

Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2040

Chapter 6: District-wide Strategic Policies

Policy	Number of written comments
Policy DS1: Affordable housing	102
Policy DS2: Housing mix	69
Policy DS3: Estate regeneration	30
Policy DS4: Rural housing	43
Policy DS5: Specialist housing provision	34
Policy DS6: Sustainable design	80
Policy DS7: Infrastructure delivery	63
Policy DS8: Business and Employment Areas	28
Policy DS9: Education and associated development	30
Policy DS10: Town centres and community facilities	27
Policy DS11: Tourism development	40
Policy DS12: Rural economy	74
Policy DS13: Movement Hierarchy	67
Policy DS14: Active and sustainable travel	190
Policy DS15: Highways and parking	54
Policy DS16: Air quality	57
Policy DS17: Habitats of international importance	60
Policy DS18: Habitats and landscapes of national importance	54
Policy DS19: Habitats, landscapes and sites of local importance	103
Policy DS20: Flood risk and sustainable drainage	62
Policy DS21: Supporting biodiversity recovery	
Policy DS22: Landscape Character	56
Policy DS23: The Blean Woodland Complex	85
Policy DS24: Publicly accessible open space and sports	47
Policy DS25: Renewable energy and carbon sequestration	43
Policy DS26: Historic environment and archaeology	42
Any other comments	32

Policy DS1: Affordable housing

- Support this policy: 24 comments
- 30% affordable is not enough/ doesn't meet identified need - stronger policy to encourage more: 18 comments
- Building new houses isn't affordable/new houses need to be actually affordable: 17 comments
- Prioritise social housing and starter homes: 14 comments
- Needs to be actively enforced/developers held to policy requirements: 13 comments
- Concern for viability (e.g. for clustering of affordable housing and tenure mix, accepting offsite contributions): 10 comments
- Focus on holiday homes, Airbnb's, second homes, properties bought to let and HMOs (using existing and preventing): 8 comments
- Needs to be an appropriate housing mix that matches need and location: 8 comments
- Affordable housing previously purchased by London Boroughs: 7 comments
- Policy is not clear enough - provide further clarity (e.g. definition of affordable home ownership, or percentage/number of clusters): 6 comments
- Housing should be for local people: 6 comments
- Need more affordable rentals: 5 comments
- Use existing buildings and brownfield instead of new developments/greenfield: 5 comments
- Affordable housing needs defining/redefining: 4 comments
- Not deliverable (build in flexibility): 4 comments
- Don't have the infrastructure for new homes/no new houses: 4 comments
- No houses in the district are affordable: 4 comments
- National systematic issue: 4 comments
- Should not rely on developers e.g. social housing construction programme/use contributions: 4 comments
- Affordable housing in rural and AONB should be separate from urban: 3 comments
- Remove/weaken compliance with supporting documents and strategies: 3 comments
- Existing affordable homes/new build homes are empty: 3 comments
- Not economically convincing: 2 comments
- All new housing should have sustainable infrastructure/be built sustainably: 2 comments
- Disapprove of the bus strategy: 2 comments

- Will increase crime rates: 2 comments
- All new housing will need parking: 1 comment
- 30% affordable is too high: 1 comment
- Self-build plots will struggle with nutrient neutrality: 1 comment
- Extend student accommodation exemption: 1 comment
- Separate policy /criteria for self and custom build: 1 comment

Policy DS2: Housing mix

- Policy should build in flexibility (site/location and timeframe across plan period/identified need): 16 comments
- Review Housing Strategy and existing evidence/allow for new evidence to be considered: 12 comments
- Too many large/family homes - need smaller houses: 11 comments
- Policy requires further clarity/too vague (e.g. quantity self and custom build requirements): 11 comments
- Support this policy: 8
- Houses are not affordable/more affordable and social housing: 7 comments
- Viability and deliverability concerns (especially for First Homes): 7 comments
- Higher density housing (e.g. more flats, terraced housing, less bungalows): 6 comments
- More accessible housing/review of accessibility/older persons policy reference: 5 comments
- Inadequate infrastructure for required housing need: 4 comments
- Include reference to co-housing/co-living: 3 comments
- More brownfield development: 3 comments
- Disapprove of the policy: 2 comments
- Too many smaller/social and affordable homes: 2 comments
- Canterbury homes bought out by London Boroughs/Housing should be for local people: 2 comments
- Houses should be in keeping with local character: 2 comments
- Lower density housing: 1 comment
- Needs to be actively enforced: 1 comment
- Focus should be more on buying not renting: 1 comment
- More rental homes needed: 1 comment
- Custom and self-build should be in smaller sites instead of larger: 1 comment

Policy DS3: Estate regeneration

- Support this policy: 8 comments
- Greater urgency/prioritisation needed: 5 comments
- Policy supports a sustainable future and encourages sustainable development: 3 comments
- Infrastructure cannot cope: 2 comments
- Not implementable: 2 comments
- Council/social housing should not be sold off: 2 comments
- Protect and encourage green infrastructure and open space: 2 comments
- Provide clarity on funding: 2 comments
- New housing is better, higher quality: 1 comment
- Needs actively enforcing: 1 comment
- More help needed for young people: 1 comment
- Policy to support the use of renewable/sustainable infrastructure: 1 comment
- More affordable housing: 1 comment
- Less focus on students: 1 comment
- Policy will help address water problems (e.g. flooding, water quality, groundwater recharge): 1 comment

Policy DS4: Rural housing

- Support this policy: 12 comments
- Object to current/previous site allocation policy in the Local Plan/Other policies contradict DS4: 8 comments
- Needs to be proportionate: 7 comments
- Should only develop on brownfield: 5 comments
- Affordable and social housing needs to be a priority in rural areas: 5 comments
- Further clarity/additional policy requirement needed: 5 comments
- Infrastructure cannot cope: 3 comments
- Protect the identity and heritage/character of rural areas: 3 comments
- Rural development is unsustainable: 2 comments
- Should be for local people: 1 comment
- Not NPPF compliant: 1 comment

Policy DS5: Specialist housing provision

- Policy is too restrictive/build in flexibility: 5 comments
- More/prioritise older persons housing/remove exemption: 5 comments
- Further clarity needed: 4 comments
- Support policy: 4 comments
- Not NPPF compliant: 3 comments
- More support for community and self-build: 2 comments
- Infrastructure cannot cope: 2 comments
- Gypsy and Traveller need is met by windfall figures/No need for site allocation: 2 comments
- Policy lacks evidence: 2 comments
- Higher density housing: 1 comment
- Strengthen restrictions on greenfield: 1 comment
- Over supply of student accommodation: 1 comment
- Conflicts other Local Plan policies: 1 comment
- Make reference to specialist accommodation with care e.g. supported living with learning difficulties: 1 comment
- No mention of social or affordable housing: 1 comment
- Strengthen student accommodation requirements: 1 comment
- Objection to use of student accommodation for tourist use: 1 comment
- Need a suitable and sustainable Gypsy and Traveller allocation: 1 comment

Policy DS6: Sustainable design

- Support this policy: 23 comments
- Concerns over viability/deliverability: 18 comments
- Strengthen/add further requirements e.g. for solar panels/EV charging/low carbon heating systems/cycle parking/biodiversity: 13 comments
- Add more/ strengthen sustainable water requirements (e.g. permeable paving, grey water usage, no outdoor taps, tree cover): 10 comments
- Policy is not fair or reasonable - should be more flexible: 10 comments
- Insufficient evidence: 10 comments
- Higher density housing: 7 comments
- Needs to be actively enforced and managed: 7 comments
- Infrastructure and services cannot cope with further development: 4 comments
- No reference to the retrofitting of existing properties: 3 comments
- All dwellings should have 2 parking spaces: 2 comments
- Object to a site allocation policy: 2 comments
- Add lighting requirements: 2 comments
- Sustainability should be the priority within development - e.g. should have sustainable transport links: 2 comments
- Strengthen Net Zero policy - remove 'get out' clause: 2 comments
- Design needs to be in keeping with local heritage and character: 2 comments
- Add requirement for variety in design: 1 comment
- Further promotion of renovation rather than rebuild: 1 comment
- Include requirements for sustainable construction: 1 comment
- Small scale (sustainable) village growth should be permitted: 1 comment
- Invest offset funds in NHS: 1 comment
- Further policies to support healthy communities: 1 comment
- Requires further clarification/is not clear: 1 comment

Policy DS7: Infrastructure delivery

- Deliver infrastructure prior to development: 16 comments
- Needs actively enforcing/developers held accountable (including financially): 11 comments
- Support policy: 9 comments
- Strengthen/support references to phasing and delivery of infrastructure/remove 'get out clause': 7 comments
- Don't have the infrastructure for further developments/housing figures too high for infrastructure: 7 comments
- More clarity required (e.g. on funding): 7 comments
- Prioritise water infrastructure/add additional water/coastal infrastructure policy: 5 comments
- Required level/proposed infrastructure (as phased) is not deliverable/achievable: 5 comments
- Increase sustainability: 4 comments
- All outlined projects should have funding secured: 3 comments
- Viability concerns: 3 comments
- Existing infrastructure requires improvement to support current land use: 3 comments
- Reference energy capacity and energy improvements: 2 comments
- Objection to a site allocation policy/site allocation infrastructure: 2 comments
- Reduce reliance on developers to deliver infrastructure: 1 comment
- Disagree on the need for proposed infrastructure: 1 comment
- More/improvements to road infrastructure required: 1 comment
- Add reference to green and grey infrastructure: 1 comment
- Prioritise social and community infrastructure: 1 comment

Policy DS8: Business and Employment Areas

- Not NPPF compliant/doesn't reflect national policy: 4 comments
- Need to protect (resist loss of) in rural service centres and countryside: 3 comments
- Infrastructure cannot cope: 2 comments
- Plan proposes more than is needed: 2 comments
- Will increase congestion: 2 comments
- Should not impact the landscape/minimise and mitigate impact: 2 comments
- Policy is too prescriptive/not justified: 2 comments
- More sustainable/'greener' employment opportunities (e.g. agriculture): 2 comments
- Support policy: 1 comment
- Business use should be integrated within residential areas not as business parks: 1 comment
- Provide infrastructure prior to occupation: 1 comment
- Further clarity required: 1 comment
- Add reference to coastal business and employment: 1 comment

Policy DS9: Education and associated development

- Minimal need for more schools and universities/schools and universities do not need expanding: 7 comments
- Support policy: 5 comments
- Objects/suggested amendments to policy C12: 3 comments
- No need for more student accommodation: 3 comments
- Infrastructure cannot cope: 2 comments
- More diversity required in school/university development (e.g. sports provision): 2 comments
- Still have to travel to Canterbury for grammar school: 1 comment
- Focus on maintenance of schools and staff: 1 comment
- Disagree with helping the University of Kent support their finances: 1 comment
- Provide further clarity: 1 comment
- University of Kent transformation plan is dependant on C12: 1 comment

Policy DS10: Town centres and community facilities

- Conflict with another policy: 4 comments
- Developer contributions for community halls should be specifically for facilities local to that development: 4 comments
- Car parking charges are too high and discourage shoppers: 2 comments
- Support sustainable development: 2 comments
- Infrastructure cannot cope with more development: 2 comments
- Policy should be more agile to consider changing needs/trends: 2 comments
- Support protection of Wincheap: 2 comments
- Encourage accommodation above shops: 1 comment
- Uncertainty that developers will fulfil policy requirements: 1 comment
- The district needs more leisure facilities: 1 comment
- Support hierarchy of centres: 1 comment
- Remove point on viability: 1 comment
- Suggest a single policy for community facility protection: 1 comment
- Conflict with NPPF: 1 comment
- No justification for some of the requirements: 1 comment

Policy DS11: Tourism development

- Limit housing as holiday homes: 12 comments
- Agree with the policy: 6 comments
- Support more hotel accommodation: 5 comments
- Good public transport accessibility is needed: 3 comments
- Support the need to protect existing heritage: 3 comments
- Support better walking and cycling opportunities: 3 comments
- No more new build homes / on greenfield land: 2 comments
- Policy to consider Marine Conservation Zones / Marine Plan: 2 comments
- Concern about sustainability of rural tourist accommodation: 2 comments
- Transport policies will put tourists off: 1 comment
- Need more tourist attractions: 1 comment
- Policy is too ambitious: 1 comment
- Infrastructure cannot cope with more development: 1 comment
- Short term lets should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances: 1 comment
- Object to the plan: 1 comment
- Protect Canterbury Parkrun: 1 comment
- Holiday let threshold should be reduced to 30 days a year: 1 comment
- University of Kent development will damage tourism: 1 comment
- Detail on funding needed: 1 comment
- Conserve the environment: 1 comment
- Concern about temporary use of student accommodation as tourist accommodation: 1 comment
- Sustainable travel is unrealistic: 1 comment

Policy DS12: Rural economy

- University of Kent site conflicts with this policy: 36 comments
- Protect good quality agricultural land from development: 17 comments
- Support the policy: 8 comments
- Rural economy is vital to district: 6 comments
- Protect the character of rural areas: 3 comments
- Strengthen language used: 3 comments
- Improve infrastructure: 2 comments
- Policy should not be too restrictive: 2 comments
- Object to the policy: 1 comment
- Protect rural communities: 1 comment
- Policy should mention protecting groundwater quality: 1 comment
- Policy should mention Marine Plan: 1 comment
- Farmers should be helped to stay in food production business: 1 comment
- More detail needed: 1 comment

Policy DS13: Movement Hierarchy

- Concern development will only be met with private vehicle increase: 18 comments
- Support this policy: 17 comments
- Better public transport needed: 15 comments
- High quality / safer walking and cycling routes needed: 12 comments
- Plan wording is vague in some areas and needs more detail before acceptance: 8 comments
- Provision made for those that can't walk or cycle: 7 comments
- Some provision/allowance should be made for private vehicles still: 4 comments
- Better parking arrangements could promote less traffic in the major urban areas: 3 comments
- Conditions of rural roads are dangerous: 2 comments
- Suggestion of site to comply with policy: 1 comment
- No evidence that air quality will be improved through implementation of policies: 1 comment
- Restrictions needed for freight vehicles: 1 comment

Policy DS14: Active and sustainable travel

- Concern policy is not deliverable: 75 comments
- Concern development will lead primarily to an increase in private vehicles: 63 comments
- District residents would still use cars for personal travel regardless of active travel promotion: 57 comments
- Improve bus service needed (cost, routes, times, Park & Ride, accessibility etc): 51 comments
- Support this policy: 29 comments
- More consideration to rural communities: 21 comments
- Improvement to cycle and footpaths required: 21 comments
- Policy wording does not commit to enough detail: 16 comments
- Policy fails to address increase in pollution: 15 comments
- Canterbury is hilly and not accessible: 12 comments
- Too dangerous to cycle: 12 comments
- Provision must be made for those that can't walk/cycle or use public transport: 10 comments
- Road infrastructure not suitable for busses/large vehicles: 9 comments
- Concern over transport options for schools: 6 comments
- Must be increased provision for secure cycle storage: 5 comments
- Policy wording requested to be changed: 4 comments
- Ban e-scooters: 3 comments
- Provide separate waling and cycling routes. Do not create mixed use: 1 comment

Policy DS15: Highways and parking

- Housing developments will increase traffic: 15 comments
- Policy needs to be flexible to allow for development: 9 comments
- Parking for locals should be easier/subsidised: 9 comments
- Parking charges are unaffordable: 6 comments
- Unrealistic proposal: 6 comments
- Concern that existing infrastructure would be affected: 5 comments
- Greenspaces/farmland should be protected: 5 comments
- Improve public transport: 4 comments
- Support for policy: 4 comments
- Concern with accessibility for disabled persons: 3 comments
- In favour of Electric Vehicle charging points: 3 comments
- On street parking should be heavily restricted: 2 comments
- Cycling infrastructure should be improved to work with transport options like Park & Ride: 2 comments
- Improve foot and cycle paths: 2 comments
- Objection to scale of new development: 1 comment
- Provisions should be made for small business vehicles: 1 comment

Policy DS16: Air quality

- Building more houses will equal more pollution: 17 comments
- How will the impact from the increase in traffic be addressed: 15 comments
- Support this policy: 9 comments
- Policy wording should be amended to include more specific wording: 8 comments
- Policy lacks detail on how air quality will be improved: 6 comments
- Policy approach is not in line with national guidelines on air quality: 6 comments
- Smaller-medium sites should have smaller emissions thresholds to ensure development remains viable: 5 comments
- How can air quality impacts be accurately measured prior to development: 5 comments
- Canterbury should introduce Ultra Low Emission Zone/Low Traffic Neighbourhoods with local residents excluded: 4 comments
- Emissions other than NOx should be measured in the district: 4 comments
- How will air quality be monitored and by who: 3 comments
- Plant more trees: 2 comments

Policy DS17: Habitats of international importance

- Build flexibility into wording - to allow consideration of new evidence over plan period and for developers to work with water companies: 11 comments
- Support policy: 10 comments
- Objection to policy C12/C12 contradicts this policy: 8 comments
- Retention and enhancement of habitats e.g. support the creation of ecological corridors: 8 comments
- Nutrient Mitigation Strategy is insufficient: 8 comments
- Add references to specific species, places and partners: 6 comments
- Further detail/clarity required: 6 comments
- Wastewater will negatively impact Stodmarsh Habitat Regulation sites: 5 comments
- Strengthen policy wording/ proposals that can't fully mitigate should be refused: 4 comments
- Need for high quality waste water treatment works and SUDs: 4 comments
- Infrastructure cannot cope: 2 comments
- Needs actively enforcing: 2 comments
- CCC overestimates the level of impact from development/policy should be weakened: 2 comments
- Full costing and plans before permission is given: 1 comment
- Existing drainage needs upgrading: 1 comment
- Protected areas should be prioritised over new development: 1 comment
- Reference to off-site mitigation: 1 comment
- Look at groundwater as well as surface water: 1 comment

Policy DS18: Habitats and landscapes of national importance

- Object to site allocation policy: 16 comments
- Support the policy: 13 comments
- Habitats are irreplaceable, more focus on retention and enhancement e.g. ecological corridors: 9 comments
- Requires further clarity/detail: 7 comments
- Not compliant with national policy: 4 comments
- Needs actively enforcing: 3 comments
- Strict buffer zones should be placed around important designations: 3 comments
- Need further resources to achieve this/resources and funds should be established prior to permission: 2 comments
- Protect green/open space: 2 comments
- Infrastructure cannot cope: 2 comments
- Local Plan fails to recognise certain landscapes and their importance: 1 comment
- Add references to specific places/partners: 1 comment
- Development with any adverse impacts should be rejected: 1 comment
- Concern about wastewater treatment: 1 comment
- All water is contaminated: 1 comment
- Policy needs strengthening: 1 comment

Policy DS19: Habitats, landscapes and sites of local importance

- Objection to policy C12: 49 comments
- Contradicted by other policies: 39 comments
- Support policy: 16 comments
- Additional/amendments to green gap (or other designation): 12 comments
- Further clarity/greater detail required: 9 comments
- Add reference/policy for specific places/partners: 7 comments
- Development will destroy/largely impact the environment: 5 comments
- Should accept no adverse direct or indirect impacts: 5 comments
- Strengthen protection of areas of local landscape importance: 5 comments
- More support for retention and enhancement: 4 comments
- Policy is overly restrictive around green gap development (build in flexibility): 3 comments
- Infrastructure cannot cope: 2 comments
- Green gap policy should be separate: 2 comments
- Add Area of High Landscape Value designation: 2 comments
- Concern over wastewater treatment: 1 comment
- Needs actively enforcing: 1 comment
- Resources and funds should be established prior to permission: 1 comment
- Objection to Policy R7: 1 comment
- Object to the number of homes proposed in the plan: 1 comment
- Development will affect health: 1 comment
- Include reference to biodiversity: 1 comment
- Add reference to green and blue infrastructure: 1 comment

Policy DS20: Flood risk and sustainable drainage

- Flooding concern regarding University of Kent site: 14 comments
- Agree with policy: 13 comments
- Insufficient drainage infrastructure to support development: 10 comments
- No more development on green sites: 4 comments
- Flexible approach to use of SuDS towards open space provision: 4 comments
- More emphasis on the maintenance of suds: 2 comments
- Object to the plan: 2 comments
- Include rainwater harvesting: 2 comments
- Too many loopholes: 1 comment
- Need flood risk assessment of Littlebourne: 1 comment
- Require sites to complete a site-specific flood risk assessment: 1 comment
- Developments must provide water treatment facilities: 1 comment
- Flooding concern in Seasalter: 1 comment
- Impact of climate change must be taken into account: 1 comment
- Require a stability report if development is on unstable land: 1 comment
- Sequential test location should be clearer: 1 comment
- Protect the River Stour: 1 comment
- Clarify the topography of the Stour catchment: 1 comment

Policy DS21: Supporting biodiversity recovery

- Contradictory policy – building on countryside is causing the need for biodiversity recovery: 49 comments
- Objection to Policy C12: 46 comments
- 20% Biodiversity Net Gain not justified or feasible/deliverable: 30 comments
- Support this policy: 25 comments
- Add further detail/clarity (e.g. numerical targets, how tree cover is measured etc.): 15 comments
- Tree cover requirement not sufficiently justified/needs further flexibility: 11 comments
- Strengthen requirements for vegetation on developments: 5 comments
- Should accept no greenfield development: 4 comments
- Needs actively enforcing: 4 comments
- Add support for bird boxes and bricks: 3 comments
- Biodiversity on developments needs maintaining: 3 comments
- Infrastructure cannot cope: 2 comments
- Suggested specific place/type of place for additional protection: 2 comments
- Objection to the use of Natural England Biodiversity Metric: 2 comments
- Add reference to partners: 2 comments
- Larger emphasis on importance of ecological corridors: 2 comments
- Local Plan should support further biodiversity data gathering: 1 comment
- Green and Blue infrastructure requirements not feasible for all scale developments: 1 comment
- Add soil biodiversity requirement: 1 comment

Policy DS22: Landscape Character

- Supports protecting landscapes and nature: 27 comments
- Developments harm habitats and landscapes: 20 comments
- Developments contradict this policy (Blean, Brooklands and others): 19 comments
- Too many houses: 4 comments
- Extend protected areas (Old Park & Chequer's Wood and others): 4 comments
- Improve infrastructure or infrastructure concerns: 3 comments
- Protect dark skies: 3 comments
- Supports removal of old R1 policy: 2 comments
- Food security and loss of farmland concerns: 2 comments
- Build on brownfield sites: 1 comment
- Build more affordable homes: 1 comment
- Pollution and health concerns: 1 comment
- Water pollution concerns: 1 comment

Policy DS23: The Blean Woodland Complex

- Development will damage the Blean Woodland Complex: 60 comments
- Supports protecting integrity and connectivity of Blean Woods: 35 comments
- Extend policy to other areas around Blean Woods or elsewhere (e.g. Old Park, Chequer's Wood and Stodmarsh): 3 comments
- Improve infrastructure or infrastructure concerns: 3 comments
- Development damages nature: 2 comments
- Improve management practices of Blean woods: 1 comment
- Development damages heritage assets: 1 comment
- Make requirements more flexible: 1 comment

Policy DS24: Publicly accessible open space and sports

- Support the policy: 15 comments
- Clarify ambiguity: 5 comments
- Questioning a specific open space designation: 5 comments
- Questioning deliverability: 4 comments
- Policy does not consider already planned open space on strategic sites: 3 comments
- Policy is ambitious and goes above and beyond the requirements: 2 comments
- Object to the plan: 2 comments
- Protect Canterbury Parkrun: 2 comments
- Lack of children's open space in South side of Canterbury: 1 comment
- Concern that University of Kent development will cause a loss in open space: 1 comment
- Protect the countryside / Duncan Down: 2 comments
- Designate Old Park and Chequer's Wood as open space: 1 comment
- Need flexibility in suds being used for open space: 1 comment
- Applicants to use more detailed calculations for sports pitch provision: 1 comment
- Sturry needs more open space: 1 comment
- Older persons housing schemes need different types of open space: 1 comment
- Protect the KCIIECP National Trail: 1 comment
- Questioning the need: 1 comment

Policy DS25: Renewable energy and carbon sequestration

- All new buildings to have solar PV or more rooftop solar PV: 9 comments
- Large renewable projects damage nature and farmland: 8 comments
- Large renewable projects damage heritage and rural amenity: 7 comments
- Unspecified support: 4 comments
- Promote on-site generation: 3 comments
- Be bolder: 3 comments
- Supports net-zero or low carbon energy: 3 comments
- Vegetation and soil sequester carbon: 2 comments
- Apply to all council assets: 2 comments
- Improve grid capacity: 2 comments
- Carbon sequestration won't work: 2 comments
- Improve infrastructure and public services: 2 comments
- Supports tree planting: 2 comments
- How will the council decarbonise?: 1 comments
- Supports hydrogen fuel infrastructure: 1 comment
- Improve sustainability of existing developments: 1 comment
- Promote on-site generation for affordable homes: 1 comment
- Measure should be compulsory for new builds: 1 comment
- Improve enforcement of developer obligations: 1 comment
- Against biofuel: 1 comment
- Require marine licences: 1 comment
- Policy is unclear: 1 comment

Policy DS26: Historic environment and archaeology

- Protect heritage assets and world heritage status: 17 comments
- C12 and other developments damage heritage and archaeological assets: 11 comments
- Local archaeological sites should be safeguarded: 8 comments
- Work with heritage and archaeology experts: 3 comments
- Recognise importance of Fordwich Pit: 2 comments
- Improve infrastructure and public services: 2 comments
- Stop tacky shop fronts: 2 comments
- Unspecified support: 2 comments
- Ensure people can afford to visit heritage assets: 1 comment
- Too many houses: 1 comment
- Require marine licences: 1 comment
- Do not require heritage statements for minor applications: 1 comment

Any other comments

- Protect and improve connectivity of Old Park & Chequer's Wood and Stodmarsh: 6 comments
- Too many houses: 4 comments
- Protect National Landscapes or rural amenity: 3 comments
- Protect heritage assets and World heritage Status: 3 comments
- Support and retain existing biodiversity: 2 comments
- Feasibility, funding, and implementation concerns: 2 comments
- Improve infrastructure and public services: 2 comments
- Improve housing mix and number of affordable homes: 2 comments
- Improve road capacity: 2 comments
- Show how the policies are related: 1 comment
- Public transport will not work or will require a large investment: 1 comment
- Create a self-build policy: 1 comment
- Sell homes to locals only: 1 comment
- Prefer brownfield over greenfield sites: 1 comment
- Some policies contradict other policies: 1 comment
- Make the policies easier to understand: 1 comment
- C12 damages nature and heritage assets: 1 comment
- Protect farmland: 1 comment
- Protect nature: 1 comment
- Development should have good drainage infrastructure: 1 comment
- Base policies on more recent demographic data: 1 comment
- Improve rural policies: 1 comment
- Support sustainable travel and infrastructure: 1 comment