

Friday 31st May 2024
656/A3/JJAPlanning Policy
Canterbury City Council
Military Road
Canterbury
CT1 1YW**By Email**

Dear Sirs

**Re: Regulation 18 Draft Canterbury District Local Plan (March 2024)
Representations on behalf of Catesby Estates
Land at Thanet Way Whitstable**

I write with reference to the above. I act for Catesby Estates who have an interest in land situated to the south of the A2990 Thanet Way, proposed allocation W5 / SHLAA site 132, which as you will be aware is subject to an outline planning application (all matters reserved), for the erection of up to 220 dwellings, a 300 space park and bus facility, 400sqm local shopping/ community facility and associated infrastructure including (but not limited to) spine road, internal roads and car/cycle parking, allotments, open space and play facilities, utilities infrastructure, drainage infrastructure and earthworks with access from the Thanet Way (A2990), CA/23/00379 refers.

Having regard thereto, and further to our representations on the Regulation 18 Draft Canterbury District Local Plan (October 2022), and associated evidence base, especially the Sustainability Appraisal; we have the following comments on the amended Regulation 18 Draft Canterbury District Local Plan (March 2024), and associated evidence base. In making said representations we would like to confirm that we are supportive of the Council progressing the Local Plan and offer these comments to be helpful and ensure a sound plan proceeds to submission.

1 The Housing Requirement, Supply and Trajectory and Policy SS3

1.1 Local Housing Need and the Minimum Housing Requirement and Plan Period.

1.1.1 We note that policy SS3 as amended now looks to deliver 1,149 dpa and that the plan period is 2020/21 to 2040/41. Thus, over the 20 year plan period the plan looks to deliver some 22,980 dwellings. We further note that the figure of 1,149 dpa¹ reflects the Standard Method figure applicable at the time the revised Reg 18 Plan was published, and therefore accords with the advice set out in the PPG², albeit the figure may need to be recalculated when the plan is submitted as the ratio of median house price to median gross annual (where available) workplace-based earnings by local authority district, England and Wales, 1997 to 2023 were updated in March 2024 and the affordability ratio for Canterbury has increased, leading to a higher Local Housing Need (LHN) figure than set out in the draft plan. We also note that the LDS does not suggest receipt of the Inspector's Report, followed by Adoption of the Local Plan until February - March 2026, such that for the plan to run 15 years from adoption – as required by paragraph 22 of the NPPF, the plan period should be to 2041/42 to ensure it looks ahead for a minimum of 15 years from adoption. Both the above would require the plan to allocate land to accommodate at least 1,200 dwellings more than currently provided for.

¹ See calculation in section 2 of the Development Topic Paper

² Housing and Economic Needs Assessment section of PPG - Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 2a-008-20190220 Revision date: 20 02 2019

1.1.2 It is also important to note that the LHN figure is a minimum starting point, and it does not produce the Housing Requirement³.

1.1.3 The PPG⁴ goes on to consider the circumstances where it might be appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the Standard Method indicates. Such circumstances can include:

- Instances where housing need is likely to exceed past trends; and
- Where the authority agrees to address unmet need arising from neighbouring authorities.

1.1.4 The PPG is not exhaustive in its examples as to what may be a sound reason for considering an uplift. Matters such as a high affordability ratio that is following a rising trend, along with significant affordable housing need, and of course the importance of ensuring an adequate buffer to cater for under supply, or instances where the Plan strategy fails to deliver as expected, are all sound reasons for considering an uplift.

1.1.5 In the context of the above we note that the SA in section 5.3 and appendix E has looked at three options for housing growth:

The Preferred Option - 1,149 dpa (24,129 dwellings over the LP period 2020/21-2040/41);

Alternative option 10% increase - 1,264 dpa (26,544 dwellings over the LP period 2020/21-2040/41); and

Alternative option 20% increase - 1,379 dpa (38,959 dwellings over the LP period 2020/21-2040/41).

1.1.6 Table 5.2 of the SA sets out a summary of the appraisal of the alternative housing growth options, with a more detailed matrix containing commentary of the scoring contained in Appendix E. It's clear from table 5.2 that the preferred option and one that is 10% above the standard method scored identically in all ways bar sustainability objective 8, para 5.3.9 of the SA suggesting that: *'Minor negative effects were assessed for waste (SA Objective 8) reflecting the scale of development envisaged under the preferred option figure. The reduced quantum aligned to the LHN and shorter plan period is likely to be accompanied by a substantially lower amount of waste generated and greater opportunities for effective waste management than the previously assessed figure in the SA Report (2022). However, there is some uncertainty over the exact waste generated and ability to reuse waste generated through the construction phase.'*

1.1.7 Having regard to the above there does not appear to be any real justification for not taking this option forward- para 5.3.22 merely suggesting that: *'There is currently no robust evidence to justify an alternative methodology and include a 10% or 20% uplift in the standard method figure as proposed under the alternative options.'*; and para 5.3.22 advising that: *'None of the alternative options were considered to perform any better in sustainability terms than the preferred option'*

1.1.8 The above belies the evidence base and the various reasons why an uplift to the LHN should be considered further, as summarised in the commentary below.

1.1.9 The reasons for uplifting the LHN should be set into two categories, firstly those that indicate an uplift is required for the District itself and secondly any uplift that might arise from meeting unmet need from neighbouring authorities.

³ Housing and Economic Needs Assessment chapter of the PPG – Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 2a-002-20190220
Revision date: 20 02 2019

⁴ Housing and Economic Needs Assessment chapter of the PPG – Paragraph 010 Reference ID: 2a-010-20201216
Revision date: 16 12 2020

Affordability

1.1.10 Canterbury is an inherently unaffordable place to live as acknowledged at para 6.1 of the Reg 18 Plan.

1.1.11 To this end, we note, when looking at the ONS 'House Price to Workplace-Based Earnings Ratio - March 2024' that the ratio of median house price to median gross annual workplace-based earnings by local authority district, England, and Wales, 1997 to 2023 indicates that the ratio of median house price to median gross annual workplace-based earnings in CCC has increased significantly over the past 10 years from 8.1 to 10.96⁵.

1.1.12 The rapid increase in the affordability ratio is clear evidence of the lack of housing delivery that has taken place over the last 10-year period within the District. Simply providing for the LHN as calculated through the Standard Method will only slow the rate of decline in affordability. For an improvement in the affordability situation to occur, decisive action is required through the provision of more housing over and above the LHN.

1.1.13 The matter of affordability alone clearly indicates that the Council should be planning for more than the minimum LHN.

Affordable Housing Need

1.1.14 Linked to the issue of affordability is the significant need for affordable housing identified in the District. A symptom of a rising affordability ratio is the fact that more members of society are priced out of the open market and consequently require affordable housing in one form or another. Again, the Council acknowledges this in the Draft Plan and in the Housing Needs Assessment (SNA) September 2021 that accompanies the consultation pack.

1.1.15 The 2021 SHMA assessment shows an annual need for 308 rented affordable homes and 156 affordable home ownership homes in CCC, a combined average of 464 affordable dwellings per annum, (9,744 dwellings across the plan period⁶), which equates to 40% of the total LHN. Whilst we understand the Council are proposing an affordable housing policy requiring 30% onsite provision, this will only be triggered for those sites that meet the qualifying criteria. It is therefore highly unlikely that the affordable housing need will be met. Indeed table 8.13 of the Development Topic Paper indicates that even taking into account completions and secured⁷ units, as well as carried forward 2017 Local Plan Allocations and draft 2020-2040 Local Plan Allocations, there will be an outstanding affordable requirement of 3,264 dwellings. Given the decreasing trend in terms of affordability set out above, the gross affordable housing need of 464 dpa is highly likely to increase over the plan period, leading to an increase in the net shortfall and in turn a higher number of people in need and on the Council's housing waiting list.

1.1.16 In the context of the above we note that according to table 4.1 of CCC Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) for April 2022 to March 2023 (published Dec 2023) CCC have over the past 10 years, only delivered 806 affordable completions. An average of 81 (rounded up) affordable completions per annum. We also note that this figure, as set out below is just 18.43% of total completions. Even

⁵ ONS House price to workplace-based earnings ratio – March 2024 – table 5c
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/ratioofhousepricetoworkplacebasedearningslowerquartileandmedian>

⁶ See table 8.12 of the Development Topic Paper

⁷ Includes units secured through S106 agreement, granted planning permission and other agreements.

if one assumes an average of 20%, this suggests that the plan would need to deliver over 2,320⁸ dpa to meet the identified affordable housing needs of the District.

JAA table 1 – record of CCC affordable housing delivery 2013/14-2022/23 as set out in the Dec 2023 AMR

	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18	18-19	19-20	20-21	21-22	22-23	Total
Net additional dwellings ⁹	475	285	296	417	446	405	528	330	547	644	4,373
Total affordable dwellings	70	40	50	48	45	56	139	57	143	158	806 ¹⁰ ,
% of total											18.43%

1.1.17 Whilst we are not advocating this level of growth, the above demonstrates the need for an uplift to the LHN figure to boost the supply of open market and affordable homes and thus help address the affordable housing needs of the District. Said approach would also reflect strategic objective 1 of the Plan to ‘provide affordable high quality housing for people at every stage in their lives as part of mixed sustainable communities’, and SA objectives 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3:

10.1 Promote increased access to affordable housing.

10.2 Support the timely delivery of market and affordable housing.

10.3 Support the provision of homes which cater for existing and future residents’ needs and the needs of different groups within the community’.

1.1.18 The SA in reviewing the merits of the alternative growth options appears to have paid little regard to these fundamental points.

Past Under Delivery

1.1.19 Whilst we note the addendum to CCC AMR, published in March 2024 suggests that the Council is able to demonstrate a 4.48 year housing land supply for the period 01/04/23 to 31/03/28¹¹, and that the HDT results for 2022, as published in December 2023 was, as set out below, 75%; we also note that in previous years CCC have not performed so well, and that table 3.2 and para 3.5 of the Dec 2023 AMR both indicate that the next HDT test results will be 72%, such that the council will be subject to the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the appropriate buffer will be 20%.

⁸ 100/20 x 464 = 2,320

⁹ The completions table in appendix B of the AMR incorporates residential, student and care home provision. The figures used in JAA table 1 are the residential completions only to provide a fair comparison with affordable provision and reflect the figures in table B1 of the Housing Land Supply Statement found at appendix F of the AMR

¹⁰ We note these figures differ from those set out in DLUHC Affordable housing supply statistics 2020-21 – see table 1011C <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-affordable-housing-supply> which suggests affordable housing completions of 788 dwellings over the period 2013/14 – 2022/23.

¹¹ Given paras 77 and 266 of the NPPF 2023 and para of the housing supply and delivery PPG, and as the Reg 18 Plan of Oct 2022 sought to allocate sites, the council only need to provide a 4 year housing land supply against a 5 year housing land supply requirement.

JAA table 2 - Result of 2022 Housing Delivery Test

Area	Number of homes required			Total number of homes required	Number of homes delivered			Total number of homes delivered	Housing Delivery Test: 2022 measurement	Housing Delivery Test: 2022 consequence
	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22		2019-20	2020-21	2021-22			
Canterbury	824	599	900	2,323	602	463	688	1,753	75%	Buffer

1.1.20 We further note that CCC housing delivery has over the past few years been somewhat mixed, with the Council failing to meet their annual housing requirement in 6 out of the last twelve years, which has led to a deficit that suggests that there has been a record of under delivery that should be addressed by an uplift to the LHN figure.

JAA table 3 – History of housing delivery in CCC as set against the adopted LP requirement 2011/12 – 2022/23.

Year	Requirement ¹²	Delivery ¹³ (gross)	Shortfall	Cumulative shortfall
2011-12	500	655	+155	+155
2012-13	500	597	+97	+252
2013-14	500	641	+141	+393
2014-15	500	554	+54	+447
2015-16	500	594	+94	+541
2016-17	900	422	-478	+63
2017-18	900	1,119 ¹⁴	+219	+282
2018-19	900	444	-456	-174
2019-20	900	597	-303	-477
2020-21	900	474 ¹⁵	-426	-903
2021-22	900	785	-115	-1,018
2022-23	1,070 ¹⁶	693	-377	-1,395
Total	8,970	7,575	-1,395	
Annual average delivery rate		631dpa		

¹² Policy SP2 of the adopted development plan encompasses a stepped housing requirement of 500dpa between 2011 and 2016 and 900dpa thereafter.

¹³ The completions table in appendix B of the AMR incorporates residential, student and care home provision. The figures used in JAA table 3 are the sum of these figures using the appropriate ratios.

¹⁴ 679 of these were student accommodation.

¹⁵ We note that the HDT figure for 20-21 is 463, the AMR says 474 and the Development Topic Paper says 474 in table 8.6 so clarity is required.

¹⁶ See table 8.4 and footnote 24 of the Development Topic Paper which identifies a requirement of 1070dpa based on an appropriate split of the Local Plan need figure of 900 dwellings (adopted 17 July) and the LHN as calculated on 1st April 2022.

A Buffer

1.1.21 In considering the appropriate housing requirement for the Draft Plan it is necessary to ensure that the Plan remains sufficiently flexible to respond to changes in circumstance across the Plan period.

1.1.22 Whilst we note that the SA has assessed two alternative housing growth options to that advocated in the draft plan, we do not feel this adequately addresses the issues raised above or looks to address the issue of unmet needs from adjacent authorities – see below.

1.1.23 Given the issues identified above that are affecting the District, and have a material impact on housing need, we feel that at the very least a buffer should be built into the housing requirement for the Plan. Introducing a buffer into the housing requirement would ensure that the Council plans positively for the future in a manner that at least meets the minimum LHN but also provides an uplift to reflect the acute affordability problem and in turn the rising affordable housing need. Given the time horizon of the plan (to 2040/41), the Council should also consider the need for flexibility to be built into the strategy so that it can be resilient to unforeseen changes that may occur during the latter years of the plan period.

1.1.24 Given the above we consider that at the very least a buffer of circa 10% (i.e. circa 2,300 additional dwellings over the plan period) should be added to the LHN to ensure the Plan proceeds on a robust footing.

Unmet Need

1.1.25 We note that paras 1.40 and 1.41 of the Reg 18 Plan indicate that:
'The council continues to work closely with its neighbouring authorities on a range of strategic planning matters and has established mechanisms in place to ensure effective and ongoing cooperation and joint working on cross boundary strategic matters. Statements of Common Ground have been prepared with all adjoining authorities, setting out the shared position that each authority intends to meet its development needs in full within its administrative area'.

1.1.26 We also note that para 1.7 of the HNA indicates Canterbury District is considered to be a self-contained housing market area, and that section 4 of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement, in reviewing the engagement and outcomes of cooperation on strategic issues, in particular housing need, advises that having worked together with neighbouring LPAs at HMA level to plan strategically for housing provision, an agreement has been reached that each LPA plans to meet its own housing needs within its own administrative boundary. It goes on to advise that SOCGs have been agreed between the neighbouring LPAs on the matters of housing market areas and meeting housing needs; and that all Councils have agreed to prepare their own Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and also to meet their housing needs in full within their own administrative area. Appendix A of the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement then provides Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with Ashford, Dover, Folkstone and Hythe, and Swale; a standalone SoCG (of 2022) is also contained within the evidence library with Thanet. All the SoCG effectively say the same thing – that the parties agree that there is no material overlap between the HMA centred on Canterbury, and the HMA for the relevant authority, and as such the HMAs are fully contained within the relevant authority areas for the purposes of plan making, and that it is agreed that each party will meet its own housing needs. Whilst noting the content of these SoCG, and that they were, with the exception of the SoCG with Thanet, agreed in the Jan/ Feb 2024, in order to demonstrate that the consultation with adjacent authorities has been effective, continuous and ongoing, and the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate (DtC) or its potential successor have been

addressed in terms of the overall housing requirement, these will need to be updated and reviewed regularly if they are to be relied upon. We also note that the Development Topic Paper acknowledges in para 2.3 that a Canterbury focused HMA covers parts of Thanet and parts of Dover (albeit not the district's main settlements).

1.1.27 Only through a rigorous approach to the issue of the DtC will the Council be able to demonstrate that its housing requirement is right, and that the spatial strategy is correct in its approach to growth, including the release of land within the AONB.

Conclusions on the Housing Requirement

1.1.28 Whilst recognising that the Council has worked from the correct starting point, which is the minimum annual LHN calculated by reference to the Standard Method i.e. 1,149 dpa, the PPG is clear in that the LHN is only the starting point.

1.1.29 There are a range of factors relevant to the calculation of the housing requirement for the Draft Plan that the Council needs to consider when arriving at its overall housing requirement. These include:

- The inherent lack of affordability and the increasing affordability ratios;
- The poor levels of affordable housing delivery, and attendant increasing need for affordable homes; and
- The importance of including a buffer above the LHN to ensure adequate housing delivery particularly given the Council's historically poor track record of delivery as set out above.

1.1.30 When these factors are properly scrutinised, they demonstrate clear and rational reasons as to why there should be an uplift to the LHN. Having regard to the above Catesby believe that at the very least the plan should provide for the LHN + **a 10% buffer** to ensure the Plan proceeds on a robust footing. This would lead to an annual housing requirement of **1,264dpa**. Setting the housing requirement at this level would significantly improve the affordability situation within the District and would deliver more affordable homes for those members of the community in the most need.

1.1.31 It is clear from section 5.3 and appendix E of the SA that the sustainability effects of this higher number are little different to those of the preferred option, and that there is nothing to demonstrate that this can't be delivered. Equally, if the higher-level scenario advocated above cannot be accommodated within the District, the Council could then explore through the DtC, or successor alignment policy, whether any of its neighbours could assist, which is of course another important area of work that the Council does not appear to have done.

1.2 Housing Supply

1.2.1 Nowhere in the Reg 18 Plan is there a trajectory setting out how the housing requirement will be met or a rolling five year housing land supply maintained. Furthermore, the Draft Local Plan housing land supply trajectory set out in Figure 8.2 of the Development Topic Paper is what can only be described as rudimentary. It is only by integration of tables 8.8 and 8.9 of the Development Topic Paper that we have been able to establish that the housing supply comprises the following:

Draft Local Plan Annual Requirement	1,149	
Draft Local Plan Requirement 2020/21-40/41	24,129	21 x 1,149
Total Completions from 2020/21 – 2022/23	1,952	
Residual Requirement	22,177	
Existing Planning Permissions ¹⁷	2,121	9.5% of the residual requirement
Saved Allocations from 2017 Local Plan	11,461	51.7% of the residual requirement
Draft Proposed Allocations ¹⁸	8,504	38.3% of the residual requirement
Windfall Allowance ¹⁹	2,429	11% of the residual requirement
Total Land Supply	24,514	
Surplus	2,337	10% of the residual requirement

1.2.2 Whilst noting the above and having regard to CCC's current position on their 5-year Housing Land Supply (HLS), as set out in the AMR and table 8.9 of the Development Topic Paper, given the past record of under delivery it is important that the Council maintains a robust and rolling 5-year supply going forward. This will necessitate a front loading of delivery focussed on sites that are able to come forward early and deliver quickly, which in reality will be the small to medium sites of 10 – 250ish dwellings. To this end, whilst para 1.36 of the Reg 18 Plan infers that this will be facilitated through extant consents, this needs to be demonstrated more evidentially within the next iteration of the Plan. Equally the Council must ensure that it has the required clear evidence to demonstrate that completions will be delivered when expected. At present no detailed trajectory is provided within the evidence base, and as such there is nothing to demonstrate when the proposed allocations will deliver and how this integrates with existing commitments to provide for a rolling 5-year HLS going forward. Whilst we note that table 8.8 of the Development Topic Paper and appendices D, F and G (which relate to extant planning permissions, carried forward 2017 local plan allocations and new allocations respectively) provide some information there is no evidence behind this to justify the approach taken. Likewise, whilst appendix E of the AMR (The Housing Land Supply Statement) contains within its own appendices includes data on the phasing of the Strategic and Housing Allocations (appendix D), Extant Planning Permissions (appendix E), and Small Site Windfalls to 2031 (appendix C), it is not for consultees to piece this together to create a trajectory. The Council should.

1.2.3 In the context of the above, and whilst noting paras 8.27 – 8.31 of the Development Topic Paper, we would suggest that the Council consider further whether a buffer of say 10% should be applied to the existing commitments category to take into account any potential non-delivery/ delay in delivery of the dwellings contained within this category which is over 13,500 dwellings²⁰/ 55% of the projected supply. If this is not to be used, then the Council need to undertake a more detailed critique of the proposed commitments to ensure what is being put forward is truly deliverable within the plan period. Either way we believe this would generate the need to find land to accommodate circa 1,350 (+) dwellings. Furthermore, whilst noting the information on windfall data contained within paras 8.13 – 8.26 in the Development Topic Paper, the windfall rate now advocated (170dpa) is considerably higher than that agreed by the previous Local Plan Inspector (138dpa²¹). We would remind the Council of the need to provide compelling evidence that the windfall trajectory is a reliable source of supply, in accordance with para 72 of the NPPF. The information contained in the Development Topic Paper merely relies upon a headline review of past windfall delivery rates without

¹⁷ This includes residential as well as older persons' (366) and student accommodation (594) appropriately ratioed.

¹⁸ This includes older persons' accommodation (431) precautionarily ratioed at 1.8.

¹⁹ 170 per year for years 2027/28- 2040/41, and 49 for 2026/2.

²⁰ 2,121 + 11,461 = 13,582

²¹ See para 6.8, table 6.2 and para 6.21 of the Development Topics Paper

any analysis of expected future trends so goes nowhere near to meeting the evidence test required by the NPPF.

1.2.4 We note that para 8.1 of the Development Topic Paper advises that ‘*The council proposes to continue to use the Liverpool method of spreading any shortfall that might arise over the plan period, because of the specific circumstances that occur due to the higher level of development needing to take account of major infrastructure requirements.*’ The following paragraphs then identify a series of reasons why the Saved Allocations from 2017 Local Plan continue to take longer to deliver than was originally anticipated, yet at the same time the para 1.36 of the Reg 18 Plan says: *The majority of the strategic site allocations identified within the Canterbury District Local Plan (2017) now have planning consent and are under development and these sites will continue to contribute to the district’s development land supply, predominantly during the early years of this plan.*’ These two statements are contradictory and do not in our opinion support the use of the Liverpool method when calculating the rolling 5 year housing land supply. The plan should adopt the Sedgefield method as set in PPG. If they did then the current 5 year HLS would be thus, and not the 4.4. yrs. suggested in table 8.9 of the Development Topic Paper/ the AMR.

Local Plan requirement 2020/21 - 40/41	24,129	(1149dpa)
Total completions from 01/04/20 to 31/03/23	1,952	
Shortfall 01/04/20 to 31/03/23	1,495	1149 x 3 – 1,952
5 year requirement (5x PA requirement) 1/4/2023-31/3/2028	5,745	1149 x 5
Plus, shortfall from Shortfall 01/04/20 to 31/03/23	7,240	
20% buffer	1,448	7,240 x 20%
Overall 5 yr. requirement	8,688	
Annual requirement	1,738	8,688/5
Components of 5-year supply from 01/04/23 to 31/03/28		
Strategic and other new allocations	4,268	
New allocations in draft Local Plan	345	
Planning permissions	761	
Windfall allowance	219	
Students	594	
Care homes	322	
New care home allocations in draft Local Plan	0	
Total 5 year supply	6,508	
District-wide 5 year supply	3.74	
Surplus/ deficit	-2,180	

1.2.4 In the context of the above we note given the contents of para 8.125 and table 8.7 of the Development Topic Paper that the land south of Thanet Way is actually included in the 5 yr. HLS calc for delivery from 2027/28.

Conclusions on the Housing Supply

1.2.5 Having reviewed the component parts of the Housing Land Supply that is relied upon to meet the Councils minimum housing need, we consider that:

- 100% reliance on all current commitments (existing allocations and permissions) is not justified and a 10% buffer should be introduced to allow for non-delivery/ slower than expected delivery – especially of the larger sites and their planning history to date i.e. 1,350 dwellings.

- Whilst the proposed housing sites may deliver the quantum proposed within the plan period, this is subject to all of said sites being found acceptable by the Local Plan Inspector, such that a contingency may be sensible – see below.
- The proposed windfall allowance is not based on a credible evidence base and is not justified. At 11% of the residual requirement, it is a significant part of the overall supply and needs to be reviewed to ensure a realistic approach is adopted at Reg 19.
- There is no justification for the use of Liverpool in calculating the rolling 5 year HLS. Sedgefield should be used and on this basis the council only have 3.74 yrs. supply for the period 1/4/2023-31/3/2028.

1.2.6 As a result of the above, and we would submit that the ‘over supply’ of 2,337 dwellings currently proposed should at 10% of the residual requirement be the minimum the Plan should be looking to deliver to address our concerns about the commitments and windfalls, anything less would mean the plan would be incapable of accommodating any fluctuations in the market/ improving the prospect of delivering the minimum housing need.

2 The Spatial Strategy and Strategic Objectives of the Draft Plan

2.1 The Spatial Strategy

2.1.1 We note that the preferred spatial strategy comprises:

- Canterbury Urban Area which will be the principal focus for development in the district.
- A new rural settlement is planned for land north of the University of Kent campus north of Canterbury.
- Whitstable and Herne Bay Urban Areas which will be a secondary focus, where development will be principally driven by the need for new infrastructure especially new secondary schools and improved public transport connectivity.
- Proportionate development which will be allocated at all Rural Service Centres at a suitable scale which supports the function and character of the settlement.
- A limited amount of growth which will be allocated at Local Service Centres, where suitable sites are available, at a suitable scale which supports the function of the settlement.
- No residential development in the countryside.

2.1.2 Whilst we support this spatial strategy in principle, we do, despite what is said in sections 5.6 of the SA, have reservations about the deliverability of the proposed new freestanding settlement on the land north of the University of Kent campus north of Canterbury, but leave that for the Council to justify.

2.2 The Strategic Objectives

2.2.1 We note that Policy SS2 indicates in section 1 that new residential and commercial development should be designed to achieve net zero operational carbon emissions. We comment upon this issue when addressing Policy DS21 as well and would ask that these comments are taken into account in considering the policy approach being promoted in Policy SS2 as well.

2.2.3 Furthermore, we note that Policy SS4 refers in section 3 to the provision of the park and bus facility in Whitstable and how this will help reduce congestion and help improve the town centre environment. The provision of this facility falls within Policy W5, on land within Catesby’s control and they fully support its provision, having provided for it through planning application CA/23/00379.

2.2.4 Finally we note that Policy SS5 indicates that *'Where new or improved infrastructure is needed ahead of development taking place, the council will use appropriate mechanisms to actively manage the release of land for housing and other development.'* This is we have to say somewhat vague and needs further clarity to be effective. To this end we note that Policy DS7 (Infrastructure delivery) suggests in criterion 7 that; *'Where critical infrastructure such as transport improvements, strategic environmental mitigation or utilities provision including sewage is required ahead of development reaching a specific level of occupation, either as a whole, or separate phases of development, the council will use planning conditions and / or S106 agreements to manage the release of land for development in line with the agreed infrastructure delivery programme. All types of infrastructure connections to existing footpaths and cycleways should be delivered prior to occupation.'* This is we believe a more precise approach, albeit we are concerned about the infrastructure providers capacity to deliver when required of them and occupations potentially being stalled as a result. We say this as it is often the infrastructure providers who are the cause of delay. Contributions can in some cases be held or pooled by them for a considerable time whilst the associated project receives the necessary consents and is delivered. To actively tie the delivery of sites to the delivery of the required infrastructure improvements, or as is suggested to front load it could seriously delay the delivery of much needed housing and prejudice the Council's ability to maintain a rolling five year housing land supply.

2.2.5 Thus, whilst Catesby believe it is laudable of the Council to set clear requirements that necessary infrastructure must be provided at the right time to address the impacts of development, and note that each site allocation has within its policy approach a section on phasing and delivery which in effect clarifies what is required and when, they fear that anything linked to the provision of utilities would effectively require the development industry to be able to demonstrate that a third party (the infrastructure provider) will deliver when required of them – which we just can't do – all we can do is agree the timing of the infrastructure payments and then leave the matter with the infrastructure provider to deliver.

3 Site Specific representations on the proposed allocations in Whitstable

Having reviewed section 5.7 of the SA, especially table 5.12 and the summary of the proposed housing allocations in the Whitstable area, and having regard to the aims and objectives of Policy W5 relative to the overall vision for Whitstable as set out in chapter 3 of the Reg 18 Plan and the strategy for South Whitstable as set out in paragraphs 3.9 – 3.17 of the Reg 18 Plan, we have the following comments to make:

3.1 The SA of SHLAA site 132 / Policy W5

3.1.1 The SA scores SHLAA site 132 thus²²:

SA Objective	1	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	11	12	13	14
	Air Quality	Biodiversity	Geology	Landscape	Water	Flood zone	Heritage	Dwellings	Land use	Employment	Transport	Sustainable communities
SLAA132	0	- -	0	- -	-	++	0	++	- -	++	+/- -	++

3.1.2 The rationale behind the scores, in particular the fact that site 132 has a poorer score for transport impacts when it is this site that is allocated to provide a bus and park facility to ease congestion in the town centre seems somewhat odd, and should we believe be reviewed further, especially when SA appendix F (p17 (objective 13)) suggests, when commenting upon the preferred spatial strategy that *'the provision and support of park and ride/ bus facilities in Canterbury and Whitstable would also help reduce traffic through the city and town centres'*; whilst appendix I of the SA, in reviewing W5 against SA objective 13 scores it as a +/- , and states: *'Policies such as W4 and W5 would create large improvements such as through the creation of a park and bus facility (as does policy W3). These parks and bus facilities would encourage the use and increase the accessibility of public transport within Whitstable. Any development created by these policies would have to ensure they have adequate access into the local road infrastructure..... W4-W7 provide appropriate infrastructure to be enhance connectivity...'*

3.1.3 In reviewing SA appendix I and the Appraisal of Policy Sections for Whitstable we further note that in assessing the proposed allocations in Whitstable against SA objective 3 (To conserve, connect and enhance biodiversity across the District), the SA suggest that: *'Policies W4, W5 and W6 would all result in the creation of development that is within 400m of an International/National biodiversity designation (identified in associated site assessments). Policies W4 and W5 include measures that would see the creation of new grassland, woodland, hedgerows and other priority habitats to aid in mitigating any habitat loss or damage they could cause to the biodiversity assets of the area. Policy W5 would seek to enhance Benacre Wood. They also seek to provide 20% biodiversity net gain and create connected biodiversity sites across the sites created by these policies, alongside protecting hedgerows. Policies W4 and W5 are therefore scored as having a minor negative effect.'*

3.1.4 The above appears in part to be predicated on the fact the authors of the SA have allowed for no mitigation and suggest that the sites ability to deliver 20% BNG is not known. Given the fact planning application CA/23/00379 received a committee resolution to grant permission in December 2023 and it was confirmed that said development will provide for significant biodiversity net gains, significantly in excess of the 20% requirement promoted in the Reg 18 Local Plan and enhance Benacre Wood, we would ask that the appraisal of W5 in appendix I is reviewed accordingly.

3.1.5 Similarly we note that appendix I scores sites W4 and W5 as having significant negative affects even with mitigation on SA Objective 5 (To conserve and enhance the landscapes of the

²² SA objectives 2 and 8 (climate change and wate management) do not appear in the scoring table in section 5.7, para 5.7.21 advising - In accordance with site scoring framework, all sites were assessed having a not applicable score for climate change (SA Objective 2) and waste (SA Objective 8).

District for people and wildlife). Again, this ignores what has now been agreed with the Council as far as site W5 is concerned and we would thus ask the Council/ authors of the SA to review their position on this accordingly.

3.1.6 Appendix I of the SA also suggests in terms of SA Objective 6 (To protect water resources and ensure a high quality of inland and coastal waters), that site W5 has been identified as having the potential to compromise local water bodies that are within or close to the site. Whilst it then goes on to suggest this could be mitigated, the site still scores a minor negative as this is said to be uncertain. Again, given the fact planning application CA/23/00379 received a committee resolution to grant permission in December 2023 and it was confirmed that said development will have no adverse impact on any local water bodies that are within or close to the site, we would suggest that the sites score in this regard is revised to neutral.

3.1.7 In the context of the above we note that appendix G of the SA (the appraisal of the site allocations and alternatives) indicates on p49 that: *'SLAA104 and SLAA132 are identified as suitable, available and achievable in the SLAA. While the SA has identified significant and minor negative impacts across all three sites, it is determined when reviewed alongside the SLAA on the balance of impacts and considering possible mitigation and design, that the majority of these impacts can be addressed.*

The sites are allocated as part of a strategic development area in South Whitstable. Together, these sites present important opportunities to deliver new and improved connectivity with the A299, a new Park and Bus service for Whitstable, enhancements and extension to the Crab and Winkle Way walking/cycling route, and a new SEND school'.

3.1.8 Having regard to the above we believe the sites scoring should be amended thus:

SA Objective	1	3	4	5	6	7	9	10	11	12	13	14
	Air Quality	Biodiversity	Geology	Landscape	Water	Flood zone	Heritage	Dwellings	Land use	Employment	Transport	Sustainable communities
Original Score	0	- -	0	- -	-	++	0	++	- -	++	+/- -	++
Catesby score	0	+	0	-	0	++	0	++	- -	++	+/-	++

3.2 Policy W5

3.2.1 Policy W5 is a multi-faceted and detailed policy, which requires the land south of Thanet Way to provide for:

'(a) Approximately 220 new dwellings:

(b) Non-residential development:

(i) Provision of a new park and bus facility for a minimum of 200 spaces with land safeguarded for a further 100 spaces (approximately 0.7ha in total), with interchange to bus service;

(ii) Provision of new local shopping and community facilities; and

(iii) Proportionate land and build contributions towards early years, primary, secondary and SEND education plus proportionate contributions for primary healthcare and other necessary off-site community infrastructure

(c) *Open space: new on-site open space will be provided in line with Policy DS24*

3.2.2 Whilst Catesby generally support the policy in principle, they do have a few concerns about some of the detailed elements of the proposed policy wording, in particular criterion 2 (a) which states: *'Be coordinated with proposals for neighbouring sites, including the adjacent Site 7 in Policy CF1.'* This appears to be a hangover from the previous Reg 18 Plan and should we assume be deleted. Similarly, criterion 3(c) states *'Assess the site's potential to be functionally linked land for golden plover, in line with Policy DS17'*. Whilst we note that the Natural Environment and Open Space Topic Paper (Feb 24) advises in para 6.3 that *'As identified in the Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) supporting this Regulation 18 draft Local Plan (2024) there were 8 sites that had the potential of being FLL for Golden Plover'* this was not identified in the policy requirements of what was then policy W7 of the former Reg 18 Plan and was not raised during the course of the determination of application CA/23/00379. Indeed, the habitat regulations assessment submitted with the application highlighted the fact that *'Habitats within the site are not of types supporting these species'* and that *'Wintering bird surveys of the site have shown it not to support wintering waterfowl'*. As such we would suggest that this requirement is removed from policy W5.

4 Other Proposed Housing Policies

4.1 In addition to our minor comments on Policy W6 above, we would also like to comment upon policies, DS1 (Affordable Housing), DS2 (Housing Mix), DS6 (Sustainable Design), DS7 (Infrastructure Delivery), DS24 (Publicly Accessible Open Space and Sports), and DM11 (Residential Design). Taking each in turn:

DS1: Affordable Housing

4.2 We note that policy DS1 requires 'at least 30% affordable housing'. As the council will be aware policies must be clear to the decision maker and applicant as to what is required to ensure there is no confusion as to what is expected. This does not prevent development from coming forward above this figure but there must be no suggestion that the Council may require development to go beyond this figure. As such the prefix 'at least should be deleted from policy DS1. We also note that part 2 of policy DS1 advises that development should accord with the requirements set out the most up to date housing strategy. As the council will be aware policy can only be set within the local plan. Therefore, any policy that seeks to give similar weight to policies set out elsewhere is unsound. The Council must amend part 2 to state that development should 'have regard to' the Housing Strategy. That aside, whilst having no objection in principle to the provision of 30% affordable housing or the associated tenure split of 66% affordable rent, 25% first homes and 9% affordable ownership, we are concerned about the proposed housing mix to be delivered within the first homes for the reasons set out below in our comments on policy DS2 and would ask that the Council review this in the light of our comments. In addition, we note that policy DS1 also looks to see the affordable units dispersed throughout the site, avoiding large clusters, and integrating with the market housing. Whilst we appreciate and support the need to ensure integration and to create more balanced communities, that has to be weighed against the management objectives of the affordable provider, who often find small clusters to be inefficient, such that this requirement needs to provide for those instances where the affordable provider feels a different approach is justified in that particular instance.

DS2: Housing Mix

4.3 In noting the unit mix proposed in policy DS2, we would in the first instance question the extent to which policy DS2 should look to be prescriptive on the market housing to be delivered in

any one area. In our opinion the Council should recognise the need for flexibility, as per the NPPF and PPG, the fact that the needs of the area may well change over the lifetime of the plan, particularly given the current uncertainty in the housing market, that different areas will inevitably deliver different forms of housing i.e. apartments within city centre locations and family housing in suburban areas; and that it is the combination of the two that will ultimately address the overall need.

4.4 In addition we would question the housing mix advocated for affordable home ownership, including first time homes. The housing mix requirements for new affordable housing as set out in policy DS2 is reproduced below.

	Social or Affordable Rent	Affordable Home Ownership (including First Homes)
1 bed	48%	16%
2 beds	28%	43%
3 beds	19%	37%
4+ bed	5%	4%

The suggestion, that so many affordable home ownership properties, including first time homes are 3 and 4 bed (+) properties is we feel likely to lead to issue of deliverability for First Homes.

4.5 Para 66 of the NPPF is clear in that *‘Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the total number of homes to be available for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups’*. Whilst annex 2 of the NPPF defines *‘discounted market sales housing’* and *‘other affordable routes to home ownership’* as being at least 20% below local market value.

4.6 Para 2 of the planning practice guidance on First Homes (Reference ID: 70-002-20210524) makes it clear that:

- a) a First Home must be discounted by a minimum of 30% against the market value.
- b) after the discount has been applied, the first sale must be at a price no higher than £250,000 (or £420,000 in Greater London).

It goes on to explain that in Para 4 (ID: 70-004-20210524) that: *‘the First Homes Written Ministerial Statement does give local authorities and neighbourhood planning groups the discretion to require a higher minimum discount of either 40% or 50% if they can demonstrate a need for this.’* My emphasis.

4.7 Having regard to the above, the proposed unit mix advocated in policy DS2 will in our opinion be hard to deliver even at a 50% market value reduction given local values. Furthermore, the effects of delivering at this level of discount needs to be assessed in the viability appraisal to ensure it is achievable. Without any evidence to support the viability of this approach, said policy is totally unjustified.

4.8 In the context of the above we note that para 10.31 of the Viability Appraisal of May 2022 advises that:

‘The analysis suggests that increasing the First Homes discount from 30% to 40% is likely to reduce the Residual Value by about £26,000/ha on greenfield sites and by about £70,000/ha on brownfield sites. Increasing the First Homes discount from 30% to 50% has a greater impact and is likely to reduce the Residual Value by about £52,000/ha on greenfield sites and by about £142,000/ha on brownfield sites. Whilst the Council does not currently plan to seek a greater discount than 30%, if it does, it may be necessary to reconsider viability.’ My emphasis

4.9 Unfortunately the Supplementary Annex to the Viability Appraisal (August 2023), produced to consider the effect of affordable housing tenure and to clarify the approach to zero carbon on development viability does not look to address the issue of First Homes we raised in our reps of Jan 2023 so this matter remains unresolved.

4.10 We also note that part 5 (b) of Policy DS2 requires developments of 100 dwellings (+) to deliver a minimum of 10% bungalows. Whilst we note that the HNA highlights the high number of bungalows that exist within the district at present and the continued demand for this type of accommodation, especially to meet the needs of the elderly, single storey accessible accommodation can be provided in other forms, such as flatted development; whilst the delivery of M4(2) units will allow homes to be adapted if the need arises. As such a blanket 10% policy is not in our opinion justified or properly evidenced. Indeed, given the housing needs of the district and the desire to make the most efficient use of those greenfield sites that are to be allocated, the delivery of bungalows at what are often very low densities is we believe an inefficient and unsustainable use of land that is counter intuitive given the aims and objectives of the plan. We also note that no consideration has been given to the implications of this policy in the Viability Assessment. As such there is no justification for this part of Policy DS2 and it should be deleted. The needs of older people can be met without requiring the delivery of bungalows.

DS6: Sustainable Design

4.11 We note that policy DS6 (in part 1a) requires all new development to be designed to achieve a recognised calculated Net Zero operational carbon emissions standard; and in part 5b that proposals for 10 or more should be designed to achieve a per capita consumption of 90 litres per person per day.

4.12 With regard to the energy efficiency standards for new homes, Catesby supports the Government's approach set out in the Future Homes Standard. To this end we note that the Government have set out a clear roadmap as to how low carbon homes will, alongside the decarbonisation of the national grid, ensure that the Government can meet its commitments to net zero by 2050. The way forward being taken by the Government recognises that the improvements in energy efficiency of new homes should be a transition which ensures that new homes continue to come forward to meet housing needs whilst still being sufficiently challenging to significantly reduce the carbon emissions of new homes from 2025. As such, there is in our opinion no need for additional standards to be placed on the development through additional Local Plan policies that vary from that required in national government guidance. Indeed to do so would appear to conflict with the written ministerial statement (WMS) published on the 13th of December 2023, in which the housing minister notes that "*Compared to varied local standards nationally applied standards provide much-needed clarity and consistency for businesses, large and small, to invest and prepare to build net-zero ready homes*" and that local standards can "*add further costs to building new homes by adding complexity and undermining economies of scale*". The 2023 WMS goes on to state that any standard that goes beyond building regulations should be rejected at examination if the LPA does not have a well-reasoned and robustly costed rationale that ensures:

- That development remains viable, and the impact on housing supply and affordability is considered in accordance with the NPPF.
- The additional requirement is expressed as a percentage uplift of a dwelling's Target Emissions Rate (TER) calculated using a specified version of the Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP).

4.13 Turning to the first bullet point, the Council will need to ensure the costs and deliverability of this policy are fully and robustly tested. Whilst the Council have undertaken some cost analysis in

their Supplementary Annex to the Viability Appraisal (August 2023) reiterates the fact that if a Council wish to introduce higher standards than national policy, those must be justified, and that if this is something the Council wish to pursue further, then the authors recommend that, when procuring that evidence, the Council are particularly clear around the definitions and seek clear advice as to the costs of the different options (over and above current costs). To this end the Supplementary Annex to the Viability Appraisal indicates that there are numerous studies from other councils suggesting a broad range of costs for seemingly similar additional standards, so it may not be satisfactory to simply take assumptions from other authorities and assume that they will apply in CCC as objectors are likely to be able to point at other evidence that suggests a different approach. A point we would suggest the council consider further as we also note that the Supplementary Annex to the Viability Appraisal highlights the fact the 'zero carbon' and other requirements set out in the recommendations are based on the assumption of build costs being increased by 10%, and that this is based on the costs for zero regulated and unregulated CO₂; and that the Supplementary Annex to the Viability Appraisal acknowledges that a 5% fall in house prices or a 5% increase has a negative impact on viability and would result in a significant number of the strategic sites becoming unviable²³.

4.15 Similarly, the desire to achieve a maximum water consumption standard of 90 litres per person per day (lppd) is in our opinion totally unjustified and unsupported by the evidence base. The technical standards that can be introduced within Local Plans are set out in PPG and include higher standards with regard to water use. Where there is evidence to support their introduction, the Government allow local planning authorities to require a higher standard of 110 lppd in their Local Plans. Therefore, the proposed policy is inconsistent with national policy with no justification as to why such a low standard is necessary in Canterbury.

4.16 In addition to the above we note that section 7 of policy DS6 indicates that: '*The council will prepare design codes and/or guides, as necessary, which reflect local character and design preferences and provide a local framework for creating distinctive places with a consistent and high quality standard of design.*'

4.17 Whilst Catesby Estates support the aspirations of the National Design Code and agree that well designed places influence the experiences we have in the places where we live, work, and spend our leisure time, they also believe that you cannot be too prescriptive about the design approach that should be adopted to a site when it is allocated. We say this because all sites differ – so no one approach will fit all, and because it is only when one gets into the detailed design process associated with the preparation of a planning application that conflicting issues can arise and a pragmatic approach has to be adopted. Any aspiration for design codes/ guides thus needs to be taken forward in detailed discussions with site promoters to ensure the practicalities of the requirements do not prejudice deliverability.

DS7: Infrastructure Delivery

4.18 As set out in section 3 above, we note that Policy DS7 (part 7) sets out specific expectations where infrastructure is required in advance of development either in whole or part. As set out above

²³ We also note that the Climate Change Topic Paper acknowledged the WMS and recommends in section 7.1 that the local plan set net zero operational emissions standards for new development in the district in line with the WMS. And that said climate change topic paper also indicates at para 1.11 that whilst Table 8.9 of the 2022 Viability Study assessed the costs of on-site reduction of carbon emissions for regulated and un-regulated carbon, these costs were calculated before recent changes to requirements of new buildings, which mean gas boilers are no longer the default source of heating and air source heat pumps should be used in the first instance from 2025. Such that the 2022 VS clearly needs updating to reflect current circumstances.

we have serious concerns about the practicalities of this policy and thus its potential effectiveness when it comes to the upfront delivery of utilities / works required by statutory undertakers and would look to the Council to demonstrate that they have discussed this with the service providers and that the latter has the ability to deliver what is being suggested and when suggested.

4.19 We also note that para 6.19 of the Reg 18 Plan, in the preamble to Policy DS7 stated that: *'The Canterbury District Local Plan Viability Study (2022) has tested the viability of policies in this plan and has demonstrated that the plan as a whole is viable and deliverable. The council will therefore not accept further viability evidence from developers at the planning application stage other than in extremely limited circumstances.'*

4.20 This approach is in our opinion both unreasonable and inappropriate. Unexpected issues can arise whilst an application is being determined that can affect its viability and as such its important the Council continue to accept viability assessments as part of the determination of future planning applications. Indeed, to refuse to do so could actively prejudice the deliverability of sites and thus the Council's housing land supply.

DS24: Publicly Accessible Open Space and Sports

4.21 The publicly accessible open space and sports requirements of policy DS24 are in Catesby's opinion very ambitious and go way beyond that normally required, such that the financial implications of providing this level of publicly accessible open space and sports provision needs careful consideration in both the VA and assessment of a sites overall development potential as it could impact on the number of sites required to be developed to meet the Council's housing requirement.

4.22 In the context of the above, we note that section 2 of policy DS24 requires developments of 7.5ha or greater to provide all typologies in full within the site. It is not clear if this relates to the residential development area or the entire site area and is a point that needs clarity in order to make the policy effective. Either way 7.5ha is not that large a greenfield site and this approach could end up delivering a large number of disjointed sports facilities rather than what would be more effective and efficient sports hubs and takes no account of a site's topography or indeed the BNG implications of providing such facilities/ the implications this could have on a sites net to gross development area and thus housing delivery. As such whilst Catesby Estates fully support sites providing appropriate levels of onsite open space there should be an option to provide for offsite facilities where it is shown that either the site is not suitable due to its specific characteristics or the quantum of open space such as sport facilities would render then ineffective.

DM11: Residential Design

4.23 Again whilst having no objection in principle to Policy DM11, Catesby are concerned about the detailed requirements of this policy, especially those associated with 2(b) and (d). The former requires minimum floor to ceiling heights of 2.4m for new build to allow for good internal daylighting, and the latter houses with more than one bedroom to be dual or triple aspect, to allow for good internal daylight levels and cross ventilation. In terms of the former we would seek clarification as to whether this applies to apartments; and in terms of the latter would ask that clarity is provided as to how this applies to terraced accommodation.

5 Conclusions on Reg 18 Plan

5.1 Whilst we recognise the fact that in calculating their housing requirement the Council has worked to the correct starting point which is a minimum annual LHN calculated by reference to the standard method of 1,149 dpa, we are concerned that the scale of growth proposed in Policy SS3 of the Reg 18 Plan is the minimum needed to meet the LHN. No regard seems to have been had to increasing this to address the affordability issues that prevail in the area, the affordable housing needs of the area. As the SA suggests that providing for 10% above the minimum LHN makes little difference when assessed against the sustainability objectives we would ask the Council to review their position in this regard.

5.2 Similarly we are concerned that no evidence has been provided to demonstrate how the housing requirement will be met or how a rolling five year housing land supply will be achieved. The deliverability of the existing commitments needs to be demonstrated more evidentially than it has to date. Likewise, the evidence needs to be provided to demonstrate that the proposed allocations will deliver the quantum of development suggested when expected; and the plan needs to encompass compelling evidence to support the windfall rates expected rather than rely on historic trends.

5.3 Turning to the spatial strategy, whilst supporting this in principle, especially the proposals for south Whitstable, and Policy W5 in particular; we do have some concerns about the detailed requirements of Policy W5, as set out in para 3.2.2. above.

5.4 Likewise we would question the assessment of site W5 in the Sustainability Appraisal which we believe to be unfairly harsh, especially where technical and factual evidence has been provided to support improved scoring.

5.5 We also have specific concerns about the strategic objectives of policies SS2 and SS4, which interrelate to our concerns about policies DS1 (Affordable Housing), DS2 (Housing Mix), DS6 (Sustainable Design), DS7 (Infrastructure Delivery), DS24 (Publicly Accessible Open Space and Sports), and DM11 (Residential Design), all of which we do not believe to be properly justified or effective as drafted.

To conclude, subject to the comments above, we support the Reg 18 Plan and the proposed allocation of the land at Thanet Way (Policy W5) for strategic scale expansion. Having regard to the resolution to grant planning permission for the development of this site, we believe that this site can come forward in a timely way to help accommodate the housing needs of the area, and that they can deliver tangible benefits for the local community in terms of the improvements to the strategic highway network, the proposed park and bus facility, improvements to public transport provision, enhanced pedestrian and cycle links, new community / retail facilities, new public open space, including new play facilities, and 20% BNG. Said development will also provide for much needed family sized housing, affordable housing, and starter homes, without any adverse environmental impacts. Indeed, the development of this site provides an opportunity to provide for significant environmental improvements.

In the context of the above we would like to highlight Catesby's desire to work with Canterbury City Council on the delivery of the land South of Thanet Way, and to this end would welcome the opportunity to meet with officers to discuss our proposals for this site further, as well as our associated reps on the other policies contained in the Reg 18 Plan/ its supporting evidence base.

Yours sincerely



JUDITH ASHTON
Judith Ashton Associates

C.c. Victoria Groves – Catesby Estates