering the entire site, limiting it to the roadside landscape buffer.	We request the council to remove the Protected Open Space designation covering the entire site, limiting it to the roadside landscape buffer.
Policy OS9	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5635	Supporting	Whitstable The shortage of parkland in the town means that existing open space and green areas (wooded or otherwise) are all the more valuable and worthy of preservation. The role of the beach is also crucial in compensating for open space shortfalls. The need to protect these existing green and recreational assets is critical in this context.	
Policy OS9	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	6176	Objecting	See OS 8 also. OS8 and OS 9 are very confusing . They replicate, have irrelevant sections and do not cover Local Green Space	OS8 and 9 should be combined or one applied to 'ordinary' protected open space and one to Local Green Spaces using primarily the development hurdles of the NPPF making clear the contribution that protected open space makes to the visual or recreational amenity of the area and that is to be protected. See OS 8 response.
Policy OS9	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6773	Objecting	If this refers to Public Open Space held in Trust, then the answer for any development proposal must surely be 'NO'.	
11.68	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1807	Objecting	Should include reference to reasonable size open space that is actually useable, in the vicinity. Offsite provision could also lead to a lack of provision in an area where it is needed, ie where residences are unless it is situated in the vicinity.	Should include reference to reasonable size open space that is actually useable, in the vicinity.
11.69	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6774	Objecting	€; The use of open space in housing design is considered in policy DBE7 and DBE15 of this Local Plan'. These Policies do not actually refer to the standards in para 11.71. NOTE: The last DBE Policy is 13 - there is NO DBE15 in Chapter 8	
11.71	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4131	Objecting	These paragraphs present various, and different, definitions of open space which causes confusion. Just one definition should be used.	Just use one definition.
11.71	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5203	Objecting	Policy SO10 is not 'Justified' as it does not represent the most appropriate strategy by failing to take into account a range of circumstances. A more flexible approach to address site specific considerations would be reasonable and Justified, and Comply with National Policy' by ensuring that the scale of obligations is proportionate to the development. Also the public open space requirements are excessive. Amend as outlined.	Open space should be provided at NPFA standard of 2.5ha per 1000 people. Amend Table in para 11.71.
11.71	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6775	Objecting	Where are site population estimates? These are needed to ensure the open space provisions are delivered with the development. The provision MUST be guaranteed. NOTE: STURRY/Broad OAK NEED ACTUAL PROVISION. A Developer's financial contribution is not an option for SP3 Site 2. There is NO guarantee at the moment that actual benefit to the community will be delivered here, as no allocation is specified for Site 2 (as yet).	Mention/ cross reference Paras 11.18 to 11.25 here, which are concerned with under provision. Suggested addition here: 'The open space provision for all new development sites, should include additional provision where there is an already an outstanding shortfall in the immediate area'.
Policy OS10	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1410	Objecting	I agree with most the policies in this chapter, but there is no mention of a quad bike or motocross track. There is a real need for this in the District, but it has been difficult to identify a suitable site. However, the Howe Barracks might be the place.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS10	778569	Mrs Jennifer Bate	PLANNING OFFICER KENT DOWNS AONB	1835	Objecting	Where within or within the setting of the AONB financial contribution to the management of the AONB which will be impacted by pressures from the new development will be sought. We raise this point under para 1.86 and SP7	Add text as indicated in BOLD: Where within the AONB or its setting a financial contribution to the management of PRoW and boundary treatments in perpetuity will be required to mitigate recreational pressures on the AONB's farmed landscape
Policy OS10	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2869	Objecting	Policy OS10 Agree first paragraph, if this is not attainable then development should not be allowed. Disagree with 2nd Paragraph; it is a get out clause.	
Policy OS10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4153	Objecting	Support this Policy, but the phrase 'elsewhere in the locality' should be defined in the supporting text. We would suggest that this should be defined as 'within easy walking distance of the development proposed but no further than 400m'.	The phrase ' elsewhere in the locality ' should be defined in the supporting text. We would suggest that this should be defined as ' within easy walking distance of the development proposed but no further than 400m' .
Policy OS10	780620	Mr David Birmingham		4224	Supporting	Support for lots of small, very local, green, breathing spaces, which can be accessed and used by families.	
Policy OS10	780980	Ms Cecilia Duggan		4231	Supporting	I agree with OS10 regarding the importance of outdoor play space.	
Policy OS10	780986	Mr Peter Taylor-Gooby		4291	Objecting	South Canterbury lacks adequate public open space. The plan will not provide this and CCC must develop a serious policy on this issue. Part of Ridlands Farm could be dedicated to such use.	
Policy OS10	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5202	Objecting	Policy SO10 is not 'Justified' as it does not represent the most appropriate strategy by failing to take into account a range of circumstances. A more flexible approach to address site specific considerations would be reasonable and Justified, and Comply with National Policy' by ensuring that the scale of obligations is proportionate to the development. Also the public open space requirements are excessive. Amend as outlined.	Insert this text before the last sentence in para 2 of Policy OS10 - 'Where a development over provides in one specific area of outdoor space and this approach is supported by the City Council, then the proportion of other areas of outdoor space to be provided either on site or through a financial contribution, will be negotiated on a site by site basis.'
Policy OS10	784612	Mr Dale Greetham	Planner Sport England	5755	Objecting	Sport England would recommend that this policy is revised in line with the below policy objective (related policy approaches can be found at the following link: http://www.sportengland.org/media/121906/document-7-spatial-planning-for-sport-development-control-guidance-note-.pdf):	Sport England would recommend that this policy is revised in line with the below policy objective (related policy approaches can be found at the following link: http://www.sportengland.org/media/121906/document-7-spatial-planning-for-sport-development-control-guidance-note-.pdf):
Policy OS10	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6128	Objecting	Development should not be supported if it has an overall negative impact to recreational open space, green corridors and public rights of way. This policy should also include financial provision for enhancements to any public rights of way that maybe directly or indirectly affected by the development. This again would support the city councils wider ambition to promote sustainable transport. KCC supports the possibility of some education development within the Green Gap between HB/Whit.	
Policy OS10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6776	Objecting	Fine, BUT STURRY/Broad OAK NEEDS ACTUAL PROVISION - Developer's financial contribution is not optional for SP3 Site 2	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.75	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6777	Supporting	11.75 - 11.37 All points are most admirable in their intention. Delivery is the important thing.	
Policy OS11	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		409	Supporting	I wholly support this policy. In my view the need for open spaces to be highly accessible and to be available for pedestrian and cycle journeys is particularly important for enabling sustainable transport choice, improving health and social inclusion.	
Policy OS11	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1412	Supporting	Chapter 11: Open Space - I agree with policy OS11 in this chapter.	
Policy OS11	172242	Ms Debbie Salmon	Conservation Officer Policy Kent Wildlife Trust	3171	Supporting	This policy shows a good understanding of the multifunctional uses of Green Infrastructure and incorporates biodiversity enhancement. This coupled with Policy SP6 provides clear guidance regarding the requirement for green infrastructure and will ensure the design will cater for the needs of new residents and biodiversity.	We question whether the provision of 4ha of natural open space will be adequate to provide sufficient natural habitat to deflect people away from the designated sites.
Policy OS11	780494	Ms Elizabeth Akenhead	British Horse Society	3671	Objecting	Policy OS11a should be amended so that the wording does not exclude equestrians. Policy OS11a should refer to corridors for movement on "foot, cycle or horseback".	Change the wording of Policy OS11a so that it does not exclude equestrians; and refers to corridors for movement on "foot, cycle or horseback".
Policy OS11	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4162	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but the commitment in point b. to protect and improve existing areas of open space rings hollow given the decision to allocate the Kingsmead Field for development. This decision undermines any confidence in the Council's convictions to protect and improve areas of existing open space as stated in this Policy.	
Policy OS11	781064	Mr Richard Grayson		4341	Supporting	Policy OS11 - I agree also with this policy that 'Proposals for new development should ensure that ... existing green space is protected and improved'.	
Policy OS11	781400	Charlie Mount		4907	Objecting	Kingsmead Field should be included in Policy OS11 as an example of protection of open space within the urban environment.	Kingsmead Field should be included in Policy OS11 as an example of protection of open space within the urban environment.
Policy OS11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6778	Supporting	Sounds Good	
11.79	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6779	Objecting	The riverside strategy aims ..'. Para 10.76 states that the Riverside Strategy (2003) is currently under review. This needs to be here and not in para 11.80.	
11.79	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6780	Objecting	...Chartham to Sturry'. Is this the Canterbury/Fordwich link mentioned in para 11.38? Confusing.	
11.79	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6781	Objecting	'The wildlife interest and biodiversity of the river will be enhanced'. Policy LB16 says this.	
11.80	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4164	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but on the Policies Map it is unclear what the extent of the corridor is as it is shown with the same notation as for open space sites under Policy SO8. A different notation should be used on the Proposals Map. The Kingsmead Field site should be shown as being within the corridor	A different notation should be used on the Proposals Map. The Kingsmead Field site should be shown as being within the corridor

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
11.80	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6782	Objecting	...a route adjacent to the river ...shown on the Proposals Map (inset 2)'. Why no mention of Inset map 3? What provision will be made for crossing the railway to link with the Site 2 development as indicated on Inset map 3?	
11.81	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		410	Supporting	The delivery of the riverside walking and cycling route is of fundamental importance to furthering sustainable travel choice within Canterbury.	
11.81	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6783	Objecting	'All sites...'. Does this mean all the sites identified in this Plan or only those adjacent to the river? Site 2 is very close and the route is shown going into it. Do the Developers of this site know that this is something else for which they will be expected to make contribution?	
Policy OS12	776445	Dr Grainne Evans		633	Supporting	Support for the riverside strategy	
Policy OS12	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	963	Objecting	Amend Policy OS12	In respect of Policy OS 12 we need to add: "We will guard against the overuse of the river by boat hirers and kindred activities using the licensing system and bye laws to ensure that the tranquillity of the river is maintained and that wildlife suffers no undue disturbance"
Policy OS12	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1413	Supporting	Chapter 11: Open Space - I agree with policy OS12 in this chapter.	
Policy OS12	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4163	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but on the Policies Map it is unclear what the extent of the corridor is as it is shown with the same notation as for open space sites under Policy SO8. A different notation should be used on the Proposals Map. The Kingsmead Field site should be shown as being within the corridor	A different notation should be used on the Proposals Map. The Kingsmead Field site should be shown as being within the corridor
Policy OS12	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4872	Objecting	We suggest adding to Policy OS12: Kingsmead Field should be protected and used as a children's playground, an open space for sport, a skateboard park, a semi-natural area and a part of the riverside corridor.	We suggest adding to Policy OS12:Kingsmead Field should be protected and used as a children's playground, an open space for sport, a skateboard park, a semi-natural area and a part of the riverside corridor.
Policy OS12	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6784	Objecting	The only map reference is Inset 2. Inset map 3 which shows the continuation of the route must also be mentioned. Should there also be reference to Policy LB16?	
Policy OS12	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6886	Supporting	"Land ... along the River Stour ...will be protected from development to enable its future use and contribution towards the riverside corridor, as set out in the Riverside Strategy adopted by the City Council."This policy would again refer to Kingsmead Field, which could be a semi-natural area and form part of the riverside corridor, as well as having a children's playground, sports field and skateboard park.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS12	781036	Brother Austin SSF	EastBridge Hospital	6951	Objecting	The Council's wish to enhance the River Stour corridors, by seeking to create public access close to an almshouse occupied by elderly and vulnerable people, is impractical. The proposed route runs through narrow passageways. It will not be possible to create a riverside walk through the centre of Canterbury, which has many listed buildings on the banks of the River Stour, without massive disruption to the history and environment of the City.	
11.82	778154	Councillor Ashley Clark	Canterbury City Council	945	Objecting	In respect of allotments I support the views expressed but in my experience there are many allotments that are underused, ramshackle and unsightly.	We need to state as a matter of policy: "The council is supportive of the use of allotments and is aware of the huge contribution they can make in terms of physical exercise, mental well being, healthy eating and the reduction of food miles. We will actively seek out appropriate sites that can be used. At the same time we will ensure that allotment land is used to its full potential with unused plots being reallocated and half size plots being allocated. We will ensure that sites are kept in a tidy manner and where new sites are considered we will implement management plans to ensure that sites are well maintained."
11.82	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4169	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent support these policies, but we feel that the supporting text could be more promotional of allotment usage and the benefits that allotments have for physical and mental well-being.	
11.82	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6785	Supporting	11.82 - 11.84 All very good	
11.85	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6665	Objecting	An allotment standard has been suggested for the allocation of 15 plots per 1,000 households. The National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners, which gave this figure, also define the size of a plot as 250 square metres, roughly equivalent to a doubles tennis court. This important statistic should be adhered to.	
11.85	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6786	Objecting	Although there are no guidelines as to the level of provision ...!. Yes there are, in para 11.71 !	
11.86	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6787	Supporting	All very good	
11.87	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6788	Supporting	All very good	
Policy OS13	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1414	Supporting	Chapter 11: Open Space - I agree with policy OS13 in this chapter.	
Policy OS13	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4165	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support these policies, but we feel that the supporting text could be more promotional of allotment usage and the benefits that allotments have for physical and mental well-being.	

Summary Chapter 11 - Open Space

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy OS13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6789	Supporting	Good, if that is where the local community would like them to be, and the site meets the criteria in para 11.85.	
Policy OS14	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1415	Supporting	Chapter 11: Open Space - I agree with policy OS14 in this chapter.	
Policy OS14	13856	Mr Graham Cox	Chair (Planning Committee) Whitstable Society	2158	Objecting	Beach hut sites and allotment or closely related and policy is needed for both to ensure use of the land and that the sites are kept attractive.	Introduce a policy for publicly owned beach huts sites on protected open space alongside or similar to but separate to that for allotments to ensure effective use and care for the sites.
Policy OS14	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4168	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support these policies, but we feel that the supporting text could be more promotional of allotment usage and the benefits that allotments have for physical and mental well-being.	
Policy OS14	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6790	Supporting	Good, although the most important factor is in (a) 'of comparable quality'	

Comments Summary:

Chapter 12: Quality of Life



Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
12.1	778466	Mrs Barbara Hudgell		1394	Supporting	It is important to foster a good quality of life in your neighbourhood. There should be more emphasis on setting up local community groups to work together to improve things that may have been lost through cut backs.	
12.1	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3722	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and access to facilities: We welcome this Chapter	
12.1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4873	Supporting	This section contains many well-intentioned proposals and places a welcome emphasis on community involvement in decision-making in the planning of provision and facilities.	
12.1	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4882	Objecting	Any debate about quality of life must take account of those whose quality of life is reduced through poverty or other disadvantage. We are dismayed that the Draft Local Plan makes little mention of this issue. There are significant inequalities in the length of time that people can expect to live in different parts of the district.	Local authorities now have more discretion to add to social security benefits, so the options include: · Protecting families with children in decisions about benefits, and making payments for essential items, council tax and support with housing costs · Ensuring that child poverty is a priority for Health and Well-being Boards, so as to give every child the best possible start in life · More generally, it is important to check that people are receiving the benefits to which they are entitled, for example, by running a Benefits Awareness Campaign. This can also bring significant additional income to the local area (Turn2us, 2013)
12.1	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5661	Objecting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:- Quality of Life and Access to facilities chapter 12 - positive aspects (but too aspirational and not concrete enough and air quality section could be substantially improved)	
12.1	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5765	Objecting	The DLP talks about promoting community development. Unfortunately, 'community' is nowhere defined and essentially it seems to be equated with the provision of physical facilities. However, communities are uncertain human constructs and not an automatic creations of buildings. The Plan contains no ideas, let alone policies, on how to encourage real community formation.	
12.1	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6467	Supporting	We support the whole of this chapter.	
12.1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6791	Objecting	An initial comment: Although this is the last chapter, it is the most important. It is rather strange that there is no opening reference to the Council's concern, vision, pledge or overall aim for the people of Canterbury.	
12.1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6792	Objecting	.. Local authorities have the power ..'. How it is used is what matters.	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
12.1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6895	Objecting	Supportive of the focus on facilities and services that are developed and delivered locally. This is the most effective, sustainable and egalitarian approach. However, the Council could be bolder in its expectations and do more to insist that developments follow these guidelines rather than simply encouraging them. The Council should be more vocal in its opposition to government austerity measures which are, inevitably, impacting disadvantaged groups and those on low incomes disproportionately.	
12.1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6897	Supporting	Supportive of social, economic and environmental wellbeing being included in the same sentence, as they are equally important and inextricably linked.	
12.1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6945	Objecting	Additions to the Plan: There are several areas regarding community which need attention, including the real and/or perceived increasing drug problem in the City, as well as aggressive begging, and alcohol related disturbance. The Council urged to take on board the recommendations made in the Community Safety Chapter of the Canterbury Society's "Residents' Vision for Canterbury".	Addition to the Plan: Adopt the recommendations made in the Community Safety Chapter of the Canterbury Society's "Residents' Vision for Canterbury".
12.2	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4166	Objecting	After "shopping" insert "public houses".	After " shopping " insert " public houses " .
12.3	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4875	Objecting	Access to facilities and improving the quality of life' are presented as essential elements in the Plan. It does not seem to refer to access by the public to historically open recreational spaces, one example of which is the Kingsmead development which threatens to privatise a well-used public open space.	
12.3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6793	Objecting	Access to facilitiesand where possible the Local Plan should assist with delivering community facilities in the right locations'. NOT GOOD ENOUGH. This is weak. The Local Plan should, and must be the agent of delivery!	
12.3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6795	Objectinginvolve local communities ..'. The Council, as 'steward', must ensure this is democratic and actually involve residents. The situation which has occurred in Sturry Parish where there have been serious failings in the representation of residents.	
12.3	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6900	Objecting	Agree that community facilities must be delivered in the right locations and that all facilities must be accessible for all. However, the Local Plan could make an even stronger commitment to these aims by disallowing any new developments which do not meet these criteria.	
12.4	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1280	Supporting	We support the sentiment that new communities must be sustainable, but not place pressure on existing facilities. Indeed, any new development should seek to improve facilities for the community overall, new and existing. However, we would caution against large scale developments such as in Canterbury. No mention has been made about improving hospital and dental provision. This needs to be addressed	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
12.4	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4876	Objecting	Encouragement of community involvement in the design of new developments is welcomed. However, it is important that such involvement should take place at an early stage, to avoid later pressures and tensions and to integrate the new and old communities.	
12.4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6794	Objecting	... community involvement ..'. The Council, as 'steward', must ensure this is democratic and actually involve residents. The situation which has occurred in Sturry Parish where there have been serious failings in the representation of residents.	
12.4	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6902	Objecting	We fully agree that planning policy "should facilitate and promote sustainable and inclusive patterns of development, contributing to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities". We would add diverse to this list.	Amend the following text to read "should facilitate and promote sustainable and inclusive patterns of development, contributing to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable, diverse and mixed communities".
12.5	777349	Mrs Chris Molony	Secretary St Stephen's Residents Association	1281	Supporting	We support the involvement of voluntary and community groups. Only too often, community groups such as residents associations are not regarded as stakeholders. If this Plan, or indeed any part of it is to work, the local community must be consulted at every stage, and their views not just listened to, but acted upon. For too long, community and campaign groups have been ignored, or regarded as nuisances. This must change.	
12.5	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3724	Supporting	We offer the support and involvement of SMACS in critical solidarity with the Council and as a stakeholder (12.5), ready and willing to co-operate in all the positive aspects of the Local Plan	
12.5	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5527	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'Localism'. This includes the willingness to work with Neighbourhood Plans as well as the commitment to meeting current needs and working with the community.	
12.6	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6904	Objecting	Agree that there is a need for a high quality integrated transport system which is accessible to all, as is the need to dramatically reduce pollution and congestion. To these ends the Council should embrace the recommendations laid out in Dr. Lynn Sloman's report, "A Sustainable Transport Blueprint for Canterbury".	
12.7	665473	Dr Richard Norman		582	Supporting	I agree with the importance of working with local communities to address their priorities. In the Canterbury context this means in particular that the Council should work closely with Residents Associations, listen to their concerns and support them in their work.	
12.7	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6468	Supporting	Community Development:We welcome the Vision for Kent's call for a more resilient and influential society, more involved in the shape and delivery of services in their community. Canterbury has a strong and varied Third Sector and community life. We value the support and partnership of our elected representatives and would resist current proposals to reduce their numbers and thus their effectiveness. We also commend the work of the Council's excellent Community Development officers.	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
12.7	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6908	Objecting	In order to move towards more resilient communities and encourage more community involvement, there is a need to identify and develop ways of encouraging active citizenship, civic pride, participatory democracy and consensus decision-making. The Council should introduce a "register" of their localism/community initiatives as a means of demonstrating what they are doing/encouraging in this direction.	
12.8	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4167	Objecting	After "services" insert ", to financially assist and to".	After " services " insert ", to financially assist and to" .
12.8	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6914	Objecting	The civil society sector needs more support to deliver public services. Social enterprises still need funding as not all public service activities can be run like a business. Contracts with the civil society sector must reflect full cost recovery; funding should be for at least 3 years and in line with standards set by The Compact; service delivery should be outcome-focused, co-produced and co-delivered with beneficiaries; and monitoring and quality assurance should be robust but not onerous.	
12.9	665473	Dr Richard Norman		583	Supporting	The Council should support this Government commitment to promoting community cohesion in order to meet the diverse needs of all residents. This is particularly important in areas where there are high concentrations of HMOs which are liable to undermine community cohesion.	
12.11	13680	Ms Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust	971	Objecting	Para 12.10 quotes from NPPF about the delivery of social, recreational and cultural facilities, which they assume relate to 12.11 which defines social infrastructure but is inconsistent with Para 12.10. Ensure terminology remains consistent and include a new description of social infrastructure.	Include this description: social infrastructure provides facilities for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.
12.11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6796	Objecting	Social Infrastructure ...Their provision in the right location'. The proposals for the 1,000 house on Site 2 Sturry/Broad Oak lack any mention of the provision of surgeries or additional school space. Much is 'unspecified', 'to be decided' or just not designated. This is unacceptable.	
12.11	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6916	Supporting	Supportive of formal and informal community, leisure, health and educational facilities being accessible, local and sustainable. To this end, the Council should put more pressure on Kent County Council to reverse their decision to close five Sure Start Children's Centres in the Canterbury District.	
12.13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6797	Objecting	What does 'Appropriate circumstances' and 'appropriate cases' mean in reality? Who determines this? The developers of Site 2, may among others be expected to make contribution for a new road to avoid Sturry crossing, but the provision of Social Infrastructure will require a further contribution, as the present facilities in Sturry will be inadequate and not easily accessible. Is Policy SP7 being applied at this site? Where can the 'implementation plan' to which Policy SP7 refers, be seen.	
Policy QL1	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1416	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and Access to Facilities - I agree with policy QL1 in this chapter.	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy QL1	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4170	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but for developments in the rural area an additional paragraph should be added as follows: "In the rural areas, in addition to the above, proposals should be well related to an existing settlement and not in the open countryside. As a priority they should involve the reuse of an existing building or previously used land within, or immediately adjoining, the settlement boundary."	Add a paragraph: " In the rural areas, in addition to the above, proposals should be well related to an existing settlement and not in the open countryside. As a priority they should involve the reuse of an existing building or previously used land within, or immediately adjoining, the settlement boundary. "
Policy QL1	765171	Ms Louise Spalding	Ministry Of Defence	4460	Supporting	DIO supports the principles of this policy.	
Policy QL1	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6798	Objecting	Should make reference to Policy SP7	
Policy QL1	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6917	Objecting	Supportive of this policy but would add that new developments should be located close to public transport hubs and not near major road junctions or in isolated locations, with no/little access to public transport. This would have the dual benefit of reducing congestion/improving air quality while simultaneously ensuring that facilities are truly accessible to all.	
12.14	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4877	Objecting	No reference is made to minimum standards for internal or external space or storage. It is also important that new developments include sustainable energy saving provision, which should be integral to the design of dwellings, rather than clip on extras.	No reference is made to minimum standards for internal or external space or storage. It is also important that new developments include sustainable energy saving provision, which should be integral to the design of dwellings, rather than clip on extras.
12.14	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6799	Supporting	'.. where people will want to live and work now and in the future .' This and 12.15 are all good points.	
12.14	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6918	Objecting	Supportive of this policy but would add that new developments should be located close to public transport hubs and not near major road junctions or in isolated locations, with no/little access to public transport. This would have the dual benefit of reducing congestion/improving air quality while simultaneously ensuring that facilities are truly accessible to all.	
12.14	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6919	Supporting	Canterbury & District Green Party fully supports this statement.	
12.15	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4874	Objecting	The chapter mentions the promotion of social inclusion, but does not deal adequately with the quality of life of those who live in poverty or who are excluded from mainstream life. We present some data about the numbers of people involved, and some proposals about what might be done to help them.	
12.15	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6800	Supporting	Good points	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
12.15	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6801	Objecting	The diversity of local communities must be taken into account!. First know and understand the existing community where additional development is proposed. It cannot be said that the complexity of Sturry Parish and the interreaction with its Fordwich and Westbere neighbours has been really appreciated. See para 8.50	
12.15	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6920	Supporting	Supportive of this policy. However, it should refer to absolutely every unit of housing.	
12.16	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6802	Objecting	Village facilities are important ...!. Any changes which reduce free access from Sturry High Street puts the viability shops and services at risk. Does the Farm Shop at Broad Oak survive the development proposals? There is no mention here of the protection for existing village shops and services, which are implied elsewhere in the Plan.	
12.16	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6921	Supporting	Supportive of this statement and with policies QL2 and QL3.	
12.17	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6803	Objecting	'The loss of these services'. Any changes which reduce free access from Sturry High Street puts the viability shops and services at risk. Does the Farm Shop at Broad Oak survive the development proposals? There is no mention here of the protection for existing village shops and services, which are implied elsewhere in the Plan.	
Policy QL2	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1417	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and Access to Facilities -I agree with policy QL2in this chapter.	
Policy QL2	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6804	Supporting	Within the villages ..permit use or extension ...!. This is a sensible approach	
Policy QL2	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6922	Supporting	Supportive of policy QL2.	
12.18	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6129	Objecting	KCC wish to point out that local community services are being transformed and will be delivered in different ways in the future. This may include provision by different agencies and from different locations, as well as shifting from a geographically based delivery focus. These changing service needs must be considered when looking at any perceived reduction in community accommodation.	
12.18	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6806	Supporting	Para 12.18 - 12.20. All points are very valid and the Council's approach is welcomed.	
Policy QL3	776757	Mr Adrian Fox	Policy and Projects Manager Dover District Council	738	Objecting	In terms of your approach towards the loss of public or privately owned community facilities, there appears to be an overlap between Policy QL3 and Policy QL6 which could lead to confusion and we would question the need for two separate policies and whether they could be combined.	Suggest consideration of whether the two policies can be combined.
Policy QL3	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1418	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and Access to Facilities -I agree with policy QL3 in this chapter.	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy QL3	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2100	Objecting	Object - to the requirement for a potentially unviable business to market the premises for two years. This period of time is inappropriate and unreasonable particularly with the ability of a community to have a building added to a list of community assets and with legislation now in place to allow 'the Community Right to Bid'.	revise marketing period
Policy QL3	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2870	Objecting	Should include halls.	
Policy QL3	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4171	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent object to this Policy. The following changes should be made: i. In point a) 'or' at the end should be changed to 'and'; and ii. Point b) should be deleted - the mere fact that there is an alternative provision for a similar type of use nearby should not be taken as an automatic justification for loss, and this has not been accepted in planning appeal decisions.	Change: In point a) ' or' at the end should be changed to ' and' ; and Point b) should be deleted - the mere fact that there is an alternative provision for a similar type of use nearby should not be taken as an automatic justification for loss, and this has not been accepted in planning appeal decisions.
Policy QL3	778566	Professor Clive H Church		5560	Supporting	Welcome the inclusion of sensible guidelines and new initiatives in the DLP such as 'locational concerns'. This includes the defence of village facilities.	
Policy QL3	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6807	Supporting	Good, clearly reflects 12.18-12.20	
Policy QL3	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6923	Supporting	Supportive of policy QL3.	
12.21	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4172	Objecting	After "location" in the third sentence insert "the nature of the goods to be sold, e.g. whether they are locally produced and not imported, nor transported over long distances, and whether the greater proportion is produced on the farm or a nearby farm,"	After " location " in the third sentence insert " the nature of the goods to be sold, e.g. whether they are locally produced and not imported, nor transported over long distances, and whether the greater proportion is produced on the farm or a nearby farm, "
12.21	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6808	Objecting	Does the Farm Shop at Broad Oak survive the development proposals at Site 2?	
Policy QL4	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1419	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and Access to Facilities -I agree with policy QL4 in this chapter.	
Policy QL4	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6809	Supporting	Sensible approach to planning permission for a Farm Shop	
Policy QL4	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6924	Objecting	The Council should give preference to certified farmers' markets (based on the definition approved by FARMA). This will encourage the sale of local produce and facilitate better knowledge and understanding among consumers about the supply chain, in turn ensuring demand for healthier, more ethically grown produce and reared meat and fish.	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
12.23	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4878	Supporting	The 2004 Transport Strategy is currently being up-dated. Amongst other things, this aims to tackle social exclusion and problems in accessing services and facilities. Withdrawal of the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) has resulted in many young people, particularly in rural areas, not being able to afford access to education due to the cost of public transport. We would support the KCC County wide project Supporting Independence Programme.	
12.23	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6810	Objecting	The Transport Strategy 2004 ... What about the Transport Modelling commissioned for this Local Plan? Is this extra/different? Why is this not mentioned? All very confusing!	
12.23	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6811	Objecting	The draft transport strategy aims to improve access....'. Will this also take into account the proposals in this Plan? In Sturry this will be a major factor and needs to be considered now.	
12.23	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6926	Supporting	Supportive of this statement. Disabled people need to be able to access mainstream public transport rather than having to rely on others to support them, or on specialist/segregated transport.	
12.24	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6927	Supporting	Supportive of this statement. Disabled people need to be able to access mainstream public transport rather than having to rely on others to support them, or on specialist/segregated transport.	
12.25	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6928	Objecting	Object to the statement that people who need support have a culture of dependency. Most disabled people want to be as independent but need support to do so. The Supporting Independence programme cannot succeed where it takes away vital funding and support services from people and continues to tighten eligibility criteria.	
12.26	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4879	Objecting	Highway design is an important part of public space, and insensitive siting of signs and yellow lines reduces the quality of the environment, especially in a City of World Heritage Site quality.	
12.26	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6930	Objecting	This needs to include ensuring that paving is accessible for people using wheelchairs, those with mobility problems, the old and very young.	
Policy QL5	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1420	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and Access to Facilities -I agree with policy QL5 in this chapter.	
Policy QL5	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2101	Objecting	Object - to the requirement for all residential developments to incorporate local community services without considering viability or whether such provisions would be detrimental to the amenities of existing or future occupants of an area.	revise
Policy QL5	13746	Mrs Monica Blyth	Parish Clerk Herne and Broomfield Parish Council	2871	Objecting	Policy QL5 what about the impact of new retail shops on the existing local shops?	
Policy QL5	781430	Newmaquinn Ltd		5204	Objecting	Object to last paragraph of Policy QL5, because: there is no definition of what a community service or facility is; it is inflexible and unreasonable to require funding sources before consent is granted as providers will not commit funds prior to consent being granted; will prevent development coming forward (Nppf 14, 205); it is not sound, inflexible and not effective. Use conditions (NPPF 176). Delete.	Delete the last paragraph of policy QL5

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy QL5	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	5881	Supporting	Welcome and support the strong commitment in Policy QL5 to agree funding prior to planning permission being granted but should suggest that this principle is established early in the plan as part of Infrastructure Planning & Delivery;	
Policy QL5	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6471	Objecting	Policy QL5 Transport and Community Services: There is no mention in this section of electric buses: a serious omission in relation to the following matter on Air Quality.	
Policy QL5	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6812	Supporting	A good policy, IF it is delivered.	
Policy QL5	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6931	Supporting	Supportive of this policy. However, would like reassurance that CCC has the power to enforce this i.e. that developers pay on time and an appropriate amount towards community facilities.	
12.27	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6813	Objecting	'..Strategic development sites ..provision will be made to ensure that community services and facilities are integrated as part of these new development sites'. This are NOT specified for Site 2. Why not?	
12.28	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6814	Objecting	Some communities need more specialist services ...'. Again the needs of the present communities need to be known - this does not appear to be the the case at the moment. The requirements of the population expected on a new development clearly anticipated.	
12.28	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6932	Supporting	Supportive of this statement. It is important to acknowledge that equality can often only be achieved through providing differentiated support and community services.	
12.29	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6816	Objecting	The Council's Corporate Plan aims to put people first by understanding their needs..'. How has the Council gone about this?	
12.30	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6817	Objecting	'.. aim to involve local communities in planning communities for the future ..'. The very few people who knew of this inSturry kept it a closely guarded secret. How is the community involved under these circumstances?	
12.32	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6933	Supporting	Supportive of this aim. Connectivity between spaces needs to be improved, both to benefit wildlife and to make it easier for people to get around the city/district without using a car.	
12.33	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6936	Supporting	Welcome the development of the Friends of Westgate Parks and, more recently, the emergence of the Friends of the Riverside group, whose mission is to champion, improve and connect green open spaces as well as identifying and applying for sources of funding in order to better manage the spaces to improve biodiversity. Would particularly like to see the development of such groups in more deprived areas and not just city centre/conservation areas.	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
12.34	779007	Mrs Angela Boddy	Secretary Thanet Way Residents Association	1808	Objecting	Visual amenity green space is also highly important in a healthy human habitat.	Add and visual amenity.
12.34	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6937	Supporting	Welcome the development of the Friends of Westgate Parks and, more recently, the emergence of the Friends of the Riverside group, whose mission is to champion, improve and connect green open spaces as well as identifying and applying for sources of funding in order to better manage the spaces to improve biodiversity. Would particularly like to see the development of such groups in more deprived areas and not just city centre/conservation areas.	
12.36	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4173	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent support these proposals, but the supporting text needs to provide more detail as to exactly what community purposes the sites are allocated for.	Provide more detail as to exactly what community purposes the sites are allocated for.
12.36	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4880	Supporting	We support the Plan in urging providers of the District's health facilities to supply a good network of primary health care facilities. The well-being of both individuals and the general community can be greatly influenced by the dual use of such facilities for learning, for the support of young parents, day centres for elderly people, pre-school nurseries, and so on.	
12.36	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6938	Supporting	Welcome the development of the Friends of Westgate Parks and, more recently, the emergence of the Friends of the Riverside group, whose mission is to champion, improve and connect green open spaces as well as identifying and applying for sources of funding in order to better manage the spaces to improve biodiversity. Would particularly like to see the development of such groups in more deprived areas and not just city centre/conservation areas.	
12.37	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6819	Objecting	..Policies OS'. What has Policy OS7 done to deserve its omission? It seems relevant as well.	
Policy QL7	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		411	Supporting	This policy must be extended to ensure that car park provision at these community sites is not to the detriment of the sustainable transport objectives of this Local Plan. Provision must follow the hierarchy of transport modes as defined in paragraph 5.24.	Add a requirement that cycle parking must also be provided at any location where car parking is added and that, as a proportion, this must meet or exceed the proportion of bicycle traffic in the district as well as meeting the minimum level required by SPG4 under policy T10 of this Local Plan. Additionally add a requirement that applicants must present a very strong case to justify why any car parking is required. This must include a demonstration of the actions being taken to encourage people to choose alternatives to private motor vehicles.
Policy QL7	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1422	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and Access to Facilities -I agree with policy QL7 in this chapter.	
Policy QL7	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4174	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent support these proposals, but the supporting text needs to provide more detail as to exactly what community purposes the sites are allocated for.	Provide more detail as to exactly what community purposes the sites are allocated for.

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy QL7	380690	Hollamby Estates		4984	Objecting	HEL seeks the Council to justify the need for the community development.HEL considers that the Policy should be changed or clarified as it is not proven that traffic generated from the development of the land would affect Herne or the Sturry Road Crossing.	HEL seeks the Council to justify the need for the community development as Policy QL7 is being carried forward from the existing Local Plan Policy C12 which has not been able to identify the need for or deliver community development on the land, despite offers and support from HEL. HEL considers that the Policy should be changed or clarified as it is not proven that traffic generated from the development of the land would affect Herne or the Sturry Road Crossing.
Policy QL7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6820	Objecting	On The Proposals Map Inset 1 it is not at all easy to see clearly there is just too much overlaying.	
Policy QL7	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6821	Objecting	Land at end of Vauxhall Avenue, Canterbury - not Road?	
12.38	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6822	Supporting	High quality health facilities are a key element ... The Local Plan...a link between the provision of health infrastructure'. Agreed.	
12.39	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6823	Objecting	Canterbury has a good networkthe Council will ensure that provision for new and enhanced health facilities form part of these new development proposals'. This is UNREALISTIC. It is out of the Council's hands. Who has the money? Where is funding to come from?	
12.40	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6824	Objecting	The Council will continue to urge the providers of the District's health facilities to ensure continual investment and upgrading of these facilities to meet growing demand'. This is not what para 12.39 says! Who has the money? Where is the funding to come from? The K & C hospital would need a considerable up-grade to cope with District's increased population. All the 'urging' in the world will not make this happen. The requirement will not be delivered. It is all unrealistic.	
Policy QL8	772200	Solihin Garrard		259	Objecting	Development on the scale of the Draft Local Plan could carry huge implications for health provision. The Kent and Canterbury Hospital has no Accident and Emergency unit, and no on-site maternity service. A population increase of 440,000 cannot be serviced by the status quo position. A&E and maternity continuing to rely on Ashford, Medway and Margate is completely unsustainable, especially given the current, let alone future, state of congestion on the linking roads.	
Policy QL8	773027	Ms Sofiah Garrard		319	Supporting	Concern that Canterbury doesn't have a fully functioning hospital with a maternity unit.	
Policy QL8	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1423	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and Access to Facilities -I agree with policy QL8 in this chapter.	
Policy QL8	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2102	Objecting	Object - to the policy in its entirety. Such provision should be considered as part of the Community Infrastructure Levy.	delete

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy QL8	777540	Dr Julia Dale		2828	Objecting	The building of 15,600 homes will result in an estimated population increase of 40,000 by 2031. There are concerns that healthcare infrastructure has not been properly considered. The existing K&C hospital is out-of-date with poor access and offers little room for expansion. Will the existing hospital being able to cope with the increase population in 2031? Is it medically satisfactory for the increased number of patients to travel to Margate and Ashford - can these hospitals cope?	
Policy QL8	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bokesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council	4685	Objecting	The number of new homes to be built around Canterbury will generate additional traffic that will worsen the current difficulties of accessing the hospital. Policy QL8 needs to be more specific in relation to the provision of health related development.	
Policy QL8	758417	Ms Ann Carruthers	Transport Strategy Delivery Manager Kent County Council	6131	Objecting	Amend wording to include " and social care" after the word health throughout this section, so it reads: health and social care. This is the government's direction towards integrated services (Health and Social Care Act 2012 and the Care Bill gives local councils a duty to promote integrated services).	
Policy QL8	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6825	Objecting	There are so many uncertainties here. It is all out of the Council's control even with 'legal agreement'. What would be the time scale and programming of 'adequate provision'? This needs to be assured BEFORE a single house brick is laid! Finding out in 2031 there is a shortfall would be unacceptable and unforgivable.	
Policy QL8	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6939	Objecting	Supportive of this policy but would also like to see an assurance of good quality health services in existing neighbourhoods, especially deprived or isolated areas.	
12.41	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6826	Objecting	.. catering for the needs of the large number of visitors to the District the Kent and Canterbury's strategic role'. Some years ago, the figures used to downgrade the K&C omitted the student population, Can we be reassured that the greatly increased student population is included now?	
Policy QL9	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1424	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and Access to Facilities -I agree with policy QL9 in this chapter.	
Policy QL9	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4176	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent generally support this proposal, but both the Policy and the supporting text need to provide more detail as to what exactly the site is safeguarded for. For example, what is actually meant by "health-related development", as it could cover a wide range of potential uses which could have different impacts on then surrounding area?	Provide more detail as to what exactly the site is safeguarded for.
Policy QL9	13736	Mrs Gail Hubbard	Clerk Bokesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council	4687	Objecting	The number of new homes to be built around Canterbury will generate additional traffic that will worsen the current difficulties of accessing the hospital. Policy QL9 needs to be more specific in relation to the provision of health related development.	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy QL9	778732		Corinthian Land Ltd	6767	Objecting	Relocate Kent and Canterbury Hospital to a new Campus alongside the new A2 junction on the South Canterbury Development site. This is needed because; the current site has poor access; current buildings deteriorating; provides ability to replace all buildings and may increase services; employment space will be retained; additional housing land could be brought forward. Redevelop hospital site for housing.	We therefore recommend that policy SP3 is amended to incorporate the possibility of relocating the Kent and Canterbury Hospital to the South Canterbury strategic allocation and that housing is identified as a possible future land use for the existing campus if it is to be redeveloped.
Policy QL9	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6827	Objecting	Land allocated at K & C hospital ..This is the ONLY 'Health Care provision' area identified on any of the maps for an increased population from 15,000 houses, so say some 30,000 to 40,00 more people. What a very small amount it is.	
Policy QL10	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		412	Supporting	Development of medical facilities must include cycle parking provision.	Make it clear that cycle parking provision is a requirement of any planning permission granted for medical facilities. This needs to clear up any ambiguity over the application of DBE7 which is worded for housing, not medical facilities.
Policy QL10	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1425	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and Access to Facilities -I agree with policy QL10 in this chapter.	
Policy QL10	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4175	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent support the provision of new medical and health facilities, but more guidance should be given in the Policy as to where they are provided, especially in the rural area. We would suggest that this Policy should be recast along the same lines as that for Policy QL1 (including our proposed amendment).	Recast along the same lines as that for Policy QL1 (including more guidance as to where they are provided in rural areas).
Policy QL10	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6828	Objecting	Does this need to be specified, as surely the DBE Policies mentioned would already apply?	
12.44	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4177	Objecting	Reword to include recognition of poor air quality in the district, its danger to public health, that development and traffic have worsened problems since 2002. That the Council will reduce pollution so that Air Quality is within World Health Organisation guidelines, to be monitored annually at heavy traffic times.	Reword to read as follows: " The Council recognises the poor quality of air in some areas of the District, notably the AQMAs, that it presents a danger to public health and social well- being, and that the amount of pollution at times exceeds the World Health Organisation limits.The Council further recognises that this pollution is caused mainly by traffic fumes/particulates, and that development in urban areas increases traffic, thus having worsened the problems since 2002.The Council is determined to reduce the pollution so that Air Quality is within World Health Organisation guidelines.It will continue to monitor and assess air quality on an annual basis at times when traffic is heaviest."
12.44	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5663	Objecting	POSITIVE ASPECTS OF DRAFT LOCAL PLAN:- Quality of Life and Access to facilities chapter 12 - positive aspects (but too aspirational and not concrete enough and air quality section could be substantially improved)	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
12.44	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6940	Objecting	Wider measures are needed to improve the air quality across the whole city. The Council is urged to adopt the recommendations of "A Sustainable Transport Blueprint for Canterbury", which also addresses air quality issues. One simple measure that should be taken immediately is to reduce speed limits to 20mph in all residential areas and around schools. This will improve air quality and road safety, as well as reducing traffic congestion.	One simple measure that should be taken immediately is to reduce speed limits to 20mph in all residential areas and around schools. This will improve air quality and road safety, as well as reducing traffic congestion.
12.49	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4178	Objecting	Please state whether a detailed assessment took place in 2012 or 2013 and the results.	Please state whether a detailed assessment took place in 2012 or 2013 and the results.
12.49	171669	Prof Jan Pahl	Chair Canterbury Society	4881	Objecting	Given that St Dunstan's Street has been identified as an area of high air pollution, it is regrettable that new residential accommodation for retired people has been built there. Good air quality is an important part of health and a sense of well-being and the Council's detailed work on attempting to deal with this problem is noted.	
12.50	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4179	Objecting	After "issues" in the first sentence insert "in order to protect public health and social well-being." In the last sentence after "houses" insert "student accommodation, retirement/residential/nursing homes".	After " issues " in the first sentence insert " in order to protect public health and social well-being. " In the last sentence after " houses " insert " student accommodation, retirement/residential/nursing homes" .
12.51	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4180	Objecting	Please define "mitigation measures" and ensure that they are included in planning applications so that the measures are in the public domain before the application is considered.	Please define " mitigation measures " and ensure that they are included in planning applications.
12.51	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6829	Objecting	The potential for increased traffic from Site 2, 4, 5, 6 and Site 8 had obviously been considered, because of the proposed traffic infrastructure for Herne and Sturry. The question of air quality for the ACMA area seems to have been fudged. The 'mitigation measures' of an improved bus service from the Sturry Road Park and Ride, will be insufficient. Air quality along the A28 will worsen, as the Sturry level crossing will not provide 20 minutes of respite every hour and congestion will increase.	
12.51	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6831	Objecting	..For example, provision for a large number of parking spaces ..'.Developers have spoken of 100 spaces for a new Sturry car park.	
12.51	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6832	Objecting	..or new residential houses close to a busy road'. This is the case for Site 2 when there will be even more traffic on the new A291/A28 than on the present roads.	
12.52	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4181	Objecting	After "unacceptable" insert "The Government states that where public health is endangered this may be a ground for refusing planning consent."	After " unacceptable " insert " The Government states that where public health is endangered this may be a ground for refusing planning consent."
12.52	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6833	Objecting	In some cases, mitigation may not be appropriate or feasible and the development may be deemed to be unacceptable. ...'. How can Site 2 be 'acceptable'? That goes for Sites 4,5,6 & 8 as well.	
12.53	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4182	Objecting	At the end add "Such assessments must be lodged with planning applications."	At the end add " Such assessments must be lodged with planning applications."
12.53	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6835	Objecting	Have Air Quality Assessments been completed for the Sites 2,4,5,6 and 8 mentioned above in respect of AQMA 2? Where can they be seen? Who assesses the results? And then, who decides what should happen to the development proposals?	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
12.54	768209	Mr. Gregory Williams		413	Supporting	I'm strongly in support of car free / reduced car schemes.	
12.54	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6836	Objecting	Planning considerations ..reduce exposure and allow a development to take place €€ Building layout ..'. This could go some way to help the residents of houses on Site 2 with the new A291/A28 route as their neighbour but it does not help the AQMA 2 area.	
12.54	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6837	Objecting	'..travel plans'. Free, or greatly reduced, public transport fares could well make a difference.	
12.54	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6941	Objecting	Supportive of this statement. However, it is recommended that the Council undertake research into ways of persuading all drivers to switch off their engine while waiting at the level crossings i.e. an electronic information board, as well as at light-controlled crossroads like at the junction of Lower Chantry and New Dover Road.	
12.55	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6838	Objecting	..crucial to involve the relevant people ..'. Does this include the residents of the AQMA 2 area?	
Policy QL11	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1426	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and Access to Facilities -I agree with policy QL11 in this chapter.	
Policy QL11	114808	Mr John Ellaby	Acting Chairman St Mildreds Area Community Society	3723	Supporting	We welcome this Chapter and especially Policy QL 11 on Air Quality.	
Policy QL11	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4183	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent support this Policy, but the word 'normally' should be deleted from the final sentence.	The word 'normally' should be deleted from the final sentence.
Policy QL11	127115	B.J. Gore		5273	Objecting	Canterbury has a major air quality problem, caused by traffic fumes, resulting in an enormous AQMA and danger to health. Building more houses and roads in and around the City will just make matters worse, and will give the wrong message to developers. The Plan needs to state clearly that additional houses and new roads will only bring more traffic, will increase the danger to health, and that for such reason alone, development may be opposed.	
Policy QL11	389717	Rev Paul Wilson		5619	Objecting	Need to reword Policy QL11 to include 'Any housing development likely to add to traffic flows around and through Canterbury will be subject to very careful scrutiny. If it is likely to increase such flows through areas of poor air quality, including Air Quality Management Areas, it will be refused permission unless a significant compensatory contribution is made to air quality mitigation measures and actions'.	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy QL11	38531	Mr Mike Walling	Acting Chair Barton Residents Association	6473	Objecting	The reports (12.47-9) of worsening air pollution by PM10 & NO2 from vehicle traffic are deeply disturbing. Decision to house at least 5000 car drivers in S Canterbury wanting to cross the City at peak-times and who need to be serviced by more vehicles is folly. Add in the traffic from proposed schools/businesses, plus location and scale of this development is seen to be civic irresponsibility. Paras on duty to consider air quality been disregarded. Devt is unacceptable in line with para 12.53.	
Policy QL11	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6839	Objecting	AS THIS POLICY STANDS THE POINTS MADE IN PARAGRAPHS 12.51 and 12.52 ARE TOTALLY IGNORED, including any reference to developer contribution. By specifying 'the area surrounding the development', the Council's responsibility for AQMA 2 is being sidestepped. If the points made in paragraphs 12.51, 12.52 and 12.53 were taken seriously and were fully incorporated in the Policy, then the development proposals for Sites 2,4,5,6 and 8 would NOT be permitted.	
12.56	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6942	Supporting	Supportive of this statement but would urge the Council to take a clear stance on fracking, as, apart from the huge negative environmental impact (air pollution, ground pollution, water contamination, increase of greenhouse emissions), it also poses a serious risk to human health. Enormous pressure should be put on KCC to ban fracking in the Canterbury District.	
12.57	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6840	Objecting	..noise'. There are implications of this for Site 2, as a result of road noise and street lighting. Do DBE Policies cover this?	
12.57	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6943	Supporting	Supportive of this statement but would urge the Council to take a clear stance on fracking, as, apart from the huge negative environmental impact (air pollution, ground pollution, water contamination, increase of greenhouse emissions), it also poses a serious risk to human health. Enormous pressure should be put on KCC to ban fracking in the Canterbury District.	
12.58	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4185	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent generally support this Policy, but the supporting text needs to elaborate on what sort of mitigation measures may be employed.	supporting text needs to elaborate on what sort of mitigation measures may be employed.
12.58	780980	Ms Cecilia Duggan		4234	Supporting	The effect of light pollution from new housing 12.58 is often underestimated particularly where residents install very bright spotlights on their properties and any measure to limit light pollution which can be incorporated into the plan is something I support.	
12.58	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6841	Objecting	'...light polluion'. There are implications of this for Site 2, as a result of road noise and street lighting. Do DBE Policies cover this?	
Policy QL12	765778	Mr Philip Wilson-Sharp		18	Objecting	There is anecdotal evidence from America that fracking leads to contamination of water supplies, not a happy prospect in an area that draws its water from aquifers.	

Summary Chapter 12 - Quality of Life

Policy /Paragraph	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment Number	Support / Object	Summary of comment	What change you are seeking
Policy QL12	13757	Ms Amanda Sparkes	clerk Westbere Parish Council	1254	Supporting	Since Westbere's parish plan recommends a reduction in maximum speed sections of the A28 in order to improve safety and to reduce CO2 emissions. The plan also recommends planting Lombardy poplars from Bushy Hill Road to the Business Parks in order to increase the absorption of CO2, recognising the fact that trees, in their capacity as our lungs, could reduce/combat future air pollution problems. These recommendations will be absolutely essential if the Hersden site is approved.	
Policy QL12	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1427	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and Access to Facilities -I agree with policy QL12 in this chapter.	
Policy QL12	777951	Mr Andrew Bartlett		2060	Objecting	The policy as drafted is inadequate because it fails to mention mitigation of pollution by traffic noise.	after "pollution" add "including traffic noise"
Policy QL12	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4184	Supporting	CPRE Protect Kent generally support this Policy, but the supporting text needs to elaborate on what sort of mitigation measures may be employed.	
Policy QL12	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6842	Supporting	Seems good	
Policy QL12	769494	Ms Patricia Marsh	Secretary Kent Green Party	6944	Supporting	Supportive of this policy but would urge the Council to take a clear stance on fracking, as, apart from the huge negative environmental impact (air pollution, ground pollution, water contamination, increase of greenhouse emissions), it also poses a serious risk to human health. Enormous pressure should be put on KCC to ban fracking in the Canterbury District.	
12.59	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6843	Objecting	When will the Vauxhall site close? Where will landfill go then? What are the traffic implications? Has/will all this been/be taken into account in the traffic modelling studies supporting this Plan?	
12.59	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6845	Objecting	How appropriate that 'Waste Management' is the very last topic in the Local Plan!	
Policy QL13	109652	Cllr Michael Dixey		1428	Supporting	Chapter 12: Quality of life and Access to Facilities -I agree with policy QL13 in this chapter.	
Policy QL13	778769	Miss Karen Banks	Associate Lee Evans Planning	2103	Objecting	Object - to the policy in its entirety. Canterbury City Council is not the waste authority; relevant policies will be provided as part of the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan.	delete
Policy QL13	780278	Mr Brian Lloyd	Senior Planner CPRE Kent	4186	Objecting	CPRE Protect Kent would question the need for this Policy as these will be matters that will be addressed in the Waste Local Plan being prepared by KCC.	Delete
Policy QL13	786664	Mr & Mrs R Gaskell	Sturry Residents Together	6844	Supporting	Well considered	