

LTR/P3750

Canterbury City Council

Correspondence by email only: consultations@canterbury.gov.uk

May 2024

REPRESENTATIONS TO CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN 2040 (REGULATION 18)

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Lee Evans Partnership LLP is instructed by Summit Developments Ltd. (hereafter, the landowner) to submit representations to the Regulation 18 Draft of the Canterbury City Council Local Plan 2040. Representations are made with specific reference to the landowner's interests at Broome Park Hotel, with commentary expressly made around matters pertinent to the onwads future success of the Site as a major tourism and leisure site in the District.
- 1.2. On behalf of the landowner, this response advocates for the continued support of tourism-led development across the District, recognising the key roles of hotel and leisure facilities to the wider economic health of the District and beyond, both for local and regional spend and local employment opportunities. These representations further make reference to matters of rural housing, design, heritage, and ecology.
- 1.3. The case is made below in support of such, in first identifying support for the vision for the plan, its objectives and other broad strategic policies, and in second seeking to bring to the attention the Site's availability to further enhance the capacity of the Plan to deliver on these ambitious and positively prepared tourism and leisure policies.
- 1.4. A site location plan is enclosed to situate the site for context.

2. CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN 2040

- 2.1. The Draft Local Plan at this Regulation 18 stage identifies a clear vision for the District in promoting aspirations for residential growth achieved through a range of homes which will meet the needs of the district, improving affordability and supporting growth. It further outlines a strategic approach to employment, tourism, leisure, transport, and the environment across its various objectives and policies.
- 2.2. It is noted that the Plan has already – in a previous iteration – been the subject of public consultation throughout 2021 and 2022. The 2022 Regulation 18 consultation resulted in extensive response rates – some 2,000 responses from organisations and 24,000 responses from individuals.
- 2.3. Following a period of review and a political chance at the local-level, this consultation provides an opportunity to respond to a revised Regulation 18 Plan. Key changes to the Plan are summarised as follows:
 - the plan period being reduced from 2045 to 2040/41;
 - a fall in the number of new homes proposed by a total of 4,149 – from 13,495 to 9,346 over the life of this plan compared to the previous draft plan;

chartered architects and planning consultants

- removal of the proposed new settlement at Cooting Farm near Adisham;
- removal of the proposal for an Eastern Movement Corridor (the Eastern Bypass) in Canterbury;
- removal of the proposed Canterbury Circulation Plan which contained the suggestion that the city should be zoned to remove 'rat runs' and force active travel opportunities; and
- removal of the proposed strategic sites to the east of Canterbury which provided land for a part of the Eastern Movement Corridor and funding.

2.4. In line with the above, the Plan presents a number of alternative proposals which in broad terms seek to prioritise a new garden settlement north of Canterbury, increased emphasis on climate change and biodiversity, focused policies on brownfield development, and active transport options.

2.5. The landowner recognises the effort of the Local Planning Authority in seeking to address the litany of clarifications, queries and concerns raised throughout previous consultation exercises. Comment is therefore provided only on this updated draft document, and is not focused – unless necessary – on comparison with the previously issued draft iteration.

2.6. Detailed commentary is provided herein on the Vision, Objectives, and Policies of the Plan. Commentary is not provided for all policies, and is instead reserved for those considered of most relevance to the landowner.

2.7. Commentary on emerging policies is provided namely against:

- SS1 – Environmental Strategy for the District
- SS2 – Sustainable Design Strategy for the District
- SS3 – Development Strategy for the District
- SS5 – Infrastructure Strategy for the District
- R19 – Countryside
- DS4 – Rural Housing
- DS5 – Specialist Housing Provision
- DS6 – Sustainable Design
- DS11 – Tourism Development
- DS12 – Rural Economy
- DS22 – Landscape Character
- DS26 – Historic Environment and Archaeology
- DM1 – Conversion of Existing Rural Buildings
- DM6 – Extension and Alterations to Existing Buildings
- DM11 – Residential Design
- DM12 – Non-Residential Design
- DM18 – Light Pollution and Dark Skies

2.8. Commentary is provided using the references above and, where relevant, the paragraph numbers as used in the Regulation 18 Draft.

2.9. Due regard has been had to the wider evidence, and where necessary cross-reference has been made to the LPA's evidence as available as part of this consultation process.

3. OVERARCHING VISION & OBJECTIVES

3.1. The overarching Vision for the District in providing “a stronger and more resilient, economy” as a central facet of the Plan's aspiration is supported as a high level principle underpinning the purposes of the Plan. The Vision makes specific provision for investment in the city, coastal towns and the rural areas which will in turn ensure the District's historic and natural environment “...can thrive to improve the

visitor experience and support sustainable tourism". This clear centring of the benefits of tourism – specifically tourism rooted in the District's existing natural and heritage capital is encouraged, and supported. The District offers unique experiences to day- and night-guests, and it is agreed that the Vision recognises the role of leisure and tourism both to the local economy, but also the wider benefits of such in the broadest sense.

- 3.2. The wider vision for the District includes for a thriving environment, improved connectivity and healthy communities. It seeks to restore and enhance habitats and landscapes in line with a drive towards nature recovery, environmental resilience and providing significant increases in biodiversity. As a target vision, this is agreed as being in alignment with wider corporate objectives and national guidance and legislation. It is agreed that opportunities for nature-based responses to climate change will be maximised.
- 3.3. It is, however, also acknowledged that the Vision balances this with confident alignment with healthy communities – include new communities, whether through regeneration of existing resources in town and city centres or through the creation of new homes. The Vision goes on to outline how the Plan should seek to provide greater choice of high-quality housing to meet the needs of the District's growing population and changing demographic, and address affordability issues, as well as highlighting the focus of new development at accessible and sustainable locations which can utilise existing infrastructure, facilities and services, and to ensure development contributes to the sustainability of local communities and services. This objective is consistent with the thrust of the National Planning Policy Framework in its pursuit of sustainable development. Again, this is supported overall at the District-wide level as an appropriate and realistic vision for Canterbury over the plan period to 2040. Such homes should seek to meet a diverse range of needs in different places at different times. In this regard, it is agreed that the Vision supports "a range of new homes to meet the needs of the District, ensuring the right type of homes are delivered in the right places to improve affordability and support our communities". It is considered at this stage, as part of the Vision this is sufficiently broad to allow flexibility in the delivery of such.
- 3.4. Supporting the Vision, the Draft identifies a number of strategic objectives for the Plan. There are twelve (12) objectives, though these are not numbered as such. For ease, future iterations of the Plan should appropriately label these objectives.
- 3.5. Whilst commentary is not provided for each of these objectives, due regard has been had to their content. It is considered that the objectives are generally appropriate in supporting the implementation of the Vision, and that the objectives themselves are adequately reflected across the strategic policies as proposed, albeit subject to any refinement that may follow during the consultation process and later Examination in Public.
- 3.6. In particular, the landowners directly supports the following draft objectives which it considers should be retained and reflected in full across the various strategic and development management policies of the Plan:
 - Create a thriving economy with a wide range of jobs to support increased prosperity for all throughout the district.

- Capitalise on our rich and distinctive heritage and culture, enhancing character, sense of place and quality of life, supporting sustainable tourism and the local economy for our residents, visitors and businesses.
- Provide affordable high-quality housing for people at every stage in their lives, as part of mixed, sustainable communities.
- Support the sustainable growth of our rural communities through the provision of affordable housing, community facilities and public transport infrastructure while taking advantage of opportunities to protect and grow the rural economy.

3.7. In this regard the Promoter supports the overarching Vision and associated strategic objectives, notwithstanding the detailed comments below.

4. STRATEGIC AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

SS2 – Sustainable Design Strategy for the District

- 4.1. Quality, sustainable design approaches to new design are supported, recognising the lifespan of buildings and their need to change and adapt over time according to needs. It is agreed that new development should be responsive to character and local history, and that architecture and landscaping should be attractive and function well. Policy wording should however closely reflect circumstances – such as conversion – where opportunities to incorporate net-zero initiatives or other such approaches may be proportionately limited.
- 4.2. This policy should be closely scrutinised to make sure it does not apply onerous or otherwise stringent requirements on all developments in all instances. Provision must be made for some level of caveat for existing buildings, including listed buildings. This can be achieved through the insertion of the words “where appropriate” or “where feasible”, at any point throughout the policy wording. Whilst it is likely to be discussed on a case-by-case basis, it is important that the policy wording itself does not unduly instil a level of conflict from the outset with new development that simply cannot meet the required policy position owing to existing site conditions.

SS3 – Development Strategy for the District

- 4.3. This policy deals with the overall delivery of housing, employment, industry, and other uses over the plan period up to 2040. It seeks the implementation of this vision over a period up to 2040, with growth focused at the urban cores of Canterbury, Whitstable, Herne Bay, with proportionate growth across the villages. The overall ambition of the Plan is supported, specifically with recognition of the aspirational level of growth to meet housing needs as identified in the evidence base. To ensure the flexibility of the plan in its implementation, such figures should not be viewed as a ‘cap’ to sustainable development, but rather a minimum target. Likewise the overall approach to sustainable growth at settlements in line with their range of services and facilities is supported, in line with the settlement hierarchy.
- 4.4. Specifically relating to non-residential land uses in the countryside, the development strategy records that the provision of new community facilities and services, business space and tourism facilities outside of settlement boundaries will be supported provided such development is proportionate in scale to the relevant settlement and the need for the development outweighs any harm. This is supported, subject to the comments made herein across the wider plan policies, including those relating to the protection and enhancement of the built and natural environment, particularly outside of settlement confines.

Policy R19 – Countryside

- 4.5. This policy deals exclusively with rural development outside of urban or rural settlement boundaries. Its relevance to the landowner is set in this context. Principally, R19 addresses the protection of the rural character and appearance of the countryside, and is a policy somewhat characterised by restraint. It records that housing development in the countryside will only be supported where it represents appropriate infill, is required for agricultural or forestry purposes, meets the requirements of conversion of existing rural buildings, meets the requirements for isolated homes in the countryside, or the requirements for rural exception sites or community-led development sites. This is consistent with the guidance of the Framework, which relates to similar matters. Subject to the commentary provided at DS4 below, this is supported as a reflection of national planning policies.
- 4.6. In respect of tourism development, R19 notes that proposals for new development will only be supported in line with Policies R1 (2)(d), R11 (2)(d), or C17, or where identified need outweighs harm, the development protects rural character, the development can be accommodated in highways terms, and the development would not undermine the viability of existing provision in the area. Again, subject to commentary below regarding Policy DS11, the provisions here are noted. In this regard, specific reference to DS11 should be made within the wording of R19 given the overlap in guidance for tourism-related development. This would aid clarity.
- 4.7. Whilst the ambition of R19 in protecting against inappropriate countryside development is noted, it must also recognise that existing development sometimes needs to grow, diversify, and expand. The provisions of R19 should be amended to clearly refer to how the Council intends to approach new tourism development in the context of existing tourism sites. There is in many cases strong merit in the consolidation of new development around existing development, even in the countryside. This matter does not appear to be centrally considered in the current draft wording. For clarity of interpretation, this must be remedied in later iterations of the draft. As written, there is potential scope for conflict within the interpretation and application of R19 with DS11 for example – where tourism in the countryside would on one hand appear supportable, and on the other less so. There should be a consistent thread across the Plan, and as drafted there is perhaps too much room for ambiguity at the decision-making, site specific level.
- 4.8. Further clarity should also be provided in respect of criterion 4 of this Policy, which relates to the loss of existing community facilities and business premises. This goes on to state that “...*Proposals to improve or expand existing provision will be supported where this protects the rural character of the area and any adverse impacts on the landscape are appropriately mitigated*”. The principle of such is supported fully, though this should be expanded to explicitly reference tourism-related development in the countryside where already existing. It is not clear that references to existing rural businesses would include such, and this ambiguity should be cleared up. Tourism-related development is a key contributor to the rural economy, and this should be reflected here.

DS4 – Rural Housing

- 4.9. Rural housing sites can contribute significantly to different housing tenures across the District, and their inclusion in the Plan is important in that regard. The criteria-based approach to DS4 is supported, recognising the circumstances where exception sites will be supported including where there is an identified local housing need, and an explanation as to why this cannot be accommodated elsewhere, with evidence from an independent body.
- 4.10. Criterion 1 (c) identifies that exception sites should be “directly adjacent” to an urban area, rural service centre, or local service centre. Whilst the aspiration of such is that sites would in turn benefit from local services and facilities, this definition excludes a number of otherwise suitable sites which are not themselves isolated – functionally or in transport terms – but simply form part of wider areas of countryside – in small villages, hamlets, or other sites such as Broome Park where there are already a

number of existing residential dwellings at the Regency Villas. Amendment should be made to reflect the occasions where opportunities for rural exception sites are located in demonstrable proximity to other dwellings such as this.

- 4.11. Amendment could read: *“(c) the development is directly adjacent to an urban area, rural service centre, or local service centre, or would form an extension to an existing area of non-isolated residential development in the rural area”*.
- 4.12. Criterion 2 deals with sites that would not meet the above definition, and focuses on community-led affordable housing, with market housing limited to 30% of the total offering subject to assessment of a viability report.

DS11 – Tourism Development

- 4.13. This policy expressly deals with development for the purposes of tourism, specifically focusing on hotels, guesthouses, bed and breakfast accommodation, and new visitor attractions. It outlines at Criterion 1 that new tourism development within or on the edge of the designated town centres will be supported subject to additional criteria. Specific commentary against this is not provided, though it is emphasised that tourism and the visitor economy is a fundamental and key aspect of the District's economic success, and should be supported in principle at multiple scales across multiple geographies. Policy DS11 at its core should be one which is positively worded and predicated around furthering the strength of Canterbury's regional, national and international reputation as a tourist destination, increasing the presence of overnight visitors as well as the established 'day trip' market.
- 4.14. As an overarching commitment to tourism development outside of urban areas, this policy is supported. It recognises the diversity of 'out of urban area' tourism development in a manner which is aligned – in principle – to sustain and expand the District's offering of tourism-based businesses and facilities, including hotels and related ancillary facilities.
- 4.15. With specific reference to tourism development outside of the urban areas – as applies in the landowner's case at Broome Park – Criterion 3 outlines a number of matters for consideration against which the landowner provides comment as follows (against the wording of the draft policy in bold).
 - **opportunities to promote tourism, including through rural diversification, will be encouraged where there is no overriding conflict with other policies in this plan;**

The landowner supports engagement from the Council with the diverse range of tourism-led development schemes that currently abound, and will continue to abound over the plan period to 2040. This criterion is fully supported as a matter of principle.

Minor amendment to the wording as drafted could be made, however, to ensure that mitigatable 'conflict' with other policies – as sometimes may arise – does not hinder otherwise sustainable development of tourism development and/or ancillary facilities. Amendment could read: *“opportunities to promote tourism, including through rural diversification, will be encouraged where there is no overriding or unmitigated conflict with other policies in this plan”*.

Such an amendment would retain the ambition of the policy, with a refined focus on efficient delivery of suitable development that has been properly mitigated, without undue onerous policy barriers.

- **Environmental or agricultural focused tourism initiatives which foster environmental, ecological, agricultural, viticultural, gastronomic and/or cultural understanding, appreciation and conservation will be encouraged;**

This aspiration is supporting, particularly in the sense of supporting tourism initiatives which foster cultural understanding, appreciating and conservation. This is taken to apply to the District's rich heritage – both built and otherwise – and the myriad of sites which make up the District's list of heritage assets, including Broome Park. This wording is taken to be fairly broad, which is a suitable framework against which applicants can in the future be framing tourism initiatives without unduly prescriptive parameters that might otherwise hinder idea generation and the delivery of such initiatives.

- **New tourism development, change of use, conversion or extension of existing buildings to provide tourist accommodation, attractions or facilities will be supported provided that:**

- (a) The nature and scale of the proposal is in keeping with the character of the area;**
- (b) The development will contribute positively to the diversification and quality of tourist attractions and accommodation in the district;**
- (c) There is no adverse impact upon residential amenity;**
- (d) The development takes all reasonable opportunities to maximise accessibility by sustainable and active travel; and**
- (e) Where in the countryside, development complies with the requirements of Policy R19.**

This is a key policy for many existing built assets, and in particular existing tourism and leisure related sites. It is pleasing that the policy is drafted in a manner which lends itself to clarity and precision in its interpretation. The drive towards development that is in keeping with the character of the area (including nature and scale of the proposal) is supported in principle, and offers sufficient degree of flexibility to allow site-specific solutions to come forward in this context.

Part (b) would allow – similar to the above – for a range of diverse land uses to come forward. It is perhaps not an explicit requirement of this strand of DS11 as it appears to be a slight replication of other aspects of this overall policy. Nonetheless, the aspiration of such specifically dealing with new tourism development is wholly supported.

Part (c) is agreed, albeit with the addition of supplementary text to confirm no 'unacceptable' or no 'unacceptable adverse' impacts upon residential amenity, recognising that mitigated or minor impacts may arise in most forms of new development to some extent.

Part (d) is considered pragmatic, in recognising the aspiration of sustainable travel modes but acknowledging that there may be limits to the practicalities of such. This level of pragmatism is wholly supported by the landowner, particularly for non-urban sites.

Part (e) refers to Policy R19, and commentary is made elsewhere on the specifics of such. It remains the case of the landowner that the overall aspirations of the Plan in supporting quality tourism development, alongside ancillary leisure facilities and activities, be encouraged by relevant policies, as set out above.

- 4.16. Criterion 4 deals with the loss of visitor accommodation. Whilst the general parameters of such reflect widely used criteria to mitigate or otherwise justify against the loss of bedspaces and other cultural, leisure, or tourism development there should also be an additional exception supplemented. It is sometimes the case that the loss of tourist bedspaces is required in supplementing or expanding other supporting facilities, or sometimes an overall net loss is required in diversifying or upgrading the type or quality of other such bedspaces for an overall diversification in overnight accommodation offering. Developers should not be prevented – in policy terms – from responding to potential business needs or requirements for alternative accommodation types.

- 4.17. An addition to this Criterion 4 should read: *“Proposals for development involving the loss of visitor accommodation will only be permitted where...(e) The loss would enable a reconfiguration, adaptation, or other such revision to the existing accommodation to offer a diversified, expanded, or bettered type or form of other visitor accommodation in its place e.g. larger family rooms, bridal suites, executive suites, and so on”.*
- 4.18. Further commentary is not provided at this stage on Criterion 5- 7 which relate to caravans and statics, and marina provision.

DS12 – Rural Economy

- 4.19. It is welcomed that the Council will take a positive approach to the growth and diversification of rural businesses, including a wider range of land-based businesses. The rural economy is an important facet of the District’s economic offering and function, and commitment in policy terms to its diversification and success is a key underpinning in achieving the vision and objectives which the Plan seeks to deliver. The landowner does not comment here on the specifics of this policy, beyond acknowledging that diversification of rural businesses takes varied forms and that this should be noted in policy wording – diversification is not always a ‘one size fits all’ approach, and the policy should allow for a range of land uses to come forward where appropriately designed and sited, if aligned with the advancement of a given rural business.

DS22 – Landscape Character

- 4.20. It is accepted that – in line with criterion 1 with DS22 – proposals for development should demonstrate that they are informed by, and are sympathetic to, the landscape, and where appropriate seascape, character of the locality. In turn, it is also accepted and agreed that proposals should take every opportunity to reinforce, restore, conserve or improve, as appropriate, the landscape character of the area in which development is proposed.
- 4.21. Further commentary on this policy is limited, given that it records widely established approaches to good design and assessment of development proposals, with due regard to supplementary plans and development documents including the Kent Downs AONB Design Guide and Landscape Character Assessments.
- 4.22. It is noted that the Plan may be amended to reflect revised wording of ‘Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty’ to ‘National Landscapes’. For ease of interpretation, it is suggested that this amendment is made in the next iteration of the Plan.

DS26 – Historic Environment and Archaeology

- 4.23. As a site rich in built and archaeological heritage, the landowners at Broome Park take keen interest in the preservation and enhancement of such. Policy DS26 is a key planning policy of the emerging plan which will guide development and planning decisions across such matters to the year 2040.
- 4.24. The explicit request for a Heritage Statement for all development proposals with the potential to affect a heritage asset or its setting is supported in principle. That said, it is important that the scope of such is proportionate to the scale of project proposed, to ensure the smooth passage of the planning system in a manner reflective of the type and scale of proposal, and its impact (whether negligible, minor, or major) on identified assets or their setting. Criterion 1 should make clearer and more robust reference to such, to ensure a better understanding of the expectations of applicants in this regard. In some cases – for minor development – it will not necessarily be that a stand-alone Heritage Statement would

ordinarily be required. There should be some provision in the case of minor applications for a degree of flexibility in the presentation of such information, captured in the wording of proposed Policy DS26.

- 4.25. In respect of Criterion 4 (noting that Criteria 2 – 3 have little direct bearing to the landowner's direct interests at Broome Park), it is pleasing to see that support will continue to be given to development of listed buildings and structures where it would either sustain or enhance their significance and make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. It is acknowledged, however, that this policy wording should be slightly broadened to allow for development which simply 'makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness', in the setting of a listed building or structure without explicit direct maintenance or enhancement to the asset itself. This would allow for a wider support for appropriate (indirect) development in the context of the District's rich heritage landscape.
- 4.26. Further criteria under this policy provide for useful guidance for proposals in conversation areas and registered parks and gardens. The wording of these policies is supported, and reflects long-prevailing best practice on architectural design in sensitive heritage environments.
- 4.27. Criterion 7 outlines that proposals to bring back redundant or underused historic buildings or assets into appropriate and viable uses consistent with their conservation will be encouraged. This is useful, and a helpful signpost for parties interested in both sustaining and celebrating the District's heritage. As a worded policy item, its description is clear and broad, allowing for sufficient flexibility, and centring the objective of historic conversation in a manner that allows contemporary development needs to be met during the plan period.
- 4.28. A number of additional criteria are outlined in DS26, aligned with prevailing conservation principles that seek the preservation and enhancement of identified assets. The wording of these policies is sufficiently clear to support robust assessment of proposals through the planning application process.
- 4.29. The overall intentions of DS26 are supported, and the wording of such – notwithstanding the minor clarifications sought above – is agreed.

DM6 – Extension and Alterations to Existing Buildings

- 4.30. This policy is brief in its scope, and reflects wider design principles focused on sensitive and high quality extensions and alterations to buildings. Given the wide range of buildings at Broome Park, it is acknowledged that this policy is of central importance to the landowner. Across three criteria, DM6 outlines a reasonable approach – with adequate flexibility for site specific delivery and implementation – in allowing for the evolution of existing built resources. It is considered that DM6 as worded represents a pragmatic approach to development, in line with the Framework which emphasises the importance of existing built resources in pursuit of sustainable development in all its facets.
- 4.31. Criterion (a) is agreed in its wider ranging scope, focused expressly on coherent integration with character across matters of design, layout, scale, materials, height, and positioning.
- 4.32. Criterion (b) deals with amenity, and it is again agreed that extensions and alterations should not result in unacceptable loss of privacy, overlooking, or overshadowing. The use of 'unacceptable loss' is welcomed, in recognition that some change will often result in some level of loss to such matters, particularly in circumstances where existing buildings are located in proximity to alternative land uses, as is often the case.
- 4.33. Criterion (c) reflects a similar principle to (b), and is again supported.

- 4.34. This criteria-based approach is considered specific enough to capture the spirit of the Plan in securing good quality, sustainable development without placing undue or onerous restraint on applicants. It is supported in its current iteration.

DM11 – Residential Design

- 4.35. DM11 refines the aspirations of the Plan to reflect the quality of proposed residential development. It outlines the base criteria required in demonstrating how residents can expect to achieve a good quality of living, with regard to space standards, accessibility, and amenity space. The intention of this policy is supported in full in realising the Vision and Strategic Objectives set out elsewhere in the Plan. The landowner supports high quality design and will endeavour to meet the aspirations of the policy as appropriate in future development aspirations.
- 4.36. That said, refinement of the policy wording should be undertaken to ensure the deliverability of all range of new dwellings, including through conversions as outlined in the supporting text. In particular, criteria 2(b) outlines minimum floor to ceiling heights of 2.4m for new build dwellings – this should be a target height, and not a prescribed height. Development proposals are set in sometimes unique context, and uniform prescriptive heights are not always conducive to contextually good design responses. A minimum height of 2.4m may not always be most appropriate in every case, though it is acknowledged that good internal lighting is a key facet of residential design that would be sought in all scenarios. In this regard, criteria 2(b) and 2(d) could be combined, as each deals with internal lighting.
- 4.37. Criterion 2(h) is slightly prescriptive and should also be refined. It may not be appropriate in every case to specify a hard boundary between private and public spaces through physical defences such as low walls, fences, or hedges. Principles of good design – as captured elsewhere in the Plan and the Framework – as well as those around secure by design and the protection of residential amenity would in most cases allow sufficient flexibility to design a scheme, including frontage development, that provides adequate separation without the need for prescription.

DM12 – Non-Residential Design

- 4.38. Like DM11, DM12 seeks to reflect an ambitious level of high quality design throughout new design in the District. Supporting text clarifies that buildings should be design to optimise functionality and ensure safe and comfortable user environments. Again, it focuses on development that is fit for purpose and adaptable for changing needs. The reflection of this objective in policy wording is welcomed, recognising the need for buildings to develop over time to match prevailing needs at a given point in time. It is acknowledged that the lifespan of most buildings will see a change in their use – whether land use, or layout, etc. The criteria-based approach to the provision of good quality non-residential design is agreed in principle. The criteria as drafted do not appear overly prescriptive, and this too is welcomed.
- 4.39. Criterion (f) should be revised slightly to include the words ‘where appropriate, and where possible’, in recognition that not all places of employment can be reasonably accessed through active travel, and that it may not always be appropriate to provide changing and shower facilities in every instance.
- 4.40. Similarly criterion (h) as drafted is potentially overly prescriptive in its requirement for large scale premises to provide ‘seating, free drinking fountains, and free publicly accessible toilets including a ‘Changing Places’ facility’. Again it may not always be appropriate to provide for such, or possible. This criterion should be re-worded to reflect an aspiration towards such, rather than an explicit requirement.

5. CONCLUSION

- 5.1. These representations reflect the position of Broome Park Hotel, specifically on matters pertaining to the spatial strategy, development in rural areas, tourism-led development, and matters of design and heritage. It is requested that due regard is had to the content of this correspondence.
- 5.2. At the current stage of preparation, it would be premature to consider whether the Draft Plan is legally compliant, is sound, and whether it has met the duty to cooperate. That said, the evidence base as prepared – alongside the reported direction of travel – appears to show positive progress towards planning for sustainable development in the District over the period to 2045, based on an expanding and robust evidence base. We reserve detailed judgement on this until such a time that the Regulation 19 Submission Plan is available for consultation.
- 5.3. We welcome the opportunity to further assist or provide comment on the preparation of the Plan which will help shape future development in the area; and we welcome look forward to the opportunity to participate at later hearing sessions where appropriate.

Yours sincerely

Reece Lemon BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI AssocRICS
For Lee Evans Planning