****

**Local Plan Options**

**Consultation responses**

Total submissions: 770 (602 survey forms and 168 written submissions)

Total representations: 5,091

[**Vision, objectives and growth**](#_9b3avlptahrm) **3**

[1. The district vision by 2040](#_g4vktv1bcjs1) 3

[2. Our strategic objectives](#_lijohcdobn02) 4

[3. Growth options](#_6ets44m3uewq) 9

[**Town centre strategies**](#_qoz5bmophieq) **15**

[1. Canterbury](#_bol8ynjqty9) 15

[2. Herne Bay](#_fxajb0atpc6j) 17

[3. Whitstable](#_8l7nyo5c4ne) 19

[**Housing and new communities**](#_52gcxdfyazp0) **21**

[1. How should we make sure the right types and tenures of housing are provided?](#_6vme8l82rl1w) 21

[2. How should we provide opportunities for small and medium sized housing developments?](#_ck2b403kcncv) 22

[3. How should we provide opportunities for suitable brownfield and regeneration developments?](#_2lc7qcy1kr1c) 22

[4. How should we make sure that the right densities are delivered in developments across the district?](#_np9zt86kc52r) 23

[5. How should we make sure housing is provided for rural communities?](#_h1i5kiodkw9f) 24

[6. How can we support sustainable living in new communities?](#_zhfcyf4nos8a) 25

[7. How should we make sure all design is of high quality?](#_y2s7s0noxy75) 26

[8. How can we deliver low carbon and energy efficient housing?](#_li0otkburwx3) 27

[9. How should we improve water efficiency?](#_7yi5moyecbtr) 29

[10. How will we incorporate renewable energy into new developments?](#_n44fgtuob2fy) 30

[11. How should we provide housing for older people?](#_9f7ss1nmeh3v) 31

[12. How should we provide accessible and disability-friendly homes?](#_u40byosy9jie) 32

[13. How and where should we provide new student accommodation?](#_tabqmvvsxhez) 33

[14. How should we provide accommodation for gypsies and travellers?](#_lzr2vsa0c5gz) 34

[15. How should we support opportunities for self and custom-build housing?](#_d12iphke7cux) 35

[16. How can we maximise the benefits of strategic infrastructure investment for residents and businesses?](#_vs4gpit8ulff) 36

[17. How can we enhance the production of community and utility scale renewable energy?](#_b1b602hqf6lq) 37

[18. How can we make sure that infrastructure is delivered at the right time to support development?](#_fvszb3uxfacr) 37

[19. How should we address changes in development viability at the planning application stage?](#_hxq65vj0vdvj) 38

[20. Other comments](#_qxd86r40mzbf) 39

[**Employment and the local economy**](#_wiel6qow1cdz) **40**

[1. Provide enough business space in the right locations](#_7mdhbk2xyiob) 40

[2. Provide the right mix of jobs](#_c9ul47ew2gb4) 41

[3. Supporting the delivery of allocated employment sites](#_rios13jhiit) 42

[4. Improving the accessibility and connectivity of employment areas](#_g0k1t8f8smiz) 42

[5. Improving the energy performance and carbon emissions of new commercial developments](#_dul04bah037c) 43

[6. Supporting the development of our universities](#_oyj4vpky683i) 44

[7. Supporting new tourist accommodation](#_gac0qgu7kkp8) 45

[8. Supporting growth of the rural economy](#_yfkfhe3tvt9g) 46

[**Town centres and local facilities**](#_d6401g8bykm9) **47**

[1. How should we designate the hierarchy of centres in the district?](#_cl803wp92d9a) 47

[2. How should we support appropriate growth and development at out-of-town retail areas in Canterbury?](#_f9662id2bu4k) 47

[3. How should we support and protect our local centres?](#_j4a0y0moq6x2) 48

[4. How can we best support our village centres?](#_k1hv6nl3prhf) 53

[**Movement and transport**](#_i01o83i7r7lx) **55**

[1. How can we maximise active travel in the district?](#_m2444foffj27) 55

[2. How do we enable greater use of public transport in the district?](#_sm4uhef4wxc0) 56

[3. How will we enable the rapid transition to zero emissions vehicles?](#_7pxtkopd5hr8) 58

[4. How should we approach parking standards in the Local Plan?](#_tqs1xyiev3t) 59

[5. How should we approach transport assessments, transport statements and travel plans?](#_fwi6qfwzpsn) 60

[**Heritage and the historic environment**](#_mv68z8ckfm9) **62**

[1. How can we protect and enhance our heritage assets?](#_lgur70id968j) 62

[2. How can we support the adaptation of the historic environment to achieve improvements in carbon emissions and energy efficiency?](#_48ta7ch1beag) 62

[3. How should we protect and enhance biodiversity and green and blue spaces like parks and rivers?](#_ovwq1zpay8ym) 63

[4. How should we make sure that the local landscape designations (areas of high landscape value) continue to protect our valued landscapes?](#_p46v0veyugrn) 64

[5. How should we make sure our approach to green gaps is still effective?](#_k0lz1cjnp5t4) 68

[6. How should we manage outdoor lighting to support tranquility?](#_o3gy2t172ttq) 72

[7. How should we protect existing open space in the Local Plan?](#_pqqamirsbpgc) 73

[8. How can we support accessible outdoor sports and recreation across the district?](#_dtq8fb5jo6va) 74

[9. How should we make sure our approach to local green spaces is still effective?](#_6x4fwqm07gzx) 74

[10. How do we approach development where there are coastal protection and overtopping hazard zones?](#_xqse8cr4c0gf) 75

[11. How can we maximise the benefits of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)?](#_pucdopk058y6) 75

[12. What should we do about groundwater protections?](#_mtdvx7ife9o1) 76

# Vision, objectives and growth

**Summary**

Total completed survey forms: 371

Total written submissions: 168

Total representations: 2,997

Issues with the most comments:

* Object to the proposal for a western bypass: 232 comments
* Too many homes proposed to be built under the preferred option: 231 comments
* Do not build on greenfield sites: 188 comments
* Infrastructure needs to be improved before new homes are built: 166 comments
* Too many homes proposed to be built under Canterbury focus B: 113 comments
* Growth should be spread more evenly across the district: 94 comments
* Object to any growth in villages: 90 comments
* The preferred option would have a detrimental effect on climate change: 82 comments
* The preferred option would increase traffic congestion: 81 comments
* Rural infrastructure would not be able to cope with the amount of development proposed under the rural focus option: 77 comments

## 1. The district vision by 2040

| Strongly agree | 6.2% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 15.9% |
| Neutral | 11.9% |
| Disagree | 14.8% |
| Strongly disagree | 46.1% |
| No answer | 5.1% |

Comments received:

* Environmental protection is more important than growth: 76 comments
* The vision does not fully consider the effects of Covid-19 on the economy and on tourism: 44 comments
* Sustainability is more important than growth: 23 comments
* Insufficient focus on tackling climate change: 19 comments
* Support the commitment to sustainable transport: 19 comments
* Support growth being centred on Canterbury: 18 comments
* Growth should be focused on the coastal towns rather than Canterbury: 17 comments
* Insufficient detail on how the vision will be achieved: 17 comments
* Object to growth being centred on Canterbury: 8 comments
* The vision is not forward thinking enough and does not commit to real change: 7 comments
* Support the commitment to improving connectivity: 6 comments
* Affordable, reliable and safe public transport should be a priority: 3 comments
* Connections to mainland Europe have been adversely affected by Brexit: 2 comments
* Centring growth on Canterbury is incompatible with the vision for healthy communities: 2 comments
* Insufficient focus on nature conservation: 2 comments
* Insufficient mention of the importance of sport and leisure: 2 comments
* Support the commitment to improving infrastructure: 2 comments
* The commitment to healthy communities should refer to healthy communities and quality of life: 2 comments
* Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation should be mentioned, this needs to be considered at the very outset of preparing a Local Plan: 1 comment
* Focus on diversifying the economy rather than on growing it: 1 comment
* Insufficient focus on water quality: 1 comment
* Insufficient mention of the coastal towns: 1 comment
* Insufficient mention of the East Kent strategic context: 1 comment

## 2. Our strategic objectives

**2.1. Provide high quality affordable housing for everyone as part of mixed, sustainable communities**

| Strongly agree | 18.6% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 32.6% |
| Neutral | 11.9% |
| Disagree | 7.6% |
| Strongly disagree | 14.8% |
| No answer | 14.5% |

Comments received:

* New developments should include a proportion of social housing: 1 comment

**2.2. Make sure housing is of high quality design, low carbon and energy efficient, with access to community facilities and open space**

| Strongly agree | 39.6% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 29.9% |
| Neutral | 6.2% |
| Disagree | 1.4% |
| Strongly disagree | 8.1% |
| No answer | 14.8% |

Comments received:

* All new housing should be as energy efficient as possible: 6 comments
* Support commitment to low carbon housing: 2 comments
* New homes need to be built sustainably: 1 comment
* Renewable energy is unreliable: 1 comment
* This objective should refer to water efficiency as well as energy efficiency: 1 comment

**2.3. Create a thriving economy with a wide range of jobs, including more high paid jobs, to support increased opportunities for everyone**

| Strongly agree | 19.7% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 33.4% |
| Neutral | 18.6% |
| Disagree | 4.0% |
| Strongly disagree | 8.1% |
| No answer | 16.2% |

Comments received:

* Job creation needs to focus on all sectors, not just high paid jobs: 1 comment

**2.4. Support the growth and development of our universities as a centre of innovation and learning excellence, which will help create business start ups and skilled jobs**

| Strongly agree | 20.0% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 26.2% |
| Neutral | 15.1% |
| Disagree | 11.6% |
| Strongly disagree | 12.4% |
| No answer | 14.8% |

Comments received:

* Link with the universities and with Pfizer to create a science hub: 5 comments
* Focus on technical and college apprenticeships rather than on growing the universities: 1 comment
* Object to the growth of the universities: 1 comment

**2.5. Create a transport network with focus on low carbon travel to improve air quality and people’s health, make sure there’s excellent access to city and town centres, including through intelligent transport systems**

| Strongly agree | 32.1% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 28.3% |
| Neutral | 11.1% |
| Disagree | 4.0% |
| Strongly disagree | 9.7% |
| No answer | 14.8% |

Comments received:

* Public transport links need improving: 48 comments
* Support the commitment to environmentally friendly journeys, to minimise the impact on air quality: 39 comments

**2.6. Take advantage of, and improve, our links to and from London and the continent, while creating a local transport network which means most residents can access their day-to-day needs within 15 minutes through healthy, environmentally friendly journeys**

| Strongly agree | 21.0% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 26.6% |
| Neutral | 17.5% |
| Disagree | 9.2% |
| Strongly disagree | 11.1% |
| No answer | 15.1% |

Comments received:

* Support the commitment to sustainable transport: 18 comments
* The focus on proximity to London is no longer relevant post-Covid: 1 comment

**2.7. Support the sustainable growth of our rural communities with affordable housing, community facilities and transport, and take advantage of opportunities to grow the rural economy**

| Strongly agree | 18.6% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 24.3% |
| Neutral | 15.1% |
| Disagree | 10.5% |
| Strongly disagree | 16.2% |
| No answer | 15.4% |

No comments received on this objective.

**2.8. Capitalise on our rich and distinctive heritage and culture, enhancing character, sense of place and quality of life, supporting tourism and the local economy for our residents, visitors and businesses**

| Strongly agree | 25.6% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 33.2% |
| Neutral | 14.6% |
| Disagree | 3.0% |
| Strongly disagree | 6.5% |
| No answer | 17.2% |

No comments received on this objective.

**2.9. Exploit the delivery of infrastructure needed to support growth to maximise the benefits for existing residents and businesses, and ensure the critical infrastructure is delivered at the right time to support development**

| Strongly agree | 14.8% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 25.9% |
| Neutral | 18.3% |
| Disagree | 10.5% |
| Strongly disagree | 13.8% |
| No answer | 16.7% |

Comments received:

* The transport infrastructure needs upgrading in order to minimise the impact on air quality: 3 comments

**2.10. Create accessible vibrant town centres, maximising digital connectivity, for residents, visitors and businesses to shop, stay and enjoy their leisure time**

| Strongly agree | 23.7% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 31.0% |
| Neutral | 16.7% |
| Disagree | 5.1% |
| Strongly disagree | 6.7% |
| No answer | 16.7% |

No comments received on this objective.

**2.11. Protect and enhance our rich environment, creating spaces, supporting wildlife and biodiversity and improving the health and wellbeing of our communities**

| Strongly agree | 62.0% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 14.0% |
| Neutral | 2.2% |
| Disagree | 1.1% |
| Strongly disagree | 4.9% |
| No answer | 15.9% |

Comments received:

* Support the commitment to environmental sustainability: 4 comments
* Insufficient focus on protecting the landscape: 2 comments

**2.12. Adapt to and reduce the impacts of climate change by making sure new development is highly energy efficient and encourages low carbon lifestyles**

| Strongly agree | 50.4% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 17.8% |
| Neutral | 6.5% |
| Disagree | 1.4% |
| Strongly disagree | 6.7% |
| No answer | 17.3% |

Comments received:

* Support the objective of tackling climate change: 5 comments
* This objective should refer to water efficiency as well as energy efficiency: 1 comment

**2.13. Other comments on the draft objectives**

* The objective for growth and the objective for environmental protection contradict each other: 28 comments
* It is unclear how building more homes will contribute to the achievement of these objectives: 15 comments
* Insufficient detail on how the objectives will be achieved: 9 comments
* Insufficient mention of the coastal towns: 1 comment

## 3. Growth options

**3.1. The preferred option**

| Strongly agree | 4.6% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 5.7% |
| Neutral | 7.6% |
| Disagree | 12.9% |
| Strongly disagree | 53.9% |
| No answer | 15.4% |

Comments received:

* Too many homes proposed to be built: 231 comments
* This amount of development would have a detrimental effect on climate change: 82 comments
* This amount of development would increase traffic congestion: 81 comments
* Too much green space would be lost under this option: 71 comments
* The number of homes should be limited to the maximum required by central government: 38 comments
* This many homes would destroy the character of Canterbury: 26 comments
* Support this option as it has the most benefits: 12 comments
* Insufficient evidence and analysis provided to demonstrate why this is the preferred option: 10 comments
* Support this option as Canterbury is already well connected: 5 comments
* Concern this many homes would lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour: 2 comments
* Limit the amount of road space reallocated as cycle paths: 2 comments
* The Statement of Common Ground between Canterbury City Council and Dover District Council does not consider this level of uplift in housing provision: 1 comment

**3.2. Canterbury focus A**

| Strongly agree | 10.5% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 17.0% |
| Neutral | 19.7% |
| Disagree | 13.2% |
| Strongly disagree | 19.7% |
| No answer | 20.0% |

Comments received:

* 9,000 homes is still too many and the council should challenge the government on this target: 52 comments
* This amount of development would increase traffic congestion: 45 comments
* Favour this option to the preferred option: 34 comments
* 9,000 homes is more reasonable than the preferred option and still meets the government’s target: 23 comments
* This amount of development would have a detrimental effect on air quality: 23 comments
* 9,000 extra homes would destroy the character of Canterbury: 17 comments
* Support the limited growth in villages proposed in this option: 8 comments
* Support the limited growth at the coast proposed in this option: 5 comments
* Insufficient green space allocated for walking and cycling: 1 comment

**3.3. Canterbury focus B**

| Strongly agree | 4.3% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 4.3% |
| Neutral | 10.0% |
| Disagree | 14.6% |
| Strongly disagree | 51.2% |
| No answer | 15.6% |

Comments received:

* Too many homes proposed to be built: 113 comments
* Too much green space would be lost under this option: 43 comments
* This amount of development would increase traffic congestion: 22 comments
* This amount of development would have a detrimental effect on climate change: 17 comments
* Insufficient space in Canterbury to accommodate this many homes: 16 comments
* Insufficient healthcare and education provision to cope with this level of increase in population: 4 comments
* Insufficient green space allocated for walking and cycling: 1 comment
* Support the limited growth in villages proposed in this option: 1 comment
* This option makes the most sense as it properly plans for expansion and growth: 1 comment
* This option will not allow the strategic objectives to be achieved: 1 comment

**3.4. Coastal focus**

| Strongly agree | 5.9% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 15.9% |
| Neutral | 26.2% |
| Disagree | 15.1% |
| Strongly disagree | 14.3% |
| No answer | 22.6% |

Comments received:

* Favour this option to the preferred option: 24 comments
* The coastal towns are already over-developed: 22 comments
* The coastal towns are in need of the regeneration this option would deliver: 16 comments
* Too many homes proposed to be built: 13 comments
* Object to this option as growth should be centred on Canterbury: 8 comments
* This amount of development would have a detrimental effect on climate change: 8 comments
* 9,000 homes is still too many and the council should challenge the government on this target: 7 comments
* Insufficient space at the coast to accommodate 9,000 homes: 7 comments
* This option would destroy the character of Whitstable: 7 comments
* This option would prevent further traffic congestion in Canterbury: 5 comments
* 9,000 homes is more reasonable than the preferred option and still meets the government’s target: 4 comments
* There is more space at the coast to accommodate 9,000 homes than there is in Canterbury: 4 comments
* Coastal infrastructure would not be able to copy with this many extra homes: 2 comments
* Concern this option would lead to settlement merge between the two coastal towns: 2 comments
* There are already too many second homes and holiday lets in Whitstable: 2 comments
* This amount of development would increase traffic congestion: 2 comments
* This is not a viable option due to the increasing flood risk resulting from climate change: 1 comment

**3.5. Rural focus**

| Strongly agree | 4.0% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 8.9% |
| Neutral | 17.3% |
| Disagree | 16.7% |
| Strongly disagree | 31.3% |
| No answer | 21.8% |

Comments received:

* Rural infrastructure would not be able to copy with this many extra homes: 77 comments
* 9,000 homes would destroy the character of rural areas: 52 comments
* Any growth in rural areas must be sustainable, as villages need to maintain their boundaries and sense of identity: 11 comments
* Development in rural areas should be proportionate and in keeping with the character of the area: 11 comments
* Building in rural areas would increase pollution as people would have to travel further to work and shop: 9 comments
* Rural public transport links need improving: 7 comments
* This option would exacerbate problems with drainage and sewerage: 4 comments
* Favour this option to the preferred option: 2 comments
* 9,000 homes is still too many and the council should challenge the government on this target: 1 comment

**3.6. New freestanding settlement**

| Strongly agree | 7.8% |
| --- | --- |
| Agree | 11.6% |
| Neutral | 21.8% |
| Disagree | 13.2% |
| Strongly disagree | 21.0% |
| No answer | 24.5% |

Comments received:

* Impossible to assess this option without knowing where a new settlement would be located: 41 comments
* Too much green space would be lost under this option: 37 comments
* This option would allow new infrastructure to be created from scratch to meet the needs of the development: 27 comments
* A new settlement could be built to zero carbon standards: 14 comments
* This option would avoid over-populating existing towns and villages: 13 comments
* This option would increase pollution as people would have to travel further to work and shop: 12 comments
* 9,000 homes is still too many and the council should challenge the government on this target: 9 comments
* There is insufficient space in the district to accommodate a new settlement: 8 comments
* This is the best option: 8 comments
* There would not be any rail links to a new settlement: 5 comments
* The cost of this option would be prohibitive: 4 comments
* There is no existing infrastructure in place: 4 comments
* There would not be an established community at a new settlement: 4 comments
* Consider working with neighbouring councils to create a cross-district settlement: 3 comments
* Create a freestanding eco-town: 1 comment
* Prefer this option to the expansion of existing villages: 1 comment
* This option is not assessed in Jacobs Transport Modelling Report: 1 comment

**3.7. Other growth options**

Comments received:

* Object to the proposal for a western bypass: 232 comments
* Do not build on greenfield sites: 188 comments
* Infrastructure needs to be improved before new homes are built: 166 comments
* Growth should be spread more evenly across the district: 94 comments
* Object to any growth in villages: 90 comments
* Object to the expansion of Aylesham into Womenswold parish: 34 comments
* The character of Canterbury must be preserved: 25 comments
* Object to the expansion of Littlebourne which would have a detrimental effect on the village: 21 comments
* Concern growth will result in the loss of farmland and green space: 18 comments
* Canterbury is already over-developed: 17 comments
* Object to a new Park and Ride at Harbledown: 15 comments
* Insufficient detail given on how the growth options would be funded: 13 comments
* Focus on bringing existing empty homes back into use before building new homes: 12 comments
* Ever-continuing growth is unsustainable: 10 comments
* Support the upgrading of the A28: 9 comments
* Object to the proposal for an eastern bypass: 8 comments
* Problems with drainage and sewerage need addressing: 8 comments
* Look to develop existing brownfield sites in Canterbury, such as Wincheap: 7 comments
* Safer cycling routes are needed: 7 comments
* Development should be based on local need rather than developer profits: 5 comments
* Object to the expansion of Wincheap Park and Ride onto Water Meadows: 5 comments
* Problems with flood defences need addressing: 5 comments
* Support the proposal for an eastern bypass: 5 comments
* Unable to offer an informed opinion on the options without knowing how many homes would go in which parts of the district: 5 comments
* Insufficient detail provided on where a western bypass would be routed: 4 comments
* Introduce a congestion charge in the city centre to help fund infrastructure improvements: 4 comments
* Support the creation of a reservoir at Broad Oak: 4 comments
* Any allocations within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty must be small scale: 3 comments
* Demolish and rebuild existing older council housing estates rather than building new estates: 3 comments
* Combine the new settlement, city and coastal focus options in order to maximise investment: 2 comments
* Object to the development of Highland Court Farm in Bridge: 2 comments
* Repurpose empty office spaces as residential accommodation before building new homes: 2 comments
* The council should stop housing families from outside of the district, as this would reduce the need for so many new homes to be built: 2 comments
* Unclear whether the new homes are in addition to, or instead of, those in the current adopted Local Plan: 2 comments
* Avoid the privatisation of green space, as green spaces will be lost as more building takes place: 1 comment
* Ban cars from the city centre: 1 comment
* Build social housing on the site of the council offices in Military Road: 1 comment
* Concern growth will result in increased pressure on local services: 1 comment
* Focusing growth in urban areas may restrict the variety of housing choice available: 1 comment
* Limit the number of new homes to 5,000: 1 comment
* Limit the number of new homes to 7,000: 1 comment
* The council needs to work with the Environment Agency and water companies to understand the impact of increased development on water and sewerage networks: 1 comment
* Whichever option is taken forward must be sensitive to the natural environment: 1 comment

# Town centre strategies

Total responses: 47

Total representations: 196

## 1. Canterbury

**1.1. Vision**

Comments received:

* Object to the vision as it would lead to further over-population of Canterbury: 2 comments
* Support the focus on mitigating climate change and all new developments must align with this: 1 comment
* Feel the vision is incompatible with the preferred growth option: 1 comment

**1.2. Objectives**

| Maintaining the city’s function as a sub-regional centre, providing and creating a wide range of town centre uses and services to grow footfall and contribute to the vibrancy and vitality of the centre | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Facilitate business growth and development in the city by supporting the growth and development of the universities to stimulate business startups and associated economic development | * The effects of Covid-19 have not been fully thought through: 4 comments * Encourage small independent traders as this would add to the city’s character: 2 comments * Office space in Canterbury is unattractive due to high business rates and high parking charges: 2 comments * Encourage business start-ups in order to support graduate employment: 1 comment * This should include a commitment to working with Kent Chamber of Commerce and other businesses: 1 comment * The market needs improving: 1 comment * Object to student accommodation in residential areas: 1 comment * Unclear what role the council can play in supporting the growth of the universities, other than deciding planning applications: 1 comment |
| Growing the residential population by converting space above shops and developing mixed use and residential schemes, making effective use of land to attract a variety of residents that will contribute to town centre vitality, footfall and expenditure | * Support the conversion of city centre retail units to residential accommodation: 6 comments * Object to the conversion of city centre retail units to residential accommodation, they should be protected for commercial use: 1 comment * Concern crime and anti-social behaviour would deter people from wanting to live in the city centre: 1 comment |
| Improve connectivity between different areas and visitor attractions to create a more legible town centre environment, supported by enhanced digital infrastructure | * Current broadband capacity is insufficient and needs improving: 1 comment * Better signposting is needed to help visitors find their way around: 1 comment |
| Facilitating a significant increase in opportunities for walking, cycling, active travel and sustainable transport to ease congestion and improve air quality and people’s health | * Support the creation of safe walking and cycling routes: 7 comments * Cars should be excluded from the city centre as much as possible: 3 comments * E-scooters cause many problems and are often dumped: 3 comments * This needs urgent prioritisation: 2 comments * Better public transport provision is needed: 2 comments * Need to enforce against dangerous cycling in the city centre: 1 comment * Need to consider electric vehicle parking and charging points: 1 comment * Create a new bridge through the garden by Westgate Towers to reduce traffic congestion: 1 comment * Create a low couched roadway between Tower House car park and Westgate Towers mini-roundabout to reduce traffic congestion: 1 comment * This is unachievable as it takes too long to get from one part of Canterbury to another by walking or cycling: 1 comment * It is impossible to completely avoid car journeys: 1 comment |
| Positively exploit the city’s heritage to deliver economic, social and environmental benefits | * More support is needed to boost historic tourism: 4 comments * Any development must be sympathetic to the city’s heritage: 2 comments |
| Improving public spaces including new public art and lighting and new green infrastructure and landscaping | None. |
| Fostering a vibrant cultural and creative offer to embed Canterbury city centre as a core attraction and the heart of community life. New festivals, events and themes to support town centre activity, attract visitors and maximise footfall | * Cultural and creative offer will need to be adapted, as fewer visitors are coming from overseas due to Brexit and Covid-19: 3 comments * Need to highlight the importance and diversity of our existing cultural offer: 2 comments * Concern crime and anti-social behaviour would deter people wanting to visit: 1 comment * High parking charges deter people wanting to visit: 1 comment |

Other comments received:

* Support all the objectives: 10 comments
* More action is needed to address rough sleeping: 4 comments
* More action is needed to tackle littering: 3 comments
* Insufficient detail on how the objectives will be achieved: 2 comments
* More action is needed to tackle anti-social behaviour: 2 comments
* More action is needed to tackle graffiti: 2 comments
* Developing 9,000 homes around Canterbury will prevent the achievement of many of these objectives: 1 comment
* The objectives to increase visitors and to encourage active travel contradict each other: 1 comment
* The council should support the Broad Oak reservoir as it would maintain efficient water supply: 1 comment
* Object to the proposal to relocate the council offices to Whitefriars: 1 comment

## 2. Herne Bay

**2.1. Vision**

Comments received:

* The vision and objectives for Herne Bay are much the same as the vision and objectives for Canterbury: 1 comment

**2.2. Objectives**

| Providing and creating a wide range of town centre uses including opportunities for job creation and creative industries that stimulate activity, grow footfall and add to the vibrancy and vitality of the centre | None. |
| --- | --- |
| The seafront will be reinvigorated through the enhancement of public spaces and the regeneration of seafront buildings - including with contemporary design - to create a dynamic and vibrant place for people to socialise and spend leisure time | * Seafront regeneration could transform the town: 2 comments |
| Increase residential occupancy within the town centre including making use of space above shops for residential | * Support the conversion of retail space to residential accommodation: 1 comment * Focus on the housing needs of local residents rather than people from elsewhere: 1 comment |
| Significantly improving the connectivity between the different areas of the town centre, particularly Central Parade, High Street and Mortimer Street and the railway station as well as the wider suburbs | * This is key, as the disconnect between the town centre and the seafront prevents the town becoming popular: 1 comment * Introduce a shuttle bus service between the railway station and the seafront: 1 comment |
| Opportunities for movement by foot, cycle and public transport will be maximised and we will balance the desirability and convenience of car parking in the centre with the transition to more sustainable transport modes. Improving traffic flow on the road network and balancing the desirability and convenience of car parking in the centre with the transition to more sustainable transport modes | * The approach to sustainable transport should include an aim to reduce traffic in the town: 2 comments * Public transport links need improving: 1 comment |
| Enhance digital infrastructure where it preserves the historic environment and support improvements to strategic infrastructure, including power and water, to the benefit of communities and businesses | * Water efficiency needs improving before any development takes place: 1 comment |
| Positively exploit Herne Bay’s rich heritage to develop tourism and the local economy to benefit residents, visitors and businesses | * The town’s heritage needs to be protected, not exploited: 3 comments * In order to attract more tourists, a good quality hotel is needed: 2 comments * This also needs to include measures to maximise income outside of the tourist season: 1 comment |
| Enhance public and open space to deliver new opportunities for shopping, community and leisure events to encourage more people to visit the town centre. New festivals, events and themes will be developed to support town centre activity and maximise footfall | * Open spaces must be protected as they are vital to people’s health and wellbeing: 1 comment * The town’s shopping offer needs improving: 1 comment * The town’s sporting offer needs improving: 1 comment * A farmers’ market would help encourage visitors: 1 comment |

Other comments received:

* Support all the objectives: 13 comments
* More affordable car parking is needed: 2 comments
* Need to avoid urban sprawl: 1 comment
* Developments must be focused on sustainability: 1 comment

## 3. Whitstable

**3.1. Vision**

Comments received:

* Insufficient detail given on the need for this vision and on how it would be achieved: 1 comment

**3.2. Objectives**

| Providing a range of compatible uses including entrepreneurship and creative industry that reflect the character of the area, add to the vibrancy and vitality of the centre and maintain the town centre at the heart of the community it serves | * More business space should be provided in the town centre: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Promoting higher density development where it can be accommodated and making use of space above shops for residential | * Developments must be good quality and include open spaces: 1 comment * Need to know more about where these would be and what they would look like: 1 comment * These units would be too small and this would lead to neighbour disputes: 1 comment |
| Digital infrastructure to all new residential and business developments and provide enhanced digital infrastructure where it preserves the historic environment |  |
| Improving the town centre environment by reducing the dominance of traffic, providing low carbon travel options including new and extended cycle and walking network and enhanced public realm | * A Park and Ride is needed in Whitstable, this would help reduce the amount of traffic coming into the town centre: 22 comments * Support the aim of reducing traffic: 6 comments * Cars should be excluded from the town centre: 1 comment * The high street should be pedestrianised: 1 comment * Agree, Whitstable is too congested: 1 comment |
| Protect, improve and capitalise on the town’s rich and distinctive heritage, culture and quality of place to enhance quality of life, support tourism and the local economy for residents, visitors and businesses | * Preserving the character of Whitstable is important: 2 comments * The town’s existing shopping offer is good: 2 comments * Concern anti-social behaviour will deter people visiting: 1 comment * This also needs to include measures to maximise income outside of the tourist season: 1 comment * Need to encourage the expansion of visitor accommodation: 1 comment |

Other comments received:

* Support all the objectives: 11 comments
* The amount of second homes and holiday lets in Whitstable reduces affordable housing options for local residents: 5 comments
* Too much focus in Whitstable is given to catering for tourists rather than local residents: 2 comments
* Any development in Whitstable should be restricted to local need and be in keeping with the town’s character: 1 comment
* Roads and pavements in Whitstable need improving: 1 comment
* Parking in Whitstable needs improving: 1 comment
* The amount of second homes and holiday lets in Whitstable has a negative impact on community cohesion: 1 comment

# Housing and new communities

Total responses: 56

Total representations: 814

**Meeting housing needs**

## 1. How should we make sure the right types and tenures of housing are provided?

| Option HNC1A - continue current approach to allow some flexibility for developers to provide a mix of homes within a broad range | 19.6% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC1B - set specific housing mix targets which each site must deliver, based on the identified needs for size, type and tenure, across different parts of the district | 16.1% |
| *Option HNC1C (preferred option) - set specific housing mix targets which each site must deliver and identify opportunity sites for specific types or tenures* | *37.5%* |
| No answer | 26.8% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC1A | * This is the most flexible option: 12 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC1B | * Housing provision should be driven by local need, not by what developers want to deliver: 31 comments |
| Option HNC1C | * Housing types should be suited to location and need: 2 comments * It is unclear how this option will future proof the right mix of housing: 1 comment * This option allows scope for local communities to retain their identities: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * The council needs to build more social housing: 8 comments * Build affordable homes for first time buyers: 7 comments * Create a framework which developers must work to: 3 comments * Provide guidance for windfall sites, not just for allocated sites: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Housing must be truly affordable: 50 comments * Need to avoid developments which are all of the same tenure: 3 comments * Developers should be sanctioned for making any alterations to plans once approved: 2 comments * If building bungalows, make them so they can’t later be converted to two storey dwellings: 1 comment * Insufficient data provided to be able to form an opinion: 1 comment |

## 2. How should we provide opportunities for small and medium sized housing developments?

| Option HNC2A - continue current approach to small and medium sites | 16.1% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC2B - increase proportion of supply coming from small and medium sites through additional allocations and windfall sites | 10.7% |
| *Option HNC2C (preferred option) - maximise opportunities for delivery of small and medium sites to deliver new homes* | *42.9%* |
| No answer | 30.4% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC2A | * Support this option due to concerns about climate change and loss of green space: 4 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC2B | * This option protects villages from excessive development which could occur under option HNC2C: 8 comments * This option minimises the impact on local infrastructure: 1 comment |
| Option HNC2C | * This option maximises opportunities: 18 comments * This option disperses development across wider areas in order to minimise the impact on existing residents: 7 comments * Support this option: 6 comments * This option relies on sites which may not materialise: 2 comments |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * Concern Canterbury is in danger of losing its identity due to excessive development: 1 comment |

## 3. How should we provide opportunities for suitable brownfield and regeneration developments?

| Option HNC3A - continue with the current approach to brownfield sites | 8.9% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option HNC3B (preferred option) - maximise opportunities for delivery of suitable brownfield and regeneration developments* | *62.5%* |
| No answer | 28.6% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC3A | * Prefer this option because HNC3B gives no commitment to avoiding greenfield sites: 2 comments * Support this option: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC3B | * This option uses land that is currently unused and protects green space: 14 comments * Support this option: 6 comments * This option offers a phased approach to regeneration: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Only brownfield sites should be built on: 46 comments * Brownfield site allocations should be managed by parish councils: 2 comments * Do not build on farmland: 2 comments * Wincheap industrial estate should be developed as per the Wincheap 2020 vision: 1 comment |
| Other comments | None. |

## 4. How should we make sure that the right densities are delivered in developments across the district?

| Option HNC4A - continue current approach of influencing site density through good design | 16.1% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC4B - identify a minimum density for the district as a whole, and continue the current approach of influencing site density through good design | 3.6% |
| *Option HNC4C (preferred option) - set specific densities or a range of densities for areas of the district to make best use of the land. Site allocation densities would be influenced by the local distinctiveness and character so that housing fits in with surroundings* | *51.8%* |
| No answer | 28.6% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC4A | * This option offers a mixed approach which would be beneficial: 3 comments * This option highlights the importance of making effective use of land: 2 comments * This option minimises development and maximises sustainability: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC4B | * Each site should be assessed on an individual basis according to local need: 20 comments * Support the setting of minimum density targets at a district-wide level: 1 comment * Support this option as less is more: 1 comment |
| Option HNC4C | * This is a positive approach to planning: 11 comments * A good balance of space and density, in keeping with the surrounding areas, is needed: 7 comments * Ensure homes have space and the right infrastructure to cope with the increase in population: 2 comments * This option gives more control over density in rural areas: 1 comment * In addition to setting densities, this option should target efficient design for SuDS: 1 comment * Regeneration sites should be designed for higher density and more sustainable developments: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Build more high density housing rather than detached and semi-detached houses: 1 comment * Ground floor space in Canterbury should be protected for commercial use: 1 comment * Set a maximum density target at a district-wide level: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * High density is needed to ensure the viability of new infrastructure: 1 comment |

## 5. How should we make sure housing is provided for rural communities?

| Option HNC5A - keep existing approach to rural housing development | 14.3% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC5B - focus rural housing development at the rural service centres, and support infill development at other settlements within village boundaries | 16.1% |
| *Option HNC5C (preferred option) - support housing developments, at and next to, rural service centres, local centres and villages where this provides affordable housing* | *32.1%* |
| No answer | 37.5% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC5A | * This option protects the countryside: 3 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC5B | * This option offers villages the most protection: 4 comments * Concern over extra traffic caused by more housing: 1 comment |
| Option HNC5C | * Need to ensure more affordable housing is provided for families in rural areas: 3 comments * Growth in rural areas must be sustainable and proportionate: 2 comments * Rural areas are capable of accommodating low density, good design homes: 2 comments * This is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment * This option should include additional controls on the balance of tenures: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Rural housing should be ringfenced for people with a local connection to the relevant village: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Any growth in rural areas must be sustainable and proportionate to the area: 12 comments * Favour minimal growth in villages: 4 comments * Herne and Broomfield is not included as a local centre in the Rural Settlement Study but it should be: 2 comments * Only build on brownfield sites: 2 comments * Bungalows for older people are needed in rural areas: 1 comment * Large housing estates are not suitable in villages as they do not have a community feel: 1 comment * St Augustine’s at Chartham is not included as a local centre in the Rural Settlement Study but it should be: 1 comment |

**Community infrastructure and design**

## 6. How can we support sustainable living in new communities?

| Option HNC6A - keep the existing approach to supporting sustainable living in new communities | 7.1% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC6B - set clear requirements for new or improved social and community infrastructure to be delivered as part of strategic developments | 8.9% |
| *Option HNC6C (preferred option) - set clear requirements for new or improved social and community infrastructure to be delivered as part of strategic developments, and large developments must show that essential services can be accessed within 15 minutes walking or cycling time* | *50.0%* |
| No answer | 33.9% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC6A | * A degree of flexibility is needed: 2 comments * The current approach is not working because developers are not putting the right infrastructure in place: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC6B | * Need to consider whether rural areas can accommodate the additional infrastructure needed to support increased populations: 1 comment * Sometimes it is more appropriate to expand existing facilities than to create new ones: 1 comment * This option would need to be enforced with developers: 1 comment |
| Option HNC6C | * Support the aim for accessing services within 15 minutes: 13 comments * This must be delivered at an early stage for new residents: 3 comments * Concerned this option would result in building on farmland and an increase in traffic congestion: 2 comments * Need to provide clear requirements to developers on the infrastructure needed: 2 comments * Rural communities are not able to access services within 15 minutes: 2 comments * Developments should be built according to green infrastructure: 1 comment * It is vital to ensure sustainable travel is available to essential services: 1 comment * This is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment * This option provides better transport infrastructure for large developments: 1 comment * This option supports residents to make sustainable choices and reduce their carbon emissions: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Infrastructure should be put in place before developments start: 2 comments * Infrastructure requirements should be determined based on the number of homes being built: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Support the creation of sustainable communities: 3 comments * Developments should be carbon neutral and not rely on private car journeys: 2 comments * Need to be clear from the outset what infrastructure will be delivered for new sites: 1 comment * Building fewer homes would reduce the need for additional infrastructure: 1 comment |

## 7. How should we make sure all design is of high quality?

| Option HNC7A - keep the current criteria based approach to design | 5.4% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC7B - use the new National Design Guide and National Model Design Code | 3.6% |
| *Option HNC7C (preferred option) - embed master plans and design requirements for strategic development sites in the Local Plan, and continue current design criteria based approach for other sites and types of development; setting out when specific design tools like design codes should be used* | *46.4%* |
| No answer | 44.6% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC7A | * Support this option: 1 comment * This option is not realistic: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC7B | * No need to adopt the National Design Guide as long as the council properly enforces requirements: 1 comment * The National Design Guide is not appropriate as regions vary: 1 comment |
| Option HNC7C | * Support this option as it offers a positive approach to planning: 12 comments * Designs should be appropriate to each individual site and in keeping with the area: 7 comments * Tight control over infrastructure and design is important: 3 comments |
| Other options suggested | * Consult local communities on designs: 3 comments * Consult parish councils on master plans: 1 comment * Design is important to how people feel and experience a place: 1 comment * Garden city designs work well: 1 comment * In addition to good design, build quality should be to a high standard: 1 comment * Need to ensure green space is provided throughout developments: 1 comment * New sites should be linked together with existing sites in order to improve community cohesion: 1 comment * Specifications must be set before developments are planned: 1 comment * Water footprint should also be considered as part of good design: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Kent Police Designing Out Crime team should be consulted on developments, to ensure crime prevention through environmental design is incorporated: 1 comment * Designs must not be changed partway through: 1 comment * Need good sized homes with gardens and space around them: 1 comment |

## 8. How can we deliver low carbon and energy efficient housing?

**8.1. How should we do this for new homes?**

| Option HNC8A - keep current approach but with indicative net zero | 7.1% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC8B - early introduction of Future Homes Standard | 8.9% |
| *Option HNC8C (preferred option) - all new homes delivered to net zero* | *51.8%* |
| No answer | 32.1% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC8A | * This option helps reduce carbon emissions: 4 comments * Support this option, the council should prioritise this to help reduce long term costs: 2 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC8B | * Standards need to be maintained and regularly inspected: 1 comment |
| Option HNC8C | * Support this option, this is an area where action cannot be delayed: 15 comments * Radical action to reduce carbon emissions is essential: 3 comments * This is a good start but concerned it might not be achievable: 3 comments * This is not consistent with the national approach: 2 comments * The cost of this option is likely to be prohibitive: 2 comments * The delivery of this should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment * This option should apply to all new buildings: 1 comment * This option should include a minimum target of retrofitting existing homes to net zero: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Adopt a “fabric first” approach and the provision of renewable energy generation: 2 comments * Consider how it can be made more affordable for existing properties to be made more energy efficient: 1 comment * Educate residents on how to make their homes more eco-friendly: 1 comment * Mitigate the effects of global warming by building eco-homes: 1 comment * The council should set the Passivhaus standard: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Industry support will be needed to develop the necessary supply chains: 2 comments * Net zero is open to abuse and may result in the use of cheap offsets: 1 comment * Standards need to be reviewed and updated throughout the life of the building: 1 comment * Whichever option is taken forward, the council must ensure it is enforced: 1 comment |

**8.2. How should we do this for refurbishments and changes to existing homes?**

| Option HNC8D - require planning applications to have an energy plan for improvements to energy performance | 3.6% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC8E - apply the requirement to meet Building Regulations Part L energy standards to changes to buildings to all but the smallest extensions, and require planning applications to have an energy plan for improvements to energy performance | 3.6% |
| *Option HNC8F (preferred option) - set higher local domestic build energy standards for changes to existing homes, and require planning applications to have an energy plan for improvements to energy performance* | *51.8%* |
| No answer | 41.1% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC8D | * Support this option as it is unfair to expect existing residents to pay large sums to retrofit their homes: 2 comments * Support this option as it is unrealistic to do more than this to historic buildings: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC8E | * This is more practical than the preferred option, the cost of which would be prohibitive: 2 comments * The tighter controls should only apply to new homes: 1 comment |
| Option HNC8F | * Support this option as urgent action is needed: 17 comments * Changes to all buildings should be zero carbon: 1 comment * Existing homes need to be sustainable too: 1 comment * This option should also apply to permitted development: 1 comment * There is a need for energy plans relevant to each home: 1 comment * The delivery of this should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * There is a need for constant research and updates: 1 comment |

**Improving water efficiency**

## 9. How should we improve water efficiency?

| Option HNC8G - keep current approach to water efficiency | 1.8% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC8H - require proposals for new homes to show the higher water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day | 19.6% |
| *Option HNC8I (preferred option) - blended approach to require proposals for new homes to show the higher water efficiency standard, and for large or strategic sites to exceed the current building regulations* | *46.4%* |
| No answer | 32.1% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC8G | * 90 litres per person per day is unrealistic, 110 litres can still achieve a reduction in water consumption: 2 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC8H | * This option may be open to challenge as the council can only encourage, not require, standards higher than 100 litres per person per day: 3 comments |
| Option HNC8I | * Support this option as water efficiency will become a problem unless conditions are imposed: 7 comments * Support this option as higher water efficiency is needed: 5 comments * Unconvinced this option is achievable: 4 comments * The council must ensure developer compliance at all times: 1 comment * This is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment * This will future proof new homes: 1 comment * Important that developers are held to strict environmental targets: 1 comment * The delivery of this should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Water management systems must be updated before any other development takes place: 2 comments * Council policy should align with the future homes taskforce trajectory and targets: 1 comment * Explore other solutions such as underground water storage tanks: 1 comment * The target should be set at 90 litres per person per day: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Accepting a lower number of homes would help reduce water demand and the impact on the water network: 4 comments |

**Incorporating renewable energy into new developments**

## 10. How will we incorporate renewable energy into new developments?

| Option HNC8J - keep the current approach to reducing carbon emissions associated with energy from new developments | 7.1% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option HNC8K (preferred option) - require all new large or strategic developments to show decentralised energy supply* | *60.7%* |
| No answer | 32.1% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC8J | * Support this option, the council should align with the government’s Future Homes Standard: 4 comments * Support this option, a flexible approach is needed: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC8K | * Support this option, it is essential to achieve this quickly as the council has declared a climate emergency: 20 comments * There must not be any opt outs of this, all energy supplies must conform: 3 comments * Important to get ahead of the game now rather than having to make retrospective changes in the future: 1 comment * New developments should have decentralised, renewable energy sources: 1 comment * Small developments should also incorporate rooftop solar panels: 1 comment * New developments should have to show how they will generate energy: 1 comment * Viability must be taken into account: 1 comment * The delivery of this should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment * A focus on renewable energy should result in the creation of local high skilled jobs: 1 comment * Support this option, a new approach is needed: 1 comment * Support this as a positive approach to planning: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * All new developments should incorporate solar panels: 1 comment |
| Other comments | None. |

**Specialist housing need**

## 11. How should we provide housing for older people?

| Option HNC9A - all large or strategic sites to provide a proportion of the site for older persons’ housing (for example 5%) | 3.6% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC9B - allocate specific sites for the delivery of older persons’ housing | 16.1% |
| *Option HNC9C (preferred option) - provide a blended approach with a proportion of the site being delivered through large or strategic sites and allocated specific sites* | *41.1%* |
| No answer | 39.3% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC9A | * This option should include a specific, achievable target: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC9B | * Better to build retirement communities for older people than mixed developments on large housing estates: 3 comments * This is fairer than expecting all sites to include a proportion of housing for older people: 2 comments |
| Option HNC9C | * This allows a mix of property types for older people, in mixed communities: 13 comments * This option combines elements of both of the other options to deliver the best results: 2 comments * This is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment * Older people don’t want to be surrounded by young families: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Build homes for older people in quieter, rural locations: 2 comments * Create assisted living schemes rather than care homes: 2 comments * Create a large development of bungalows for older people: 1 comment * Create a retirement village on the coast: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Consult older people to see which of the three options they prefer: 1 comment * It is important to think about the aging population: 1 comment |

## 12. How should we provide accessible and disability-friendly homes?

| Option HNC10A - continue current approach for 20% of new properties to be built to M4 (2) standards on major developments and strategic sites | 7.1% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC10B - make sure that all new properties are built to a minimum of M4 (2) standards, and encourage M4 (3) standards | 21.4% |
| *Option HNC10C (preferred option) - require around 15% of new properties to be built to M4 (2) standards, and around 5% to be built to M4 (3) standards on major developments and strategic sites, to better reflect the needs* | *30.4%* |
| No answer | 41.1% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC10A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC10B | * This option should include a minimum of 5% M4 (3): 3 comments * This option is more inclusive for disabled people: 1 comment |
| Option HNC10C | * This option gives the best balance: 5 comments * Support this option as long as the needs for these numbers of properties can be evidenced: 4 comments * This is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * All housing needs to be accessible for disabled people: 6 comments * All properties should be M4 (2) and a designated proportion should be M4 (3): 1 comment * All properties should be built in such a way as they can be adapted if needed: 1 comment * All properties should comply with the minimum standards: 1 comment * Need should be based on local data, not national data: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * M4 (2) and M4 (3) homes can cause practical issues in the delivery of developments: 2 comments * The council should work with the NHS and Social Services to fully understand requirements: 1 comment * The council needs to do more to support disabled residents in the private rented sector whose landlords won’t carry out repairs: 1 comment |

## 13. How and where should we provide new student accommodation?

| Option HNC11A - keep current approach to purpose built student accommodation | 3.6% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC11B - provide purpose built student accommodation only on or near campus, for example within a 5-10 minute walk of the campus | 25.0% |
| *Option HNC11C (preferred option) - provide purpose built student accommodation on or near campus, for example a 5-10 minute walk of the campus, but also have some flexibility on alternative locations subject to strict criteria* | 32.1% |
| No answer | 39.3% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC11A | * Support this option as it is the most flexible approach: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC11B | * Agree that all student accommodation should be on or near campus: 9 comments * This would help minimise student travel and therefore reduce the impact on the environment as well as the costs to students: 4 comments |
| Option HNC11C | * Support this option as not all students want to live on campus: 5 comments * Applicants need to demonstrate why their site is suitable: 4 comments * This is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment * Support this as a way of protecting residential areas: 1 comment * Unclear what the strict criteria would be: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Students should only live in dedicated student accommodation, not in Houses in Multiple Occupation in residential areas: 1 comment * Outside of term time, student accommodation should be made available for renting: 1 comment * This section does not need to mention further education as there is not a need for accommodation for FE students: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * No more purpose built student accommodation is needed: 5 comments * The universities should be consulted on any decisions about student housing: 1 comment * Local residents should be consulted on any proposals for purpose built student accommodation in their area: 1 comment |

## 14. How should we provide accommodation for gypsies and travellers?

| Option HNC12A - keep current approach to meeting gypsy and traveller housing needs | 8.9% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC12B - allocate new pitches (either as new sites or extensions to existing sites) to meet gypsy and traveller housing needs | 5.4% |
| *Option HNC12C (preferred option) - keep current approach and take opportunities through the Local Plan to allocate new pitches where suitable sites are identified* | 35.7% |
| No answer | 50.0% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC12A | * This is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC12B | * Support this option as the current approach is not proactive enough: 3 comments * New sites should be carefully selected so as not to create dependency on travel by car: 1 comment |
| Option HNC12C | * Support this option: 5 comments * Support this option as there is currently a lack of suitable accommodation for travellers: 2 comments * Concern over the cost of delivering this option: 1 comment * It is positive that the council are taking this into account: 1 comment * Happy to trust the council’s judgment on this: 1 comment * Support this option, but only where there is an identified need for new sites: 1 comment * Communities need to be welcomed into the area: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * New sites should be restricted to those with local connections: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Insufficient detail given to be able to form an opinion: 1 comment |

## 15. How should we support opportunities for self and custom-build housing?

| Option HNC13A - all large or strategic sites to provide a proportion of plots for self and custom-built homes (for example 5%) | 5.4% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC13B - allocate specific small sites (up to 10 units) for the delivery of self and custom-build housing | 16.1% |
| *Option HNC13C (preferred option) - provide a blended approach with a proportion of plots being delivered through large or strategic sites, and allocated specific small sites* | 33.9% |
| No answer | 44.6% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC13A | * Support this option as it would improve the mix on housing developments: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC13B | * Support this option as small sites with smaller units are preferable to larger developments: 7 comments * Support this option as self-builders will not want to be part of larger developments: 2 comments |
| Option HNC13C | * Support this option as it is the most flexible approach: 6 comments * This option should include at least 5% on major sites, but with time limits specified: 1 comment * Support this option as all requests for self-build should be considered on a case-by-case basis: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Allocate small sites for zero carbon self-builds: 1 comment * Many small-scale self-build homes should be discouraged: 1 comment * Self-build should be encouraged in order to provide higher quality housing: 1 comment * Opportunities should be made available at a rate reflected by the need on the council’s self-build register: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Self-build can lead to better community cohesion: 2 comments * There is a lack of demand for self-build plots: 2 comments * Self-build homes must comply with all environmental regulations: 1 comment * Consult people on the self-build register to see which option they prefer: 1 comment * Ownership should not determine usage: 1 comment |

**Delivering infrastructure to support growth**

## 16. How can we maximise the benefits of strategic infrastructure investment for residents and businesses?

| Option HNC14A - keep current approach to strategic infrastructure projects | 5.4% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC14B - provide overarching general support for strategic infrastructure projects which are needed to support growth | 7.1% |
| *Option HNC14C (preferred option) - provide overarching general support for strategic infrastructure projects needed to support growth, and identify specific allocations and set criteria, for example, design for proposals where justified* | 42.9% |
| No answer | 44.6% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC14A | * Support this option, no new infrastructure is needed: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC14B | * Support this option as the preferred option could result in the delivery of infrastructure which is not actually needed: 1 comment |
| Option HNC14C | * Support this option as it is vital to ensure the right infrastructure is provided for any new development: 7 comments * It is unfair to expect strategic infrastructure such as roads to be funded by developers as it places too much of a burden on them: 1 comment * This is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * The right infrastructure should be put in place before any development is considered: 2 comments |
| Other comments | * Build less homes in order to minimise the impact on the water network: 1 comment * A new hospital in Canterbury is essential: 2 comments * It is important that healthcare facilities are accessible by public transport: 1 comment * Parish councils should be consulted on proposals in their areas: 1 comment * Local residents should be consulted on proposals in their areas: 1 comment |

## 17. How can we enhance the production of community and utility scale renewable energy?

| Option HNC15A - keep the current approach to renewable and low carbon energy production development | 7.1% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option HNC15B (preferred option) - actively support renewable or low carbon energy by removing the requirement for applicants to show need, and consider opportunities to map areas for prioritising community and utility scale renewable energy projects* | 48.2% |
| No answer | 44.6% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC15A | * This option offers better control: 1 comment * Renewable energy projects will not work in established urban areas: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC15B | * Support this option as it is important to be proactive: 14 comments * Support this option as renewable energy is vital for the future: 4 comments * Each application should be considered on a case-by-case basis: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Policies should reflect the cumulative impact of proposed developments: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Large scale solar PV should be limited to non-BMV land: 1 comment * Solar farms should not be permitted near housing developments: 1 comment |

## 18. How can we make sure that infrastructure is delivered at the right time to support development?

| Option HNC16A - keep current approach to infrastructure delivery | 3.6% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC16B - set clear requirements that necessary infrastructure must be provided at the right time to address the impacts of development | 1.8% |
| *Option HNC16C (preferred option) - set clear requirements for necessary infrastructure to be provided at the right time and explore opportunities to deliver critical infrastructure ahead of development* | 64.3% |
| No answer | 30.4% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC16A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC16B | * Support this option: 3 comments * This option gives more certainty than the other options: 2 comments |
| Option HNC16C | * Support this option as developers should contribute to the communities they affect: 2 comments * This option offers a good way of saving time and resources by thinking ahead: 1 comment * Support the timely provision of sports infrastructure: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * The right infrastructure should be put in place in a timely manner before any development takes place: 15 comments * Local residents and parish councils should be consulted on infrastructure developments in their areas: 3 comments * Developers cannot always afford to fund the required infrastructure: 1 comment * Object to development-led infrastructure: 1 comment * The council needs to work with Kent County Council to improve the highways infrastructure: 1 comment |

## 19. How should we address changes in development viability at the planning application stage?

| Option HNC17A - keep current approach to accepting viability assessments | 21.4% |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC17B - no new viability evidence is accepted at planning application stage | 23.2% |
| *Option HNC17C (preferred option) - set clear and limited criteria where new viability evidence is accepted at planning application stage* | 12.5% |
| No answer | 42.8% |

Comments received:

| Option HNC17A | * Concern the current approach allows viability assessments to be prone to gaming: 1 comment * Current approach does not reflect that viability will change according to fluctuating markets and build costs: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option HNC17B | * This option would ensure developers are held to the details of their plans: 1 comment |
| Option HNC17C | * This option would prevent developers finding loopholes: 4 comments * This option would prevent developers avoiding the provision of social housing and affordable housing: 1 comment * Proper monitoring and enforcement of this is essential: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Limit the scope of new viability evidence by setting clear criteria of the stage/s at which it will be accepted: 2 comments * Ensure all proposals meet the core requirements of the Local Plan: 2 comments |
| Other comments | * Planning applications must be complete and clear from the outset: 3 comments * Infrastructure costs can adversely impact the viability of developments: 2 comments * The council should use the upper end of any ranges to calculate fees and profit margins: 2 comments * There needs to be a balanced approach to land values: 2 comments * Local residents should be consulted on applications in their areas: 1 comment * Insufficient detail given to be able to form an opinion: 1 comment |

## 20. Other comments

Comments received:

* There is no mention of how suitable housing will be provided for homeless people: 1 comment

# Employment and the local economy

Total responses: 16

Total representations: 180

## 1. Provide enough business space in the right locations

| Option EMP1A - continue with current economic strategy and land allocations | 12.5% |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP1B - continue with current economic strategy and land allocations but remove sites with significant deliverability risks | 6.3% |
| *Option EMP1C (preferred option) - retain the most deliverable sites from the current economic strategy and land allocations, consider mixed use development opportunities at other existing sites and potential for alternative sites more aligned to market needs; provide more flexibility for existing employment areas to grow and intensify* | *81.3%* |
| No answer | 0.0% |

Comments received:

| Option EMP1A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP1B | * Support this option: 2 comments |
| Option EMP1C | * Support this option: 6 comments * Flexibility is important, but the right infrastructure must be put in place: 1 comment * Flexibility is important, but there is not enough housing to warrant the need for additional job creation: 1 comment * Flexibility is important, but economic development and inward investment must be the priority * Support this option as trust the council’s judgment: 1 comment * Support this option, but it must be achieved without a loss in the total employment land coming forward: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * The council should take over empty retail units and rent them to small businesses and start-ups: 1 comment * Develop Wincheap industrial estate: 1 comment * Develop unused brownfield sites rather than using greenfield sites: 1 comment * Ensure existing sites are developed and not landbanked: 1 comment * Look at alternative ways to attract employers to the district: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Businesses requiring deliveries by large lorries should not be situated in rural villages: 2 comments * Large business spaces are not needed, instead coffee shops and small restaurants are needed to boost tourism: 1 comment * Mixed developments work well in the city centre: 1 comment * Opportunities for expanding employment land allocations within the AONB are very limited: 1 comment |

## 2. Provide the right mix of jobs

| Option EMP2A - identify specific opportunity sites for higher-value job creation, and set out detailed employment mixes for allocated employment sites | 6.3% |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP2B - provide full market flexibility within identified employment sites | 18.8% |
| *Option EMP2C (preferred option) - provide a blended approach with specific opportunity sites identified for higher paid jobs, while enabling significant flexibility on other identified employment sites* | *75.0%* |
| No answer | 0.0% |

Comments received:

| Option EMP2A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP2B | * A variety of sites suitable for all employment types need to be provided: 2 comments * The market will dictate what opportunities there are for businesses: 1 comment |
| Option EMP2C | * Support this option as there is a need for more high quality employment opportunities locally: 6 comments * Support this option as it is the most likely to maximise job creation: 5 comments * Concern this option would lead to the development of greenfield sites: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Provide a variety of locations to enable people to work closer to home and reduce transport emissions and congestion: 1 comment * Offer incentives to attract employers to the district: 1 comment * Need to grow the science and technology sector in the district: 1 comment |
| Other comments | None. |

## 3. Supporting the delivery of allocated employment sites

| Option EMP3A - continue with current approach to delivery | 6.3% |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP3B - require that all strategic development sites provide serviced employment land and a delivery strategy | 0.0% |
| *Option EMP3C (preferred option) - secure serviced employment land and a delivery strategy as part of strategic development sites and consider opportunities for enabling development and CCC support where employment allocations are not being delivered* | *93.8%* |
| No answer | 0.0% |

Comments received:

| Option EMP3A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP3B | None. |
| Option EMP3C | * Support this option as it is a flexible approach: 7 comments * Concern this option would lead to the development of greenfield sites: 1 comment * Concern this option would give developers a get out clause: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Do not allow employment sites to be developed on farmland: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * The council needs to plan more for economic development: 1 comment * Allocated employment sites are the most attractive option to businesses: 1 comment * There is a need for more high quality employment opportunities locally: 1 comment * The district is in the wrong location to attract employment growth: 1 comment |

## 4. Improving the accessibility and connectivity of employment areas

| Option EMP4A - enable new employment developments to provide digital infrastructure and sustainable transport connectivity in response to market demand | 12.5% |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP4B - require all new employment developments to provide full fibre connections and be accessible by sustainable transport | 12.5% |
| *Option EMP4C (preferred option) - require all new employment developments to provide full fibre connections and be accessible by sustainable transport, and ensure that all strategic development sites (e.g. over 300 homes) incorporate some commercial development to reduce the need to travel* | *75.0%* |
| No answer | 0.0% |

Comments received:

| Option EMP4A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP4B | * Broadband infrastructure is essential: 1 comment |
| Option EMP4C | * Support this option as it is a forward thinking approach: 9 comments * The council can’t force people to work near to where they live, people make their own choices and move around: 2 comments * It is important that all new employment developments are digitally connected: 1 comment * This would be difficult for small businesses to achieve: 1 comment * The threshold of 300 homes is too high: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Fibre broadband should be available to everyone, not only on new developments: 1 comment * The council needs to work with employers to develop transport plans to reduce emissions: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Market forces will dictate long term viability: 1 comment |

## 5. Improving the energy performance and carbon emissions of new commercial developments

| Option EMP5A - specify that all new commercial buildings must be designed to BREEAM Excellent | 6.3% |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP5B - specify that all new commercial buildings must be designed to BREEAM Outstanding | 6.3% |
| Option EMP5C - specify that all new commercial buildings or change of use to commercial must be designed to meet Level A or better on the Energy Performance Certificate using the Standard Assessment Procedure | 0.0% |
| *Option EMP5D (preferred option) - net zero now. Specify that all new commercial buildings or change of use to commercial must be designed to meet an A+ Energy Performance Certificate using the Standard Assessment Procedure* | *87.5%* |
| No answer | 0.0% |

Comments received:

| Option EMP5A | * This is the least worst option: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP5B | None. |
| Option EMP5C | None. |
| Option EMP5D | * Support this option as urgent action is needed: 12 comments * Support this option as new developments should be designed to the best possible energy efficiency: 1 comment * Support this option but it must be backed up by law: 1 comment * Support this option but concerned over the cost implications: 1 comment * There should be legal and financial penalties for non-compliance: 1 comment * The delivery of this should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * The council should adopt the same standards as the rest of Kent: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * It is unrealistic for historic buildings to become zero carbon: 1 comment * Solar panels on roofs should become the norm: 1 comment |

## 6. Supporting the development of our universities

| Option EMP6A - continue with current approach to university development | 12.5% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option EMP6B (preferred option) - align the Local Plan with the growth plans of the universities* | *87.5%* |
| No answer | 0.0% |

Comments received:

| Option EMP6A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP6B | * This is the best option: 6 comments * Support this option as it offers a holistic approach: 4 comments * The universities’ growth plans sometimes conflict with local views: 3 comments * This option is the most transparent to local communities: 1 comment * Aligning the Local Plan with the universities’ growth plans puts the council at risk in terms of future proofing: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * The council should assess the viability of the universities’ growth plans and not just accept them at face value: 2 comments * The universities’ growth plans should be aligned to the Local Plan, not the other way around as proposed in option EMP6B: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * The council needs to support the universities to help deliver high quality employment opportunities: 2 comments * This section should mention further education as well as higher education: 1 comment * This section should mention the University for the Creative Arts: 1 comment * Large areas of land owned by the University of Kent should be protected from housing development: 1 comment * Also aim to attract graduates from other areas: 1 comment |

## 7. Supporting new tourist accommodation

| Option EMP7A - focus tourist accommodation within or on the edge of town and city centres | 6.3% |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP7B - focus tourist accommodation within or on the edge of town and city centres and identify specific opportunity sites for tourist accommodation outside of the city and town centres, where justified, to support economic growth e.g. for meetings and conference accommodation | 6.3% |
| *Option EMP7C (preferred option) - maintain support for city and town centre accommodation provision, identify specific opportunity sites elsewhere, where justified, and provide increased flexibility for tourist accommodation provision across the district, including within the rural areas, to respond to market demand* | *87.5%* |
| No answer | 0.0% |

Comments received:

| Option EMP7A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP7B | * Support this option as it is more in line with national policy than the preferred option is: 1 comment |
| Option EMP7C | * Support this option: 8 comments * Tourist accommodation in rural areas could cause problems for residents in those areas: 2 comments * Support this option as a greater variety of tourist accommodation is needed: 1 comment * Providing tourist accommodation in rural areas will support the rural economy: 1 comment * This would help develop the tourism and hospitality offer across the district: 1 comment * Concern this option could lead to development on greenfield sites: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Focus on repurposing existing empty accommodation: 2 comments * Focus on providing tourist accommodation in the coastal towns: 1 comment * Within the AONB, the focus should be on smaller sites: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Stricter control over AirBnBs is needed to prevent them making hotels and B&Bs unviable: 1 comment * There is a need for more high quality tourist accommodation: 1 comment * Small, attractive tourist accommodation options are needed: 1 comment |

## 8. Supporting growth of the rural economy

| Option EMP8A - continue the current approach to focus new rural employment development within existing employment sites | 12.5% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option EMP8B (preferred option) - provide increased flexibility for the provision of rural employment development within and outside of sustainable rural settlements, adjacent to existing employment sites and provide specific support to new agricultural developments* | *87.5%* |
| No answer | 0.0% |

Comments received:

| Option EMP8A | * Support this option: 5 comments * Develop existing sites in order to minimise the impact on farmland: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option EMP8B | * Support this option: 4 comments * This offers a flexible approach for sites to be assessed on a case-by-case basis: 2 comments * This allows increased flexibility for the provision of rural employment: 1 comment * Support this option as it makes sense to develop adjacent to existing sites: 1 comment * Unclear if this option only applies to sites adjacent to existing sites or also to new sites elsewhere: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Focus on agricultural and environmental employment growth: 1 comment * Consider agricultural tourism: 1 comment * Important to deliver a range of suitable employment opportunities in rural areas: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * There is a need to improve broadband and road infrastructure in rural areas: 2 comments |

# Town centres and local facilities

Total responses: 20

Total representations: 101

## 1. How should we designate the hierarchy of centres in the district?

| Option TCLF1A - amend the existing hierarchy of centres | 5.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF1B (preferred option) - keep the existing hierarchy of centres* | *65.0%* |
| No answer | 30.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF1A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF1B | * Support this option: 9 comments * There is sufficient capacity in town centres without the need to consider additional locations: 3 comments * This may need frequent revision due to changing shopping habits: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * Concern that out-of-town retail parks are undermining the viability of city and town centres: 2 comments * The lack of, and cost of, city centre parking discourages people from shopping in city and town centres and instead to using out-of-town retail parks: 1 comment |

## 2. How should we support appropriate growth and development at out-of-town retail areas in Canterbury?

| Option TCLF2A - continue with current approach to development at the out-of-town areas | 20.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF2B (preferred option) - provide greater flexibility for a range of uses to come forward in these areas, including residential development, and support expansion where appropriate* | *60.0%* |
| No answer | 20.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF2A | * Support this option: 5 comments * This keeps more future options open: 1 comment * Unclear what the current approach is: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF2B | * Support this option: 6 comments * Wincheap industrial estate is in a prime location for redevelopment as housing: 3 comments * This option could allow housing to be provided without needing to develop greenfield sites: 2 comments * This option reflects government policy: 1 comment * Support the flexibility of this option as it is difficult to predict what will happen in the future: 1 comment * Support proposed reduction in retail space at Wincheap: 1 comment * Object to repurposing retail units as residential accommodation: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * Concern out-of-town retail parks take trade away from the city and town centres: 2 comments * The road network would need improving to cope with any expansion of out-of-town retail sites: 1 comment |

## 3. How should we support and protect our local centres?

**3.1. Wincheap, Canterbury**

| Option TCLF3A - keep the Wincheap local centre identified in the current Local Plan | 20.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF3B (preferred option) - keep the Wincheap local centre with boundary changes suggested* | *55.0%* |
| No answer | 25.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF3A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF3B | * This option offers the most protection to local facilities: 4 comments * This would allow Wincheap to be developed in line with the Wincheap 2020 vision: 1 comment * This would encourage growth in Wincheap: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**3.2. Tankerton Road, Tankerton**

| Option TCLF3C - change the boundary of the existing Tankerton Road local centre | 5.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF3D (preferred option) - keep the Tankerton Road local centre identified in the current Local Plan* | *45.0%* |
| No answer | 50.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF3C | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF3D | * This option offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**3.3. Herne Bay Road/St John’s Road, Swalecliffe**

| Option TCLF3E - keep the Herne Bay Road/St John’s Road local centre identified in the current Local Plan | 15.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF3F (preferred option) - keep the Herne Bay Road/St John’s Road local centre with boundary changes suggested* | *30.0%* |
| No answer | 55.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF3E | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF3F | * This option offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**3.4. Sea Street, Herne Bay**

| Option TCLF3G - keep the Sea Street local centre identified in the current Local Plan | 10.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF3H (preferred option) - keep the Sea Street local centre with boundary changes suggested* | *30.0%* |
| No answer | 60.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF3G | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF3H | * This option offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**3.5. Canterbury Road, Herne Bay**

| Option TCLF3I - change the boundary of the existing Canterbury Road local centre | 10.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF3J (preferred option) - keep the Canterbury Road local centre identified in the current Local Plan* | *30.0%* |
| No answer | 60.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF3I | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF3J | * This option offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**3.6. Reculver Road, Beltinge**

| Option TCLF3K - keep the Reculver Road local centre identified in the current Local Plan | 10.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF3L (preferred option) - keep the Reculver Road local centre with boundary changes suggested* | *30.0%* |
| No answer | 60.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF3K | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF3L | * This option offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**3.7. Faversham Road, Seasalter**

| Option TCLF3M - change the boundary of the existing Faversham Road local centre | 5.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF3N (preferred option) - keep the Faversham Road local centre identified in the current Local Plan* | *35.0%* |
| No answer | 60.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF3M | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF3N | * This option offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**3.8. Zealand Road, Canterbury**

| Option TCLF3O - don’t make Zealand Road a local centre | 0.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF3P (preferred option) - make Zealand Road a local centre* | *60.0%* |
| No answer | 40.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF3O | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF3P | * This option offers the most protection to local facilities: 3 comments * This recognises the importance of the local facilities and encourages residents to use them rather than driving into the city centre: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**3.9. Hawe Farm Way in Broomfield, Herne Bay**

| Option TCLF3Q - don’t make Hawe Farm Way a local centre | 10.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF3R (preferred option) - make Hawe Farm Way a local centre* | *35.0%* |
| No answer | 55.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF3Q | * Support this option as existing provision serves the community well: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF3R | * This option offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**3.10. Poplar Drive, Greenhill in Herne Bay**

| Option TCLF3S - don’t make Poplar Drive a local centre | 5.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF3T (preferred option) - make Poplar Drive a local centre* | *30.0%* |
| No answer | 65.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF3S | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF3T | * This option offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**3.11. St Dunstan’s, Canterbury**

| Option TCLF3U - don’t make St Dunstan’s a local centre | 0.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF3V (preferred option) - make St Dunstan’s a local centre* | *65.0%* |
| No answer | 35.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF3U | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF3V | * Support this option: 3 comments * This encourages residents to use the local facilities rather than driving into the city centre: 2 comments * This formalises the position of St Dunstan’s as a local centre: 2 comments * St Dunstan’s offers facilities which are not available in the city centre: 1 comment * This option offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * Maintain the connection between St Dunstan’s and the city centre by providing good wayfinding and signage: 1 comment * Work to encourage local businesses and start-ups on Station Road West: 1 comment |

**3.12. Canterbury Road, Herne**

| Option TCLF3W - don’t make Canterbury Road a local centre | 10.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF3X (preferred option) - make Canterbury Road a local centre* | *30.0%* |
| No answer | 60.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF3W | * Support this option as existing provision serves the community well: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF3X | * This option offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**3.13. Other comments on local centres**

Comments received:

* Unable to form an opinion without seeing the Local Centre Survey Report: 1 comment
* Need more clarity on the effects of changing shopping habits before a decision is made: 1 comment
* The criteria for defining local centres should be relaxed: 1 comment
* St Stephen’s should be made a local centre: 1 comment
* Herne village should be made a local centre: 1 comment
* Herne and Broomfield parish should be made a local centre: 1 comment

## 4. How can we best support our village centres?

| Option TCLF4A - continue with the current approach to services and facilities in the rural settlements | 20.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option TCLF4B (preferred option) - designate village centres to protect and improve the existing provision of services and facilities within the rural settlements* | *60.0%* |
| No answer | 20.0% |

Comments received:

| Option TCLF4A | * Support this option as the boundaries of villages should not be extended: 3 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option TCLF4B | * This option offers the most protection to village facilities and communities: 14 comments * Support this option as it would allow sustainable rural growth: 1 comment * Concern this option offers a get out clause to those wishing to remove local services: 1 comment * Unclear how this option would benefit villages such as Littlebourne which already have well-established local facilities and do not need more: 1 comment * Unclear whether this option applies only to new uses, or also to existing uses: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Option TCLF4B should be expanded to include all village centres: 1 comment |
| Other comments | None. |

# Movement and transport

Total responses: 56

Total representations: 325

## 1. How can we maximise active travel in the district?

| Option MT1A - continue with the current approach to safeguard pedestrian and cycle routes | 8.9% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option MT1B (preferred option) - all new developments must show how they will maximise opportunities for walking and cycling* | *75.0%* |
| No answer | 16.1% |

Comments received:

| Option MT1A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option MT1B | * Support this option: 15 comments * All new developments should have footpaths and cycle paths: 9 comments * This option promotes active transport which is beneficial to people’s health: 4 comments * Active travel is essential to mitigate the effects of climate change: 3 comments * The delivery of this should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment * Unconvinced developers would provide the required infrastructure: 1 comments * The strategic sites do not meet these standards: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Options MT1A and MT1B should be combined: 5 comments * Develop a complete network of active travel pathways connecting villages and towns: 3 comments * Developments should not be granted planning permission unless they provide active travel options: 2 comments * Developers should fund the provision of a safe cycling network: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Developers must ensure their sites are linked to sustainable transport: 5 comments * It is important that pathways are properly maintained: 4 comments * Pedestrian and cyclist needs should be considered as early as possible: 2 comments * Cyclists should have dedicated lanes, away from roads: 2 comments * New developments should be within a 15 minute walk of local services: 2 comments * Neither option MT1A nor MT1B consider the costs of providing and maintaining such facilities: 1 comment * Sustainable transport needs improving across the whole district: 1 comment * Defined routes should be signposted and lit: 1 comment * Look to introduce bicycle hire schemes: 1 comment * New developments have previously been shown to have a negative impact on active travel: 1 comment * Do not build new roads as this encourages car usage: 1 comment |

## 2. How do we enable greater use of public transport in the district?

**2.1. How should we do this for road travel?**

| Option MT2A - continue with the current approach to bus improvements | 8.9% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option MT2B (preferred option) - all major developments must show how they will maximise access to the existing local bus network* | *66.1%* |
| No answer | 25.0% |

Comments received:

| Option MT2A | * Current approach does not work as major developments exploit green spaces: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option MT2B | * Support this option: 10 comments * Important to ensure bus routes serve new developments: 10 comments * Public transport plays an important role in minimising emissions and congestion: 2 comments * The council must work with developers and bus operators to ensure this can be delivered: 2 comments * It is important to ensure access to bus travel so that people who don’t drive are not isolated: 1 comment * The delivery of this should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment * Developments should not be granted planning permission unless they have public transport connections: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Options MT2A and MT2B should be combined: 2 comments * Need to provide integrated transport links between bus and railway stations: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Bus fares need to be made cheaper to encourage people to travel more sustainably: 12 comments * Bus frequency needs improving to encourage people to travel more sustainably: 11 comments * Bus operators should use electric buses: 6 comments * New developments should be served by frequent hopper buses: 5 comments * Bus operators should use smaller buses: 3 comments * Public transport should be prioritised over car usage: 2 comments * Focus on encouraging more walking and cycling rather than public transport usage: 1 comment * Work is needed to reduce emissions from public transport: 1 comment |

**2.2. How should we do this for train travel?**

| Option MT2C - continue with the current approach to rail improvements | 10.7% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option MT2D (preferred option) - all major developments must show how they will maximise access to rail services* | *62.5%* |
| No answer | 26.8% |

Comments received:

| Option MT2C | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option MT2D | * Support this option: 11 comments * Explore the option of new developments near to railway stations to facilitate this: 5 comments * It is right that the onus should be on developers to facilitate this: 2 comments |
| Other options suggested | * Need to provide integrated transport links between railway and bus stations: 4 comments * Options MT2C and MT2D should be combined: 3 comments * Open smaller railway stations as part of new developments to minimise the number of people using the larger stations: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Rail fares need to be made cheaper to encourage people to travel more sustainably: 7 comments * Rail travel needs to be made more sustainable: 5 comments * Rail links need improving to encourage people to travel more sustainably: 2 comments * The council needs to work with rail operators to improve the existing infrastructure: 2 comments * The council should lobby rail operators to keep rural stations open: 1 comment * Use solar panels on public buildings to help make trains more sustainable: 1 comment * Create railway stations close to Wincheap and Harbledown: 1 comment * In order to promote active travel, do not provide car parking at railway stations: 1 comment * Do not create a tram network through the countryside: 1 comment * Local residents should be consulted: 1 comment * Access is needed to Canterbury West railway station from the northern side of the track: 1 comment |

## 3. How will we enable the rapid transition to zero emissions vehicles?

| Option MT3A - continue with the existing approach to electric vehicle infrastructure | 14.3% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option MT3B (preferred option) - accelerated transition to zero emissions vehicles* | *58.9%* |
| No answer | 26.8% |

Comments received:

| Option MT3A | * This option does not work as improvements are needed to the charging infrastructure: 3 comments * Support this option as a flexible approach is needed: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option MT3B | * It is important to deliver this to help tackle climate change: 19 comments * This option should include a transition period to allow time for the right infrastructure to be put in place: 3 comments * The right infrastructure must be put in place to support residents to move to electric vehicles: 2 comments * Not everybody moving into a new property will need an electric vehicle charging point: 2 comments * It is important to deliver this as electric vehicles will be the dominant mode of transport by 2030: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Options MT3A and MT3B should be combined: 1 comment * Electric vehicles will not prevent traffic congestion, instead the focus should be on promoting active travel: 1 comment * Charging points should be installed on existing developments, not just new sites: 1 comment * The council should commit to providing charging points in all of its car parks: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * More charging points are needed: 3 comments * Faster charging points are needed: 3 comments * Introduce a network of electric buses: 3 comments * Encourage electric taxis: 1 comment * Charging points should be installed in car parks as it is too problematic to instal them on street: 1 comment * Increase public transport to take more private traffic out of towns and villages: 1 comment |

## 4. How should we approach parking standards in the Local Plan?

| Option MT4A - continue with the current approach to parking standards | 14.3% |
| --- | --- |
| Option MT4B - remove parking standards and adopt a more flexible approach to specific sites | 21.4% |
| *Option MT4C (preferred option) - change the current parking standards to significantly reduce car parking spaces in the most sustainable locations, and to allow for enough in suburban areas* | *50.0%* |
| No answer | 14.3% |

Comments received:

| Option MT4A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option MT4B | * This is the most flexible approach: 7 comments * Do not remove parking standards, take an evidence-based approach: 2 comments * Support this option as the current system does not work: 1 comment |
| Option MT4C | * This would help reduce car usage and encourage people to use public transport or walk: 9 comments * It is too soon to consider this option, it would exacerbate parking issues: 8 comments * Support this option: 6 comments * This would help limit car usage and relieve congestion: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Maintain the current approach but also encourage behaviour change: 2 comments * All new developments should include car parking spaces for residents: 2 comments * Provide more cycle parking in the city centre to encourage active travel: 2 comments * Encourage car sharing: 2 comments * Ban cars from the city centre: 1 comment * Locate car parks further away from city and town centres to encourage active travel: 1 comment * Create a Park and Ride at the University of Kent: 1 comment * Consider a Council Tax reduction for residents who do not own a car, or an additional charge for those who do: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Some parking will still need to be provided for disabled and/or elderly people: 3 comments * Some parking will still need to be provided in sustainable rural locations: 1 comment * More parking enforcement is needed: 1 comment * Parking availability should be based on proximity to urban areas and facilities: 1 comment * Consider how campus parking can be provided to reduce the number of students parking in residential streets: 1 comment * Need to know how the rest of the transport infrastructure will work: 1 comment * High car parking charges damage the local economy as people choose to shop at out-of-town retail sites instead of in the city and town centres: 1 comment |

## 5. How should we approach transport assessments, transport statements and travel plans?

| Option MT5A - continue with the current approach to transport assessments and travel plans | 3.6% |
| --- | --- |
| Option MT5B - all major developments must submit transport assessments and travel plans | 3.6% |
| *Option MT5C (preferred option) - all major developments must submit transport assessments and travel plans, with additional criteria to cover other types of development which could have significant impacts on the network, plus all minor developments would have to submit transport statements* | *71.4%* |
| No answer | 21.4% |

Comments received:

| Option MT5A | * This approach does not work as developers do not always deliver what is required: 2 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option MT5B | * Support this option: 1 comment |
| Option MT5C | * Support this option as it covers a range of developments: 10 comments * As part of this, transport assessments must be vigorously checked to ensure they are realistic: 10 comments * All planning applications should have to show the total load on resources: 2 comments * Support this option, it is important to be creative: 1 comment * It is important to achieve a sustainable transport network: 1 comment * As part of this, need to monitor the cumulative impact of developments: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Employers should have home to work travel plans and offer incentives to their staff to travel sustainably: 1 comment * Developments should be planned around existing railway stations: 1 comment * Small developments should also have travel plans: 1 comment * The council should follow “Better Planning, Better Places 2019”: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Local residents should be consulted: 2 comments * Transport assessments should have to be approved by the relevant parish council/s: 1 comment * All transport plans should consider future technology: 1 comment |

# Heritage and the historic environment

Total responses: 36

Total representations: 478

## 1. How can we protect and enhance our heritage assets?

| *Option NE1A (preferred option) - continue with the current Local Plan approach* | *52.8%* |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE1B - make changes to the current Local Plan policies | 22.2% |
| No answer | 25.0% |

Comments received:

| Option NE1A | * Support this option as current policies help preserve our World Heritage Site: 3 comments * Support this option as only a light touch review is needed: 2 comments * Support this option, but conservation areas need regular review and renewal: 2 comments * Support this option as the Heritage Strategy and Action Plan provide good guidance: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE1B | * Support this option as current policies are insufficient and need strengthening: 13 comments |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * Concern Canterbury may risk losing its World Heritage Site status if excessive development is carried out: 6 comments * The council needs to be more proactive in protecting heritage assets: 4 comments * An updated management plan for the World Heritage Site is needed: 1 comment * The council needs to monitor the government’s white paper for planning reform in case this impacts on anything in the draft Local Plan: 1 comment * In order to protect heritage assets, a new freestanding settlement is needed instead of continuing to develop Canterbury: 1 comment * The council must not consider extending the built city boundaries on a piecemeal basis: 1 comment |

## 2. How can we support the adaptation of the historic environment to achieve improvements in carbon emissions and energy efficiency?

| Option NE2A - continue with the current approach which gives general design policies | 0.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE2B (preferred option) - support the adaptation and retrofitting of buildings in conservation areas and historic buildings through new guidance* | *72.2%* |
| No answer | 27.8% |

Comments received:

| Option NE2A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE2B | * Support this option: 9 comments * This offers opportunities to improve water efficiency: 2 comments * This offers a more appropriate and sustainable approach to adapting historic buildings: 2 comments * Support this option, it is important to be proactive: 2 comments * This will help with long term carbon neutrality: 1 comment * Support this option, clear guidance is critical: 1 comment * Unclear how this would be funded: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * The council should offer advice and support to residents on how they can improve the energy efficiency of their homes: 5 comments * It may not be possible to improve the energy efficiency of some historic buildings, provision must be made for this: 3 comments * Restrictions around solar panels should be relaxed: 1 comment |

**Protection and enhancement of wildlife and biodiversity**

## 3. How should we protect and enhance biodiversity and green and blue spaces like parks and rivers?

| Option NE3A - continue with the current Local Plan approach of new developments providing and extending green spaces (including trees) where they can, and set a 10% biodiversity net gain requirement | 16.7% |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE3B - require new developments to enhance existing, or provide new, green spaces to conserve and where possible enhance blue spaces, plus a 10% biodiversity net gain | 0.0% |
| *Option NE3C (preferred option) - require new developments to enhance existing, or provide new, green spaces to conserve and where possible enhance blue spaces, plus a 20% biodiversity net gain* | *66.7%* |
| No answer | 16.7% |

Comments received:

| Option NE3A | * Support this option as this is a more achievable target: 4 comments * This needs strengthening to ensure protection and enhancement materialise: 2 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE3B | * This mirrors the Environment Bill’s proposed legal requirement for 10% net gain: 4 comments |
| Option NE3C | * Support this option as there is a need to maximise biodiversity net gain: 21 comments * A 20% net gain may not be viable for all developments: 4 comments * The delivery of this should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 2 comments * Support this option, it is important to protect green spaces: 1 comment * This is not a sound approach to policy making regarding biodiversity net gain: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Seek to maximise biodiversity net gain across all types of green infrastructure and developments: 5 comments |
| Other comments | * Create links between green and blue spaces and all relevant council strategies such as the Transport Strategy and the Green Infrastructure Strategy: 1 comment * The council should encourage residents to become custodians of green spaces to enhance awareness and appreciation of them: 1 comment |

**Protecting and enhancing the character of our valued landscapes**

## 4. How should we make sure that the local landscape designations (areas of high landscape value) continue to protect our valued landscapes?

**4.1. North Kent Marshes LLD**

| Option NE4A - keep the North Kent Marshes LLD identified in the current Local Plan | 2.8% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE4B (preferred option) - keep the North Kent Marshes LLD current boundaries and rename as Seasalter Marshes LLD* | *44.4%* |
| No answer | 52.8% |

Comments received:

| Option NE4A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE4B | * This ensures the protection of the area: 6 comments * Support this option, the new name would create more awareness of the site: 1 comment * Support this option, it is only an administrative change: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Extend the LLD to cover Graveney Marshes: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * A more flexible approach to boundaries is needed: 1 comment |

**4.2. Wantsum Channel LLD**

| Option NE4C - keep the Wantsum Channel LLD identified in the current Local Plan | 8.3% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE4D (preferred option) - keep the Wantsum Channel LLD with the boundary changes suggested* | *33.3%* |
| No answer | 58.3% |

Comments received:

| Option NE4C | * Support this option: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE4D | * This ensures the protection of the area: 3 comments * Support this option, it makes sense to align the site with the district boundary: 2 comments * Support this option, it makes sense to include the shoreline: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * The area covered should be expanded further: 1 comment |
| Other comments | None. |

**4.3. North Downs LLD**

| Option NE4E - keep the North Downs LLD as identified in the existing Local Plan | 11.1% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE4F (preferred option) - keep the North Downs LLD with the boundary changes suggested* | *30.6%* |
| No answer | 58.3% |

Comments received:

| Option NE4E | * Support this option: 3 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE4F | * This ensures the protection of the area: 4 comments * Support this option, AONB designation provides higher protection than LLD status: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Boundaries need to be reassessed as parts of Chartham are not currently included, but should be: 1 comment |
| Other comments | None. |

**4.4. Blean Woods LLD**

| Option NE4G - keep the Blean Woods LLD identified in the current Local Plan | 11.1% |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE4H - keep the Blean Woods LLD with boundary changes 1-4 and 5i | 8.3% |
| Option NE4I - keep the Blean Woods LLD with boundary changes 1-4 and 5ii | 0.0% |
| Option NE4J - keep the Blean Woods LLD with boundary changes 1-4 and 5iii (Tyler Hill Road) | 2.8% |
| *Option NE4K (preferred option) - keep the Blean Woods LLD with boundary changes 1-4, and changes between the University of Kent and Clowes Wood* | *25.0%* |
| No answer | 52.8% |

Comments received:

| Option NE4G | * Support this option as the boundaries should remain as currently identified: 2 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE4H | * Support this option as it provides additional protection to farmland: 3 comments * Support this option: 2 comments * Object to Sarre Penn Valley being included in this option: 1 comment |
| Option NE4I | None. |
| Option NE4J | None. |
| Option NE4K | * This ensures the protection of the area: 3 comments |
| Other options suggested | * Extend the boundary to include Neals Place and Duke's Meadow: 6 comments * Extend the boundary to the east of Blean Woods, to include area C4, Ford and Maypole farmland: 1 comment |
| Other comments | None. |

**4.5. Stour Valley landscape**

| Option NE4L - think about a new Stour Valley Floodplain (east) LLD | 25.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE4M (preferred option) - continue with the current approach to the Stour Valley landscape* | *22.2%* |
| No answer | 52.8% |

Comments received:

| Option NE4L | * Support this option: 8 comments * This option places greater emphasis on maintaining the ecological integrity of the Stour Valley: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE4M | * This ensures the protection of the area: 2 comments |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * More protection needs to be given to the Stour Valley in and around Canterbury: 1 comment |

**4.6. Canterbury AHLV**

| Option NE4N - keep the area with some boundary changes as a new designation - ‘landscape context of the historic city of Canterbury’ | 27.8% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE4O (preferred option) - delete the boundary and replace with a criteria based approach setting out considerations like views, landscape character, and historic setting for development which might impact on the landscape surrounding Canterbury city* | *33.3%* |
| No answer | 38.9% |

Comments received:

| Option NE4N | * This option provides more protection than option NE4O: 11 comments * This option allows a more flexible approach: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE4O | * This ensures the protection of the area: 6 comments * The criteria-based approach this option offers would best address potential impacts: 2 comments |
| Other options suggested | * Retain Canterbury AHLV as currently identified: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Disagree that the landscape is not high quality enough to justify a landscape designation: 1 comment * Boundaries need amending to restrict development, not to allow for more: 1 comment |

## 5. How should we make sure our approach to green gaps is still effective?

| Option NE5A - keep the current approach to development acceptable in green gaps | 33.3% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE5B (preferred option) - broaden the types of development that might be acceptable in these areas to encourage community facilities, including open space and recreation* | *22.2%* |
| No answer | 44.4% |

Comments received:

| Option NE5A | * Support this option as development in green gaps should remain tightly restricted: 10 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE5B | * This ensures the protection of the area: 2 comments * This maximises the health benefits of open green space: 1 comment * This option is acceptable providing any development does not have a negative impact: 1 comment * Insufficient detail given on proposed boundary changes to be able to form an opinion: 1 comment * Concern this option would allow planning permission to be granted for housing and roads in green gaps: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * Introduce a policy of no further residential or commercial development in green gaps, as and when needed to apply this: 2 comments |
| Other comments | * Green gaps need to be protected: 10 comments |

**5.1. What should we do with the green gap between Sturry and Westbere?**

| Option NE5C - keep the existing green gap identified in the current Local Plan | 16.7% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE5D (preferred option) - keep the green gap with suggested boundary changes to exclude a building to the east* | *27.8%* |
| No answer | 55.6% |

Comments received:

| Option NE5C | * This ensures the protection of the area: 3 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE5D | * Support this option: 2 comments * Support this option as the inclusion of the building to the east seems to serve no purpose: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**5.2. What should we do with the green gap between Sturry and Hersden?**

| Option NE5E - keep the existing green gap identified in the current Local Plan | 19.4% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE5F (preferred option) - keep the green gap with suggested boundary changes around the garage* | *25.0%* |
| No answer | 55.6% |

Comments received:

| Option NE5E | * This ensures the protection of the area: 4 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE5F | * Support this option: 1 comment * Support this option as the inclusion of the garage site seems to serve no purpose: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**5.3. What should we do with the green gap between Herne Bay and Whitstable?**

| Option NE5G - change the boundary of the existing green gap | 2.8% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE5H (preferred option) - keep the existing green gap identified in the current Local Plan* | *41.7%* |
| No answer | 55.6% |

Comments received:

| Option NE5G | * Support this option as it seems reasonable to keep some areas in the gap even if they are not open countryside: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE5H | * This ensures the protection of the area: 4 comments |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**5.4. What should we do with the green gap between Sturry and Broad Oak?**

| Option NE5I - change the boundary of the existing green gap | 0.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE5J (preferred option) - keep the existing green gap identified in the current Local Plan* | *44.4%* |
| No answer | 55.6% |

Comments received:

| Option NE5I | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE5J | * This ensures the protection of the area: 6 comments * No need to change the boundary: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**5.5. What should we do with the green gap between Canterbury and Tyler Hill?**

| Option NE5K - change the boundary of the existing green gap | 2.8% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE5L (preferred option) - keep the existing green gap identified in the current Local Plan* | *44.4%* |
| No answer | 52.8% |

Comments received:

| Option NE5K | * This prevents potential settlement merge: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE5L | * This ensures the protection of the area: 5 comments * Support this option: 4 comments |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**5.6. What should we do with the green gap between Canterbury and Bridge?**

| Option NE5M - change the boundary of the existing green gap | 2.8% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE5N (preferred option) - keep the green gap and think about opportunities to change the boundaries* | *38.9%* |
| No answer | 58.3% |

Comments received:

| Option NE5M | * Support this option: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE5N | * This ensures the protection of the area: 3 comments * Support this option as it allows for boundary changes to be considered in the future: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * The boundary should be extended: 1 comment * Retain the boundary as currently identified and do not think about opportunities to change it: 1 comment |
| Other comments | None. |

**5.7. What should we do with the green gap between Canterbury and Sturry?**

| Option NE5O - change the boundary of the existing green gap | 0.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE5P (preferred option) - keep the existing green gap identified in the current Local Plan* | *41.7%* |
| No answer | 58.3% |

Comments received:

| Option NE5O | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE5P | * Support this option: 6 comments * Support this option, strict development control in this area is very much needed: 1 comment * This ensures the protection of the area: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | None. |

**5.8. What should we do with the green gap between Blean and Rough Common?**

| Option NE5Q - change the boundary of the existing green gap | 2.8% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE5R (preferred option) - keep the existing green gap identified in the current Local Plan* | *44.4%* |
| No answer | 52.8% |

Comments received:

| Option NE5Q | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE5R | * Support this option: 6 comments * This ensures the protection of the area: 2 comments |
| Other options suggested | * This green gap includes land owned by the University of Kent, which should not be included as it cannot be used by the local community: 1 comment |
| Other comments | None. |

**5.9. What should we do about new green gaps?**

| Option NE5S - think about opportunities to identify new green gaps | 52.8% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE5T (preferred option) - don’t designate new green gaps* | *5.6%* |
| No answer | 41.7% |

Comments received:

| Option NE5S | * Support this option: 9 comments * This ensures the protection of green gaps: 6 comments * New green gaps may be needed, particularly if a new freestanding settlement is developed: 4 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE5T | * Support this option as limited land is available for development: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * Green gap between Rough Common and Canterbury should be defined: 3 comments * Green gap between Sturry and Herne should be defined: 3 comments * Green gap between Thanington and Chartham should be defined: 2 comments * Green gap between Harbledown and Canterbury should be defined: 1 comment * Green gap between Fordwich and Canterbury should be defined: 1 comment * Green gap between Lower Herne and Canterbury should be defined: 1 comment * Green gap between Radfall and Chestfield should be defined: 1 comment |

## 6. How should we manage outdoor lighting to support tranquility?

| Option NE6A - continue with the current Local Plan approach of using a design criteria when assessing outdoor lighting proposals | 2.8% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE6B (preferred option) - include clear requirements for development proposals to conserve or enhance the tranquility provided by dark skies* | *58.3%* |
| No answer | 38.9% |

Comments received:

| Option NE6A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE6B | * Support this option: 16 comments * This would enhance dark skies: 4 comments * This allows tighter control than the current approach: 3 comments |
| Other options suggested | * The council should work with developers to achieve minimum glare from domestic and street lighting: 2 comments |
| Other comments | * Light is needed in residential areas for safety: 1 comment * Downlighting can be used to provide security: 1 comment * Outdated street lighting needs modernising: 1 comment * Low level direction lighting is needed in order to preserve tranquility: 1 comment * Street lighting should be turned off at 11pm in suburban and rural areas: 1 comment |

**Provision of open space, recreation and leisure facilities**

## 7. How should we protect existing open space in the Local Plan?

| Option NE7A - continue with the existing approach | 8.3% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE7B (preferred option) - identify and protect open spaces in the Local Plan, providing clear criteria to be met if open space is proposed to be lost* | *63.9%* |
| No answer | 27.8% |

Comments received:

| Option NE7A | * Support this option, it is important to protect wildlife: 2 comments * Support this option, it is important to protect green spaces: 1 comment * Support this option as option NE7B would allow for more development: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE7B | * Support this option as it offers the most protection: 24 comments * This should include criteria relating to historic character and significance: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * Support the commitment to renewing the Open Spaces Strategy: 3 comments * Explore the option of a Stour Valley regional park: 2 comments * Involve local residents in agreeing any compensation issues for loss of open space: 1 comment |

## 8. How can we support accessible outdoor sports and recreation across the district?

| Option NE8A - keep the current approach | 16.7% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE8B (preferred option) - consider prioritising sport facilities where there is an identified lack of them* | *47.2%* |
| No answer | 36.1% |

Comments received:

| Option NE8A | * Support this option: 2 comments |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE8B | * Support this option: 9 comments * Support this option as the current approach does not work: 2 comments * Support this option as it offers a more structured approach: 1 comment * This seems sensible: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * There is no need for specific sites for sports as they can be played in any open space: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * Sports provision must be in addition to, not instead of, public open spaces provision: 2 comments * Consult local residents on what sports facilities they would like provided: 2 comments |

## 9. How should we make sure our approach to local green spaces is still effective?

| Option NE9A - consider removing the existing local green space | 0.0% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE9B (preferred option) - keep the local green spaces identified in the current Local Plan* | *66.7%* |
| No answer | 33.3% |

Comments received:

| Option NE9A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE9B | * Support this option, it is essential to protect and enhance green spaces as they are vital to people’s wellbeing: 16 comments |
| Other options suggested | * Work proactively with communities to assess the potential for new local green spaces: 2 comments |
| Other comments | * Consult local residents to see that they think: 1 comment * Encourage residents to use their local green spaces more: 1 comment |

**Water environment and how it connects with our communities**

## 10. How do we approach development where there are coastal protection and overtopping hazard zones?

| Option NE10A - keep the current Local Plan approach of preventing all development within coastal protection and overtopping hazard zones | 38.9% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE10B (preferred option) - think about allowing coastal defences for individual properties in these zones* | *13.9%* |
| No answer | 47.2% |

Comments received:

| Option NE10A | * Support this option as the strictest measures need to be taken to ensure coastal protection: 7 comments * Support this option as it is safer to prevent all development in these areas: 3 comments * This needs to account for climate change affecting water levels: 1 comment |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE10B | * Support this option providing it does not inhibit the delivery of future coastal protection work: 2 comments * Support this option as a case-by-case approach to coastal protection seems sensible: 1 comment * This option is acceptable providing it only applies to existing properties and there would be no new development in these areas: 1 comment * This option must be approached with caution as coastal erosion may occur in unexpected ways: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * Seasalter is susceptible not just to wave overtopping but also to coastal erosion: 1 comment |

## 11. How can we maximise the benefits of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)?

| Option NE11A - keep the current approach to require enough drainage and encourage major developments to design SuDS that include other benefits | 2.8% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE11B (preferred option) - encourage all developments to contain SuDS, and also keep the requirement to have enough drainage. Encourage SuDS to be designed to include other benefits and provide information and guidance on the design of them* | *63.9%* |
| No answer | 33.3% |

Comments received:

| Option NE11A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE11B | * Support this option, SuDS make economic and environmental sense: 13 comments * Support this option but it needs strengthening: 3 comments * It is fairer that SuDS should apply to all developments rather than only major ones: 3 comments * This would minimise the impact on public sewers: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | * SuDS should apply to all developments of 10 or more dwellings: 1 comment |
| Other comments | * All drainage options should be considered for deliverability as SuDS may not be suitable for all developments: 3 comments * Insufficient evidence provided to be able to form an opinion: 1 comment * The council should provide guidance on SuDS for all development applications as a matter of course: 1 comment |

## 12. What should we do about groundwater protections?

| Option NE12A - keep the existing approach of having groundwater protection zones | 8.3% |
| --- | --- |
| *Option NE12B (preferred option) - set clear requirements for development proposals in groundwater protection zones, nitrate vulnerable zones and drinking water safeguard zones* | *61.1%* |
| No answer | 30.6% |

Comments received:

| Option NE12A | None. |
| --- | --- |
| Option NE12B | * Support this option: 13 comments * Support this option as it better protects groundwater supplies: 6 comments * Support this option as water safety is very important: 2 comments * Support this option as an accurate assessment of current capacity is essential: 1 comment |
| Other options suggested | None. |
| Other comments | * Encourage the provision of water holding tanks for homes to use: 1 comment * Insufficient evidence provided to be able to form an opinion: 1 comment |