**Local Plan Options Consultation 2021**

**Officer responses to comments received**

1. **Vision, objectives and growth**

**1.1. Vision and objectives**

**Environment and climate**

Comments received:

* Environmental protection is more important than growth: 76 comments
* Insufficient focus on tackling climate change: 19 comments
* Insufficient focus on nature conservation: 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
* Insufficient focus on water quality: 1 comment
* Should refer to water efficiency as well as energy efficiency: 1 comment
* Support the commitment to environmental sustainability: 4 comments
* Insufficient focus on protecting the landscape: 2 comments
* Support the objective of tackling climate change: 5 comments
* The objective for growth and the objective for environmental protection contradict each other: 28 comments

Officer response:

* With a variety of landscapes, species and habitats, many of which are protected, our district’s natural environment is exceptionally rich and diverse. To reflect this it is proposed in the draft Local Plan that the vision includes a section on our thriving environment, habitats and water quality.
* We are required by the government to support housing and economic growth, so the draft Local Plan aims to meet our government set targets while protecting our important environments
* The council has declared a climate emergency and has a programme of work to help improve energy efficiency, this is being continued as a theme through the draft Local Plan and water efficiency is proposed to be included within the draft objectives.

**Transport**

Comments received:

* Support the commitment to sustainable transport: 19 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
* Public transport links need improving: 48 comments
* Support the commitment to environmentally friendly journeys, to minimise the impact on air quality: 39 comments
* Support the commitment to sustainable transport: 18 comments
* The focus on proximity to London is no longer relevant post-Covid: 1 comment
* The transport infrastructure needs upgrading in order to minimise the impact on air quality: 3 comments

Officer response:

* The impacts of Covid-19 and Brexit are being considered. The council is aware that some impacts will not be fully understood for a while yet and will continue to monitor the situation.
* Sustainable transport will be important for communities. New developments, and the Local Plan as a whole, will be expected to mitigate its transport impacts and minimise negative impacts on air quality, based on transport modelling and air quality assessments.

**Economic development and employment**

Comments received:

* The vision does not fully consider the effects of Covid-19 on the economy and on tourism: 44 comments
* Focus on diversifying the economy rather than on growing it: 1 comment
* Job creation needs to focus on all sectors, not just high paid jobs: 1 comment
* 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

Officer response:

* The impacts of Covid-19 and Brexit are being considered.The council is aware that some impacts will not be fully understood for a while yet and will continue to monitor the situation.
* Universities play a major role in the district’s economy. The draft Local Plan will set out a framework to support the growth and development of these institutions.
* The draft Local Plan aims to diversify and grow the district economy across the board.

**Growth**

Comments received:

* Sustainability is more important than growth: 23 comments
* Support growth being centred on Canterbury: 18 comments
* Growth should be focused on the coastal towns rather than Canterbury: 17 comments
* Object to growth being centred on Canterbury: 8 comments
* Centring growth on Canterbury is incompatible with the vision for healthy communities: 2 comments

Officer response:

* The draft Local Plan will be subject to a sustainability appraisal to ensure that sustainability is not hindered but growth aspirations.
* The location of growth within the draft Local Plan is based on consultation responses from both the Issues and Options consultation and all the evidence gathered through the Local Plan. The sites recommended as allocations are those that are determined to be the most suitable to protect the important landscapes, heritage and features of the district while still meeting our requirements as set out by the government.

**Housing**

Comments received:

* New developments should include a proportion of social housing: 1 comment
* 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
* It is unclear how building more homes will contribute to the achievement of these objectives: 15 comments

Officer response:

* The draft Local Plan will require major developments to include a proportion of affordable housing, of which social housing is one type.
* The council is improving its housing stock by improving the energy efficiency of over 200 council homes each year when tenancies change, installing the first five air source heat pumps into council homes at present and implementing a rolling programme of improvements to doors, windows, roofs and heating systems. Overall, council housing has higher energy efficiency than private sector housing (according to the national Energy Performance Certificate register).
* The draft Local Plan will include policies to support water and energy efficiency.
* We are set a housing requirement by the government so the draft Local Plan will be designed to ensure those houses meet our objectives.

**Other comments**

Comments received:

* Insufficient detail on how the vision will be achieved: 17 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
* 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
* Insufficient mention of the coastal towns: 1 comment
* Insufficient mention of the East Kent strategic context: 1 comment
* Insufficient detail on how the objectives will be achieved: 9 comments
* Insufficient mention of the coastal towns: 1 comment

Officer response:

* The Options consultation provided limited details on certain topics as it was an early stage of engagement to help us identify which preferred options to progress and explore opportunities for in more detail. Further information is provided in the draft Local Plan and within supporting evidence.

**1.2. Preferred growth option**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| Too many homes proposed to be built: 231 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. Providing housing means funds can be collected to pay for affordable housing, transport infrastructure and other infrastructure. |
| This amount of development would have a detrimental effect on climate change: 82 comments | New developments will be expected to provide climate mitigation as is anticipated to be set out in the new Local Plan. An assessment of the sustainability impacts of the draft Local Plan will be undertaken and the results considered. |
| This amount of development would increase traffic congestion: 81 comments | Improvements to transport infrastructure are being considered as part of the Local Plan process. |
| Too much green space would be lost under this option: 71 comments | While the government has set our housing targets and this will likely result in the loss of some agricultural land, new development will be directed to brownfield land where suitable and appropriate. New developments will also be expected to meet open space standards. |
| The number of homes should be limited to the maximum required by central government: 38 comments | Noted.  |
| This many homes would destroy the character of Canterbury: 26 comments | The new Local Plan will include policies to protect the important heritage and landscape character of the district. Any new developments will be designed in keeping with their local environments. |
| Support this option as it has the most benefits: 12 comments | Noted. |
| Insufficient evidence and analysis provided to demonstrate why this is the preferred option: 10 comments | When we publish the draft local plan for consultation, background documents and evidence will also be published.  |
| Support this option as Canterbury is already well connected: 5 comments | Noted. |
| Concern this many homes would lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour: 2 comments | We encourage all residents to report any anti-social behaviour to help make sure it can be dealt with at the earliest possible opportunity.The council has a dedicated Community Safety team who work closely with other agencies through the Canterbury Community Safety Partnership to help tackle anti-social behaviour issues.  |
| Limit the amount of road space reallocated as cycle paths: 2 comments | Transport improvements will be considered through Transport Modelling and Transport Strategy for the Local Plan, in discussion with Kent County Council highways. |
| 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 | Further discussions will be undertaken with Dover District Council, as well as other neighbouring authorities, and updated Statement of Common Grounds will be produced based on the level of growth identified in the draft Local Plan. |

**1.3. Canterbury Focus A**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| 9,000 homes is still too many and the council should challenge the government on this target: 52 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. Providing housing means funds can be collected to pay for affordable housing, transport infrastructure and other infrastructure. |
| This amount of development would increase traffic congestion: 45 comments | Improvements to transport infrastructure are being considered as part of the Local Plan process. |
| Favour this option to the preferred option: 34 comments | Noted. |
| 9,000 homes is more reasonable than the preferred option and still meets the government’s target: 23 comments | Noted. |
| This amount of development would have a detrimental effect on air quality: 23 comments | The council has an Air Quality Action Plan and this is being considered as part of the Local Plan process. |
| 9,000 extra homes would destroy the character of Canterbury: 17 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. |
| Support the limited growth in villages proposed in this option: 8 comments | Noted. |
| Support the limited growth at the coast proposed in this option: 5 comments | Noted. |
| Insufficient green space allocated for walking and cycling: 1 comment | Noted.  |

**1.4. Canterbury Focus B**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| Too many homes proposed to be built: 113 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. Providing housing means funds can be collected to pay for affordable housing, transport infrastructure and other infrastructure. |
| Too much green space would be lost under this option: 43 comments | While the government has set our housing targets and this will likely result in the loss of some agricultural land new development will be directed to brownfield land where suitable and appropriate. New developments will also be expected to meet open space standards. |
| This amount of development would increase traffic congestion: 22 comments | Improvements to transport infrastructure are being considered as part of the Local Plan process. |
| This amount of development would have a detrimental effect on climate change: 17 comments | New developments will be expected to provide climate mitigation as is anticipated to be set out in the new Local Plan. An assessment of the sustainability impacts of the draft Local Plan will be undertaken and the results considered. |
| Insufficient space in Canterbury to accommodate this many homes: 16 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet.  |
| Insufficient healthcare and education provision to cope with this level of increase in population: 4 comments | Ensuring that sufficient healthcare and education provisions are in place will be incorporated into the Local Plan.  |
| Insufficient green space allocated for walking and cycling: 1 comment | Existing accessible open space will be protected through the draft Local Plan and new developments will be expected to meet the open space standards. |
| Support the limited growth in villages proposed in this option: 1 comment | Noted. |
| This option makes the most sense as it properly plans for expansion and growth: 1 comment | Noted. |
| This option will not allow the strategic objectives to be achieved: 1 comment | The draft Local Plan will be produced with a growth option which meets its vision and objectives. |

**1.5. Coastal Focus**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| Favour this option to the preferred option: 24 comments | Noted. |
| The coastal towns are already over-developed: 22 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet.  |
| The coastal towns are in need of the regeneration this option would deliver: 16 comments | Noted.  |
| Too many homes proposed to be built: 13 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. Providing housing means funds can be collected to pay for affordable housing, transport infrastructure and other infrastructure. |
| Object to this option as growth should be centred on Canterbury: 8 comments | Noted. |
| This amount of development would have a detrimental effect on climate change: 8 comments | New developments will be expected to provide climate mitigation as is anticipated to be set out in the new Local Plan. An assessment of the sustainability impacts of the draft Local Plan will be undertaken and the results considered. |
| 9,000 homes is still too many and the council should challenge the government on this target: 7 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. Providing housing means funds can be collected to pay for affordable housing, transport infrastructure and other infrastructure. |
| Insufficient space at the coast to accommodate 9,000 homes: 7 comments | Noted. |
| This option would destroy the character of Whitstable: 7 comments | Any new developments will be designed in keeping with their local environments. |
| This option would prevent further traffic congestion in Canterbury: 5 comments | Improvements to transport infrastructure are being considered as part of the Local Plan process. |
| 9,000 homes is more reasonable than the preferred option and still meets the government’s target: 4 comments | Noted. |
| There is more space at the coast to accommodate 9,000 homes than there is in Canterbury: 4 comments | Noted.  |
| Coastal infrastructure would not be able to copy with this many extra homes: 2 comments | Improvements to infrastructure are being considered as part of the Local Plan process. |
| Concern this option would lead to settlement merge between the two coastal towns: 2 comments | An assessment of the green gap between Whitstable and Herne Bay was undertaken in [Green Gaps & Local Green Spaces Review (2021)](https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/downloads/planning-and-building/local-plan-2040/local-plan-2040-evidence-/historic-and-natural-environment/green-gaps---local-green-spaces-review--2021--pdf/). |
| There are already too many second homes and holiday lets in Whitstable: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| This amount of development would increase traffic congestion: 2 comments | Improvements to transport infrastructure are being considered as part of the Local Plan process. |
| This is not a viable option due to the increasing flood risk resulting from climate change: 1 comment | New developments will be expected to provide climate mitigation as is anticipated to be set out in the new Local Plan. An assessment of the sustainability impacts of the draft Local Plan will be undertaken and the results considered. |

**1.6. Rural Focus**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| Rural infrastructure would not be able to cope with this many extra homes: 77 comments | Transport modelling will be undertaken for the Local Plan to identify the mitigation requirements of the proposed housing growth in the draft Local Plan. |
| 9,000 homes would destroy the character of rural areas: 52 comments | Noted. Any new developments will be designed in keeping with their local environments. |
| Any growth in rural areas must be sustainable, as villages need to maintain their boundaries and sense of identity: 11 comments | Noted. Any new developments will be designed in keeping with their local environments. |
| Development in rural areas should be proportionate and in keeping with the character of the area: 11 comments | Noted. Any new developments will be designed in keeping with their local environments. |
| Building in rural areas would increase pollution as people would have to travel further to work and shop: 9 comments | Transport modelling will be undertaken for the Local Plan to identify the mitigation requirements of the proposed housing growth in the draft Local Plan. |
| Rural public transport links need improving: 7 comments | Improvements to transport infrastructure are being considered as part of the Local Plan process. |
| This option would exacerbate problems with drainage and sewerage: 4 comments | New developments will be expected to provide mitigation as is anticipated to be set out in the new Local Plan. An assessment of the sustainability impacts of the draft Local Plan will be undertaken and the results considered. |
| Favour this option to the preferred option: 2 comments | Noted. |
| 9,000 homes is still too many and the council should challenge the government on this target: 1 comment | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. Providing housing means funds can be collected to pay for affordable housing, transport infrastructure and other infrastructure. |

**1.7. New Freestanding Settlement**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| Impossible to assess this option without knowing where a new settlement would be located: 41 comments | Noted. |
| Too much green space would be lost under this option: 37 comments | New developments will be expected to meet open space standards. While agricultural land would be lost, these open space standards would also be considered. |
| This option would allow new infrastructure to be created from scratch to meet the needs of the development: 27 comments | Noted. |
| A new settlement could be built to zero carbon standards: 14 comments | Noted. |
| This option would avoid over-populating existing towns and villages: 13 comments | Noted. |
| This option would increase pollution as people would have to travel further to work and shop: 12 comments | Transport modelling will be undertaken for the Local Plan to identify the mitigation requirements of the proposed housing growth in the draft Local Plan. |
| 9,000 homes is still too many and the council should challenge the government on this target: 9 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. Providing housing means funds can be collected to pay for affordable housing, transport infrastructure and other infrastructure. |
| There is insufficient space in the district to accommodate a new settlement: 8 comments | Noted. |
| This is the best option: 8 comments | Noted. |
| There would not be any rail links to a new settlement: 5 comments | Improvements to transport infrastructure are being considered as part of the Local Plan process. |
| The cost of this option would be prohibitive: 4 comments | The viability of any proposed new settlements would be considered prior to allocating any site in the draft Local Plan. |
| There is no existing infrastructure in place: 4 comments | Improvements to infrastructure are being considered as part of the Local Plan process. |
| There would not be an established community at a new settlement: 4 comments | Noted. |
| Consider working with neighbouring councils to create a cross-district settlement: 3 comments | Noted. |
| Create a freestanding eco-town: 1 comment | Noted. |
| Prefer this option to the expansion of existing villages: 1 comment | Noted. |
| This option is not assessed in Jacobs Transport Modelling Report: 1 comment | At the stage of this consultation the growth scenario was an option to see whether this was an approach that would be supported. Following the consultation further work including possible site identification and transport modelling has been undertaken to inform the draft Local Plan. |

**1.8. Other Growth Options**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| Object to the proposal for a western bypass: 232 comments | Transport modelling will be undertaken for the Local Plan to identify the mitigation requirements of the proposed housing growth in the draft Local Plan. |
| Do not build on greenfield sites: 188 comments | While the government has set our housing targets and this will likely result in the loss of some agricultural land, new development will be directed to brownfield land where suitable and appropriate. New developments will also be expected to meet open space standards. |
| Infrastructure needs to be improved before new homes are built: 166 comments | Noted. |
| Growth should be spread more evenly across the district: 94 comments | Noted. |
| Object to any growth in villages: 90 comments | Noted. |
| Object to the expansion of Aylesham into Womenswold parish: 34 comments | Sites submitted through the Call for Sites process will be assessed inline with national guidance. Those sites that are suitable, achievable, available and support the draft Local Plan growth aspirations will be proposed for allocation. |
| The character of Canterbury must be preserved: 25 comments | Any new developments will be designed in keeping with their local environments. |
| Object to the expansion of Littlebourne which would have a detrimental effect on the village: 21 comments | Sites submitted through the Call for Sites process will be assessed inline with national guidance. Those sites that are suitable, achievable, available and support the draft Local Plan growth aspirations will be proposed for allocation. |
| Concern growth will result in the loss of farmland and green space: 18 comments | New developments will also be expected to meet open space standards. |
| Canterbury is already over-developed: 17 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. |
| Object to a new Park and Ride at Harbledown: 15 comments | Transport modelling will be undertaken for the Local Plan to identify the mitigation requirements of the proposed housing growth in the draft Local Plan. |
| Insufficient detail given on how the growth options would be funded: 13 comments | Providing new housing means funds can be collected to pay for affordable housing, transport infrastructure and other infrastructure. |
| Focus on bringing existing empty homes back into use before building new homes: 12 comments | The council has a dedicated Private Sector Housing team and part of their work focuses on trying to bring as many empty properties as possible back into use. However, there are insufficient empty homes across the district to meet the number of new homes needed.  |
| Ever-continuing growth is unsustainable: 10 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. |
| Support the upgrading of the A28: 9 comments | Noted. |
| Object to the proposal for an eastern bypass: 8 comments | Transport modelling will be undertaken for the Local Plan to identify the mitigation requirements of the proposed housing growth in the draft Local Plan. |
| Problems with drainage and sewerage need addressing: 8 comments | We are aware of these issues, and working with the relevant stakeholders, the draft Local Plan will consider how to address them. |
| Look to develop existing brownfield sites in Canterbury, such as Wincheap: 7 comments | Appropriate brownfield sites will be prioritised when assessing suitable sites however to meet our government targets there will never be enough suitable brownfield sites. Greenfield sites  |
| Safer cycling routes are needed: 7 comments | This will be reviewed as part of the council’s Transport Strategy.  |
| Development should be based on local need rather than developer profits: 5 comments | Development requirements are based on government methodology which considers local needs. |
| Object to the expansion of Wincheap Park and Ride onto Water Meadows: 5 comments | This and alternative options will be reviewed as part of the Transport Strategy.  |
| Problems with flood defences need addressing: 5 comments | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan. The council's engineering team will review issues if and when they arise. |
| Support the proposal for an eastern bypass: 5 comments | Noted. |
| Unable to offer an informed opinion on the options without knowing how many homes would go in which parts of the district: 5 comments | The purpose of the consultation was to identify where people would like to see homes instead of specifically identifying numbers for parts of the district. |
| Insufficient detail provided on where a western bypass would be routed: 4 comments | Noted. |
| Introduce a congestion charge in the city centre to help fund infrastructure improvements: 4 comments | Noted. |
| Support the creation of a reservoir at Broad Oak: 4 comments | Noted. |
| Any allocations within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty must be small scale: 3 comments | Any new developments will be designed in keeping with their local environments. |
| Demolish and rebuild existing older council housing estates rather than building new estates: 3 comments | The cost of this would be prohibitive, nor would it result in the creation of the additional homes needed.  |
| Combine the new settlement, city and coastal focus options in order to maximise investment: 2 comments | Noted. |
| Object to the development of Highland Court Farm in Bridge: 2 comments | Noted. |
| Repurpose empty office spaces as residential accommodation before building new homes: 2 comments | There are existing planning policies which facilitate changes of use in some circumstances. High quality office space will be sought to be retained to support the district's economy. |
| 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 | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan. The council allocates its social housing in accordance with its Housing Allocations Policy. We aim to review the allocations policy in due course and will consult residents and stakeholders as part of that process.  |
| Unclear whether the new homes are in addition to, or instead of, those in the current adopted Local Plan: 2 comments | The new homes set out are in addition to those in the current adopted Local Plan.  |
| Avoid the privatisation of green space, as green spaces will be lost as more building takes place: 1 comment | New developments will be expected to meet open space standards. While agricultural land would be lost, these open space standards would be considered. |
| Ban cars from the city centre: 1 comment | Vehicular access to the city centre may be considered as part of the council’s Transport Strategy and in work to tackle air quality issues.  |
| Build social housing on the site of the council offices in Military Road: 1 comment | The site of the Military Road council offices has already been identified as a potential site for new housing once the council vacates the site. |
| Concern growth will result in increased pressure on local services: 1 comment | As part of the Local Plan, the provision of local services will be considered to ensure that services such as healthcare and education can be provided and operate sufficiently for all.  |
| Focusing growth in urban areas may restrict the variety of housing choice available: 1 comment | Noted. |
| Limit the number of new homes to 5,000: 1 comment | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. |
| Limit the number of new homes to 7,000: 1 comment | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. |
| 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 | We have, and will continue to, work closely with the Environment Agency and the water companies in developing the new Local Plan. |
| Whichever option is taken forward must be sensitive to the natural environment: 1 comment | Any new developments will be designed in keeping with their local environments. |

1. **Town centre strategies**

**2.1. Canterbury**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| Object to the vision as it would lead to further over-population of Canterbury: 2 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. Providing housing means funds can be collected to pay for affordable housing, transport infrastructure and other infrastructure. |
| Support the focus on mitigating climate change and all new developments must align with this: 1 comment | Noted. |
| Feel the vision is incompatible with the preferred growth option: 1 comment | Noted. |
| The effects of Covid-19 have not been fully thought through: 4 comments | Covid-19 is having ongoing impacts which are being considered throughout the evidence gathering and production of the Local Plan. However, it is challenging to identify all the impacts and the council will continue to monitor the ongoing situation. |
| Encourage small independent traders as this would add to the city’s character: 2 comments | The Local Plan will encourage a variety of business uses, however it is not within the scope of the Local Plan to limit developments to specific traders. |
| Office space in Canterbury is unattractive due to high business rates and high parking charges: 2 comments | Business rates are set by the government, not by the council. Parking charges are set by the council but are reviewed annually as part of our budget setting process and are consulted on accordingly. |
| Encourage business start-ups in order to support graduate employment: 1 comment | The Local Plan will encourage a variety of business uses. |
| This should include a commitment to working with Kent Chamber of Commerce and other businesses: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| The street market needs improving: 1 comment | The council has already made the decision to disband the current street market in Canterbury city centre and is currently in the process of reviewing street trading arrangements. |
| Object to student accommodation in residential areas: 1 comment | The council is reviewing options to limit student accommodation to or near university campuses except in specific circumstances.  |
| Unclear what role the council can play in supporting the growth of the universities, other than deciding planning applications: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| Support the conversion of city centre retail units to residential accommodation: 6 comments | Noted. |
| Object to the conversion of city centre retail units to residential accommodation, they should be protected for commercial use: 1 comment | Noted. |
| Concern crime and anti-social behaviour would deter people from wanting to live in the city centre: 1 comment | We encourage all residents to report any anti-social behaviour to help make sure it can be dealt with at the earliest possible opportunity.The council has a dedicated Community Safety team who work closely with other agencies through the Canterbury Community Safety Partnership to help tackle anti-social behaviour issues. |
| Current broadband capacity is insufficient and needs improving: 1 comment | The Local Plan will look to improve broadband speeds in new developments. |
| Better signposting is needed to help visitors find their way around: 1 comment | Noted. |
| Support the creation of safe walking and cycling routes: 7 comments | Noted. |
| Cars should be excluded from the city centre as much as possible: 3 comments | Noted. Vehicular access to the city centre will be considered as part of the council’s Transport Strategy and in work to tackle air quality issues.  |
| E-scooters cause many problems and are often dumped: 3 comments | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan. |
| Better public transport provision is needed: 2 comments | Noted. This will be considered through the Transport Strategy. |
| Need to enforce against dangerous cycling in the city centre: 1 comment | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan.  |
| Need to consider electric vehicle parking and charging points: 1 comment | Noted. The council is working on an Electric Vehicle Strategy which will consider these issues. |
| Create a new bridge through the garden by Westgate Towers to reduce traffic congestion: 1 comment | The Transport Strategy will consider opportunities to reduce traffic congestion. |
| Create a low couched roadway between Tower House car park and Westgate Towers mini-roundabout to reduce traffic congestion: 1 comment | The Transport Strategy will consider opportunities to reduce traffic congestion. |
| This is unachievable as it takes too long to get from one part of Canterbury to another by walking or cycling: 1 comment | Walking and cycling improvements will be considered through the Transport Strategy. |
| It is impossible to completely avoid car journeys: 1 comment | Noted. |
| More support is needed to boost historic tourism: 4 comments | Noted. We are also currently in the process of bidding for the Levelling Up Fund (LUF) which would assist heavily in boosting historic tourism.  |
| Any development must be sympathetic to the city’s heritage: 2 comments | Any new developments will be designed in keeping with their local environments. |
| Cultural and creative offer will need to be adapted, as fewer visitors are coming from overseas due to Brexit and Covid-19: 3 comments | Cultural and creative offers will be supported in suitable locations through the Local Plan to support tourism.  |
| Need to highlight the importance and diversity of our existing cultural offer: 2 comments | Cultural and creative offers will be supported in suitable locations through the Local Plan. |
| Concern crime and anti-social behaviour would deter people wanting to visit: 1 comment | We encourage all residents to report any anti-social behaviour to help make sure it can be dealt with at the earliest possible opportunity.The council has a dedicated Community Safety team who work closely with other agencies through the Canterbury Community Safety Partnership to help tackle anti-social behaviour issues. |
| High parking charges deter people wanting to visit: 1 comment | Noted. Parking charges are reviewed every year as part of our budget setting process and are consulted on accordingly.  |
| Support all the objectives: 10 comments | Noted. |
| More action is needed to address rough sleeping: 4 comments | The council has dedicated Housing Solutions and outreach teams who work to help tackle rough sleeping. |
| More action is needed to tackle littering: 3 comments | The council has a dedicated Environmental Enforcement team who work to help tackle anti-social behaviour issues such as littering.  |
| Insufficient detail on how the objectives will be achieved: 2 comments | As this is just the first stage of the Local Plan, further detail into how the objectives will be achieved will be available in future stages of the Local Plan’s development. |
| More action is needed to tackle anti-social behaviour: 2 comments | We encourage all residents to report any anti-social behaviour to help make sure it can be dealt with at the earliest possible opportunity.The council has a dedicated Community Safety team who work closely with other agencies through the Canterbury Community Safety Partnership to help tackle anti-social behaviour issues.  |
| More action is needed to tackle graffiti: 2 comments | The council has a dedicated Environmental Enforcement team who work to help tackle anti-social behaviour issues such as graffiti.  |
| Developing 9,000 homes around Canterbury will prevent the achievement of many of these objectives: 1 comment | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. |
| The objectives to increase visitors and to encourage active travel contradict each other: 1 comment | Noted. |
| The council should support the Broad Oak reservoir as it would maintain efficient water supply: 1 comment | The Local Plan will support the Broad Oak reservoir. |
| Object to the proposal to relocate the council offices to Whitefriars: 1 comment | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan. The decision to relocate the council offices into the city centre has already been made. |

**2.2. Herne Bay**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| The vision and objectives for Herne Bay are much the same as the vision and objectives for Canterbury: 1 comment | While some points may be relevant for all three, the vision and objectives for Canterbury, Herne Bay and Whitstable have been designed based on their individual identities. |
| Seafront regeneration could transform the town: 2 comments | Noted. We are also currently in the process of bidding for the Levelling Up Fund (LUF) which would assist in regenerating Herne Bay. |
| Support the conversion of retail space to residential accommodation: 1 comment | Noted. |
| Focus on the housing needs of local residents rather than housing people from elsewhere: 1 comment | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan. The council allocates its social housing in accordance with its Housing Allocations Policy. We aim to review the allocations policy in due course and will consult residents and stakeholders as part of that process.  |
| The disconnect between the town centre and the seafront prevents the town becoming popular: 1 comment | Noted. We are also currently in the process of bidding for the Levelling Up Fund (LUF) which would assist in improving connectivity between the town centre and the seafront. |
| Introduce a shuttle bus service between the railway station and the seafront: 1 comment | A local bus network already operates through this route. |
| The approach to sustainable transport should include an aim to reduce traffic in the town: 2 comments | Noted. This will be considered through the Transport Strategy.  |
| Public transport links need improving: 1 comment | Noted. This will be considered through the Transport Strategy.  |
| Water efficiency needs improving before any development takes place: 1 comment | The Local Plan will seek to ensure new developments are more water efficient. |
| The town’s heritage needs to be protected, not exploited: 3 comments | By ‘exploit’, we wish to get the most out of the town’s heritage. |
| In order to attract more tourists, a good quality hotel is needed: 2 comments | The Local Plan will support tourist accommodation in suitable locations.  |
| Include measures to maximise income outside of the tourist season: 1 comment | The Local Plan will seek to support business and investment in the town.  |
| Open spaces must be protected as they are vital to people’s health and wellbeing: 1 comment | Publicly accessible open space will be protected through the Open Space Strategy and Local Plan. |
| The town’s shopping offer needs improving: 1 comment | The Local Plan will support retail and commercial developments in suitable locations. |
| The town’s sporting offer needs improving: 1 comment | The Local Plan will support sports and leisure developments in suitable locations. |
| A farmers’ market would help encourage visitors: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| Support all the objectives: 13 comments | Noted. |
| More affordable car parking is needed: 2 comments | Noted. Parking charges are reviewed every year as part of our budget setting process and are consulted on accordingly. |
| Need to avoid urban sprawl: 1 comment | Land in the district suitable for housing is limited and the government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet.  |
| Developments must be focused on sustainability: 1 comment | The draft Local Plan will be subject to a sustainability appraisal.  |

**2.3. Whitstable**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| Insufficient detail given on the need for this vision and on how it would be achieved: 1 comment | The purpose of the consultation was to seek views on the vision. The Local Plan will provide information on how the vision could be achieved. |
| More business space should be provided in the town centre: 1 comment | The Local Plan will support business developments in suitable locations. |
| Developments must be good quality and include open spaces: 1 comment | The Local Plan will encourage good quality design and open space will be required in line with the open space policy and standards. This will be informed by the Open Space Strategy. |
| Need to know more about where higher density developments would be and what they would look like: 1 comment | This consultation was seeking views on these issues. |
| High density units would be too small and this would lead to neighbour disputes: 1 comment | Any development would be required to provide a variety of sized properties informed by the Housing Strategy and housing mix policies. |
| A Park and Ride is needed in Whitstable, this would help reduce the amount of traffic coming into the town centre: 22 comments | We are reviewing opportunities for the possible creation of a Park and Ride or Park and Bus facility near Whitstable as part of our work on the Transport Strategy. |
| Support the aim of reducing traffic: 6 comments | Noted. |
| Cars should be excluded from the town centre: 1 comment | This will be considered as part of the Transport Strategy.  |
| The high street should be pedestrianised: 1 comment | This will be considered as part of the Transport Strategy.  |
| Whitstable is too congested: 1 comment | Opportunities to reduce traffic congestion are being considered as part of the Transport Strategy.  |
| Preserving the character of Whitstable is important: 2 comments | Any new developments will be designed in keeping with their local environments. |
| The town’s existing shopping offer is good: 2 comments | Noted. |
| Concern anti-social behaviour will deter people visiting: 1 comment | We encourage all residents to report any anti-social behaviour to help make sure it can be dealt with at the earliest possible opportunity.The council has a dedicated Community Safety team who work closely with other agencies through the Canterbury Community Safety Partnership to help tackle anti-social behaviour issues. |
| Include measures to maximise income outside of the tourist season: 1 comment | The Local Plan will seek to support business and investment in the town.  |
| Need to encourage the expansion of visitor accommodation: 1 comment | The Local Plan will support tourist accommodation in suitable locations.  |
| Support all the objectives: 11 comments | Noted. |
| The amount of second homes and holiday lets in Whitstable reduces affordable housing options for local residents: 5 comments | We are looking at opportunities to moderate the amount of holiday lets through policy channels. Regarding the amount of second homes, this is not within the scope of the Local Plan. |
| Too much focus in Whitstable is given to catering for tourists rather than local residents: 2 comments | The Local Plan aims to meet the needs of the existing communities. However, tourism is an important part of the economy and also needs to be considered. |
| Any development in Whitstable should be restricted to local need and be in keeping with the town’s character: 1 comment | Any new developments will be designed in keeping with their local environments. |
| Roads and pavements in Whitstable need improving: 1 comment | Noted. Kent County Council are responsible for highways however the Local Plan will seek to improve the public realm in the town where necessary.  |
| Parking in Whitstable needs improving: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| The amount of second homes and holiday lets in Whitstable has a negative impact on community cohesion: 1 comment | Second homes are not within the scope of the Local Plan. The Local Plan will consider opportunities to limit any adverse impacts from holiday lets. |

1. **Housing and new communities**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| HNC1 - (A) is the most flexible option: 12 comments  | Noted. |
| HNC1 - Housing provision should be driven by local need, not by what developers want to deliver: 31 comments | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. Housing mix is informed by local needs. |
| HNC1 - Housing types should be suited to location and need: 2 comments | Housing mix is informed by local needs. |
| HNC1 - It is unclear how (C) will future proof the right mix of housing: 1 comment | Housing mix is informed by local needs. |
| HNC1 - (C) allows scope for local communities to retain their identities: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC1 - The council needs to build more social housing: 8 comments | The Local Plan will seek 30% affordable housing on major developments. |
| HNC1 - Build affordable homes for first time buyers: 7 comments | The government requires 25% of affordable housing to be First Homes, which are only available to first time buyers.  |
| HNC1 - Create a framework which developers must work to: 3 comments | Noted. |
| HNC1 - Provide guidance for windfall sites, not just for allocated sites: 1 comment | The Local Plan will provide guidance for residential developments. |
| HNC1 - Housing must be truly affordable: 50 comments | The Local Plan will seek 30% affordable housing on major developments. |
| HNC1 - Need to avoid developments which are all of the same tenure: 3 comments | By providing a housing mix policy the Local Plan will seek to encourage developments to provide a mix of tenures to meet local needs. |
| HNC1 - Developers should be sanctioned for making any alterations to plans once approved: 2 comments | This is a matter for Planning Enforcement. |
| HNC1 - If building bungalows, make them so they can’t later be converted to two storey dwellings: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC1 - Insufficient data provided to be able to form an opinion: 1 comment | Noted. Further information will be provided in the next consultation. |
| HNC2 - Support (A) due to concerns about climate change and loss of green space: 4 comments | Noted. |
| HNC2 - (B) protects villages from excessive development which could occur under option HNC2C: 8 comments | Noted. |
| HNC2 - (B) minimises the impact on local infrastructure: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC2 - (C) maximises opportunities: 18 comments | Noted. |
| HNC2 - (C) disperses development across wider areas in order to minimise the impact on existing residents: 7 comments | Noted. |
| HNC2 - support (C): 6 comments | Noted. |
| HNC2 - (C) relies on sites which may not materialise: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC2 - Concern Canterbury is in danger of losing its identity due to excessive development: 1 comment | The government sets a minimum housing target per year which we are required to meet. |
| HNC3 - Prefer (A) because HNC3B gives no commitment to avoiding greenfield sites: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC3 - Support (A): 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC3 - (B) uses land that is currently unused and protects green space: 14 comments | Noted. |
| HNC3 - Support (B): 6 comments | Noted. |
| HNC3 - (B) offers a phased approach to regeneration: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC3 - Only brownfield sites should be built on: 46 comments | Suitable brownfield sites can be prioritised. However, not all brownfield sites are suitable and development on agricultural land will be required to meet the housing target set by government. |
| HNC3 - Brownfield site allocations should be managed by parish councils: 2 comments | Brownfield sites can be allocated through neighbourhood plans. |
| HNC3 - Do not build on farmland: 2 comments | Suitable brownfield sites can be prioritised. Poorer quality agricultural land is then prioritised over best and most versatile agricultural land. However, there is limited land available and we are required to meet the housing target set by government. |
| HNC3 - Wincheap industrial estate should be developed as per the Wincheap 2020 vision: 1 comment | The Local Plan will include a policy on the redevelopment of Wincheap industrial estate. |
| HNC4 - (A) offers a mixed approach which would be beneficial: 3 comments | Noted. |
| HNC4 - (A) highlights the importance of making effective use of land: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC4 - (A) minimises development and maximises sustainability: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC4 - Support (B): 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC4 - (C) is a positive approach to planning: 11 comments | Noted. |
| HNC4 - (C) gives more control over density in rural areas: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC4 - Each site should be assessed on an individual basis according to local need: 20 comments | Noted. |
| HNC4 - Support the setting of minimum density targets at a district-wide level: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC4 - A good balance of space and density, in keeping with the surrounding areas, is needed: 7 comments | Noted. |
| HNC4 - Ensure homes have space and the right infrastructure to cope with the increase in population: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC4 - In addition to setting densities, this should target efficient design for SuDS: 1 comment | Suitable designed SuDS are considered in the Local Plan, in addition to densities.  |
| HNC4 - Regeneration sites should be designed for higher density and more sustainable developments: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC4 - Build more high density housing rather than detached and semi-detached houses: 1 comment | By providing a housing mix policy the Local Plan will seek to encourage developments to provide a mix of home sizes to meet local needs |
| HNC4 - Ground floor space in Canterbury should be protected for commercial use: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will seek to protect and promote commercial / retail floorspace at ground floor level where appropriate. |
| HNC4 - Set a maximum density target at a district-wide level: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC4 - High density is needed to ensure the viability of new infrastructure: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC5 - (A) protects the countryside: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC5 - (B) offers villages the most protection: 4 comments | Noted. |
| HNC5 - (C) is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC5 - (C) should include additional controls on the balance of tenures: 1 comment | The Local plan will use housing mix policies to secure appropriate tenures. |
| HNC5 - Concern over extra traffic caused by more housing: 1 comment | The Transport Strategy will consider additional traffic from proposed development.  |
| HNC5 - Need to ensure more affordable housing is provided for families in rural areas: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC5 - Growth in rural areas must be sustainable and proportionate: 2 comments | Noted. The consultation is seeking views on different spatial options.  |
| HNC5 - Rural areas are capable of accommodating low density, good design homes: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC5 - Rural housing should be ringfenced for people with a local connection to the relevant village: 1 comment | This is a matter for Housing Allocation Policies.  |
| HNC5 - Any growth in rural areas must be sustainable and proportionate to the area: 12 comments | Noted. The consultation is seeking views on different spatial options. |
| HNC5 - Favour minimal growth in villages: 4 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC5 - Herne and Broomfield is not included as a local centre in the Rural Settlement Study but it should be: 2 comments | Herne and Broomfield is part of the Herne Bay Urban Area. |
| HNC5 - Only build on brownfield sites: 2 comments | Suitable brownfield sites can be prioritised. However, not all brownfield sites are suitable and development on agricultural land will be required to meet the housing target set by government. |
| HNC5 - Bungalows for older people are needed in rural areas: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC5 - Large housing estates are not suitable in villages as they do not have a community feel: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC5 - St Augustine’s at Chartham is not included as a local centre in the Rural Settlement Study but it should be: 1 comment | St Augustine’s is considered to be part of Chartham within the RSS. |
| HNC6 - (B) would need to be enforced with developers: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC6 - (C) must be delivered at an early stage for new residents: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC6 - Concerned (C) would result in building on farmland and an increase in traffic congestion: 2 comments | Development on agricultural land will be required to meet the housing target set by government. |
| HNC6 - (C) is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC6 - (C) provides better transport infrastructure for large developments: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC6 - (C) supports residents to make sustainable choices and reduce their carbon emissions: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC6 - A degree of flexibility is needed: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC6 - The current approach is not working because developers are not putting the right infrastructure in place: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will include policies to ensure necessary infrastructure improvements are delivered as part of developments.  |
| HNC6 - Need to consider whether rural areas can accommodate the additional infrastructure needed to support increased populations: 1 comment | Noted. The Rural Settlement Study assesses the varying range of community infrastructure and services available in the rural areas.  |
| HNC6 - Sometimes it is more appropriate to expand existing facilities than to create new ones: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC6 - Support the aim for accessing services within 15 minutes: 13 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC6 - Need to provide clear requirements to developers on the infrastructure needed: 2 comments | Noted. The Local Plan will include policies to ensure necessary infrastructure improvements are delivered as part of developments.  |
| HNC6 - Rural communities are not able to access services within 15 minutes: 2 comments | Noted. The Rural Settlement Study assesses the varying range of community infrastructure and services available in the rural areas.  |
| HNC6 - Developments should be built according to green infrastructure: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will include policies for green infrastructure and open space.  |
| HNC6 - It is vital to ensure sustainable travel is available to essential services: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC6 - Infrastructure should be put in place before developments start: 2 comments | Noted. The Local Plan will include policies for the timing of infrastructure delivery.  |
| HNC6 - Infrastructure requirements should be determined based on the number of homes being built: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC6 - Support the creation of sustainable communities: 3 comments | Noted. |
| HNC6 - Developments should be carbon neutral and not rely on private car journeys: 2 comments | Noted. The Local Plan will include policies on carbon emissions and will seek to reduce reliance on car journeys.  |
| HNC6 - Need to be clear from the outset what infrastructure will be delivered for new sites: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC6 - Building fewer homes would reduce the need for additional infrastructure: 1 comment | We are required to meet the housing target set by government and need to plan for the necessary infrastructure improvements to support that growth.  |
| HNC7 - Support (A): 1 comment  | Noted. |
| HNC7 - (A) is not realistic: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC7 - (C) offers a positive approach to planning: 12 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC7 - No need to adopt the National Design Guide as long as the council properly enforces requirements: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC7 - The National Design Guide is not appropriate as regions vary: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC7 - Designs should be appropriate to each individual site and in keeping with the area: 7 comments | Noted. |
| HNC7 - Tight control over infrastructure and design is important: 3 comments | Noted. |
| HNC7 - Consult local communities on designs: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC7 - Consult parish councils on master plans: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC7 - Design is important to how people feel and experience a place: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC7 - Garden city designs work well: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC7 - In addition to good design, build quality should be to a high standard: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC7 - Need to ensure green space is provided throughout developments: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will include policies for open space and green infrastructure.  |
| HNC7 - New sites should be linked together with existing sites in order to improve community cohesion: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC7 - Specifications must be set before developments are planned: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC7 - Water footprint should also be considered as part of good design: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will include policies for water efficiency.  |
| HNC7 - Kent Police Designing Out Crime team should be consulted on developments, to ensure crime prevention through environmental design is incorporated: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC7 - Designs must not be changed partway through: 1 comment | The Local Plan will set policies for design which applications will need to comply with. |
| HNC7 - Need good sized homes with gardens and space around them: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - (A) helps reduce carbon emissions: 4 comments | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Support (A), the council should prioritise this to help reduce long term costs: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Support (C), this is an area where action cannot be delayed: 15 comments | Noted. |
| HNC8 - (C) is a good start but concerned it might not be achievable: 3 comments | Noted. The Local Plan will need to be supported by viability evidence to demonstrate that policy requirements are achievable.  |
| HNC8 - (C) is not consistent with the national approach: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - The cost of (C) is likely to be prohibitive: 2 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will need to be supported by viability evidence to demonstrate that policy requirements are achievable.  |
| HNC8 - The delivery of (C) should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - (C) should apply to all new buildings: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will need to be supported by viability evidence to demonstrate that policy requirements are achievable.  |
| HNC8 - (C) should include a minimum target of retrofitting existing homes to net zero: 1 comment | This is outside the scope of the Local Plan.  |
| HNC8 - Standards need to be maintained and regularly inspected: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - Radical action to reduce carbon emissions is essential: 3 comments | The council has declared a climate emergency and has a programme of work to help improve energy efficiency, this is being continued as a priority through the draft Local Plan. |
| HNC8 - Adopt a “fabric first” approach and the provision of renewable energy generation: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - Consider how it can be made more affordable for existing properties to be made more energy efficient: 1 comment | This is outside the scope of the Local Plan.  |
| HNC8 - Educate residents on how to make their homes more eco-friendly: 1 comment | This is outside the scope of the Local Plan.  |
| HNC8 - Mitigate the effects of global warming by building eco-homes: 1 comment | The council has declared a climate emergency and has a programme of work to help improve energy efficiency. |
| HNC8 - The council should set the Passivhaus standard: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - Industry support will be needed to develop the necessary supply chains: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - Net zero is open to abuse and may result in the use of cheap offsets: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Standards need to be reviewed and updated throughout the life of the building: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Whichever option is taken forward, the council must ensure it is enforced: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - Support (D) as it is unfair to expect existing residents to pay large sums to retrofit their homes: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Support (D) as it is unrealistic to do more than this to historic buildings: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - (E) is more practical than the preferred option, the cost of which would be prohibitive: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - Support (F) as urgent action is needed: 17 comments | Noted. |
| HNC8 - (F) should also apply to permitted development: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - The delivery of (F) should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - The tighter controls should only apply to new homes: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Changes to all buildings should be zero carbon: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Existing homes need to be sustainable too: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - There is a need for energy plans relevant to each home: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - There is a need for constant research and updates: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC8 (G) - 90 litres per person per day is unrealistic, 110 litres can still achieve a reduction in water consumption: 2 comments | South East Water has set out ambitious targets for improving water efficiency over the period of the Local Plan.  |
| HNC8 - (H) may be open to challenge as the council can only encourage, not require, standards higher than 100 litres per person per day: 3 comments | The Local Plan will set policies for improving water efficiency to apply to new developments.  |
| HNC8 - Support (I) as water efficiency will become a problem unless conditions are imposed: 7 comments | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Support (I) as higher water efficiency is needed: 5 comments | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Unconvinced (I) is achievable: 4 comments | South East Water has set out ambitious targets for improving water efficiency over the period of the Local Plan.  |
| HNC8 - (I) is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - (I) will future proof new homes: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - The delivery of (I) should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - The council must ensure developer compliance at all times: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Important that developers are held to strict environmental targets: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Water management systems must be updated before any other development takes place: 2 comments | Noted. The council works with water infrastructure providers to ensure that growth can be accommodated within capacity.  |
| HNC8 - Council policy should align with the future homes taskforce trajectory and targets: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - Explore other solutions such as underground water storage tanks: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - The target should be set at 90 litres per person per day: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - Accepting a lower number of homes would help reduce water demand and the impact on the water network: 4 comments | We are required to meet the housing target set by government and need to plan for the necessary infrastructure improvements to support that growth.  |
| HNC8 - Support (J), the council should align with the government’s Future Homes Standard: 4 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - Support (J), a flexible approach is needed: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Support (K), it is essential to achieve this quickly as the council has declared a climate emergency: 20 comments | Noted. |
| HNC8 - There must not be any opt outs of (K), all energy supplies must conform: 3 comments | Noted. |
| HNC8 - The delivery of (K) should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC8 - Support (K), a new approach is needed: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Support (K) as a positive approach to planning: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Important to get ahead of the game now rather than having to make retrospective changes in the future: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - New developments should have decentralised, renewable energy sources: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Small developments should also incorporate rooftop solar panels: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - New developments should have to show how they will generate energy: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - Viability must be taken into account: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will need to be supported by viability evidence to demonstrate that policy requirements are achievable.  |
| HNC8 - A focus on renewable energy should result in the creation of local high skilled jobs: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC8 - All new developments should incorporate solar panels: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC9 - (A) should include a specific, achievable target: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC9 - (B) is fairer than expecting all sites to include a proportion of housing for older people: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC9 - (C) allows a mix of property types for older people, in mixed communities: 13 comments | Noted. |
| HNC9 - (C) combines elements of both of the other options to deliver the best results: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC9 - (C) is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC9 - Better to build retirement communities for older people than mixed developments on large housing estates: 3 comments | Noted. |
| HNC9 - Older people don’t want to be surrounded by young families: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC9 - Build homes for older people in quieter, rural locations: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC9 - Create assisted living schemes rather than care homes: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC9 - Create a large development of bungalows for older people: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC9 - Create a retirement village on the coast: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC9 - Consult older people to see which of the three options they prefer: 1 comment | This consultation was open to all residents and many of the responses we received have come from older people. |
| HNC9 - It is important to think about the aging population: 1 comment | All residents are considered as part of the Local Plan process. This encompasses varying age groups as well as other factors.  |
| HNC10 - (B) should include a minimum of 5% M4 (3): 3 comments | Noted. |
| HNC10 - (B) is more inclusive for disabled people: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC10 - (C) gives the best balance: 5 comments | Noted. |
| HNC10 - Support (C) as long as the needs for these numbers of properties can be evidenced: 4 comments | This is something that is evidenced in the council’s Housing Needs Assessment. |
| HNC10 - (C) is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC10 - All housing needs to be accessible for disabled people: 6 comments | Accessibility needs are considered as part of the Local Plan.  |
| HNC10 - All properties should be M4 (2) and a designated proportion should be M4 (3): 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC10 - All properties should be built in such a way as they can be adapted if needed: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC10 - All properties should comply with the minimum standards: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC10 - Need should be based on local data, not national data: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC10 - M4 (2) and M4 (3) homes can cause practical issues in the delivery of developments: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC10 - The council should work with the NHS and Social Services to fully understand requirements: 1 comment | The council engages with organisations such as these to assist in the process of forming the Local Plan.  |
| HNC10 - The council needs to do more to support disabled residents in the private rented sector whose landlords won’t carry out repairs: 1 comment | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan. The council’s Private Sector Housing team works to support residents in the private rented sector and can take action where landlords fail to keep properties to the required standard. |
| HNC11 - Support (A) as it is the most flexible approach: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC11 - (B) would help minimise student travel and therefore reduce the impact on the environment as well as the costs to students: 4 comments | Noted. |
| HNC11 - Support (C) as not all students want to live on campus: 5 comments | Noted. |
| HNC11 - (C) is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC11 - Support (C) as a way of protecting residential areas: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC11 - Unclear what the strict criteria under (C) would be: 1 comment | Noted. These would need to be set out within the Local Plan policies.  |
| HNC11 - Agree that all student accommodation should be on or near campus: 9 comments | Noted. |
| HNC11 - Applicants need to demonstrate why their site is suitable: 4 comments | Noted. |
| HNC11 - Students should only live in dedicated student accommodation, not in Houses in Multiple Occupation in residential areas: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC11 - This section does not need to mention further education as there is not a need for accommodation for FE students: 1 comment | There is a high student population in Canterbury, not only those in higher education but also in further education. |
| HNC11 - Outside of term time, student accommodation should be made available for renting: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC11 - No more purpose built student accommodation is needed: 5 comments | Noted. |
| HNC11 - The universities should be consulted on any decisions about student housing: 1 comment | Noted. The universities are key stakeholders in the preparation of the Local Plan.  |
| HNC11 - Local residents should be consulted on any proposals for purpose built student accommodation in their area: 1 comment | Local residents are always notified of any planning application consultations in their immediate area so that they can respond to the consultation accordingly. |
| HNC12 - (A) is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment  | Noted. |
| HNC12 - Support (B) as the current approach is not proactive enough: 3 comments | Noted. |
| HNC12 - Support (C): 5 comments | Noted. |
| HNC12 - Support (C) as there is currently a lack of suitable accommodation for travellers: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC12 - Support (C), but only where there is an identified need for new sites: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC12 - Concern over the cost of delivering (C): 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC12 - New sites should be carefully selected so as not to create dependency on travel by car: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC12 - It is positive that the council are taking this into account: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC12 - Happy to trust the council’s judgement on this: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC12 - Communities need to be welcomed into the area: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC12 - New sites should be restricted to those with local connections: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC12 - Insufficient detail given to be able to form an opinion: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC13 - Support (A) as it would improve the mix on housing developments: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC13 - Support (B) as small sites with smaller units are preferable to larger developments: 7 comments | Noted. |
| HNC13 - Support (B) as self-builders will not want to be part of larger developments: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC13 - Support (C) as it is the most flexible approach: 6 comments | Noted. |
| HNC13 - (C) should include at least 5% on major sites, but with time limits specified: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC13 - Support (C) as all requests for self-build should be considered on a case-by-case basis: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC13 - Allocate small sites for zero carbon self-builds: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC13 - Many small-scale self-build homes should be discouraged: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC13 - Self-build should be encouraged in order to provide higher quality housing: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC13 - Opportunities should be made available at a rate reflected by the need on the council’s self-build register: 1 comment | Noted. The register has been used to inform the council’s assessment of needs over the period of the Local Plan.  |
| HNC13 - Self-build can lead to better community cohesion: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC13 - There is a lack of demand for self-build plots: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC13 - Self-build homes must comply with all environmental regulations: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC13 - Consult people on the self-build register to see which option they prefer: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC13 - Ownership should not determine usage: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC14 - Support (A), no new infrastructure is needed: 1 comment | Noted. The council works with infrastructure providers to understand infrastructure needs, and this should be reflected within the Local Plan.  |
| HNC14 - Support (B) as the preferred option could result in the delivery of infrastructure which is not actually needed: 1 comment | Noted. The council works with infrastructure providers to understand infrastructure needs, and this should be reflected within the Local Plan.   |
| HNC14 - Support (C) as it is vital to ensure the right infrastructure is provided for any new development: 7 comments | Noted. |
| HNC14 - (C) is a positive approach to planning: 1 comment | Noted. |
| HNC14 - 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 | Developers will be required to fund infrastructure which is needed to support their development.  |
| HNC14 - The right infrastructure should be put in place before any development is considered: 2 comments | The Local Plan will set policies for the timing of infrastructure delivery.  |
| HNC14 - Build less homes in order to minimise the impact on the water network: 1 comment | We are required to meet the housing target set by government and need to plan for the necessary infrastructure improvements to support that growth.  |
| HNC14 - A new hospital in Canterbury is essential: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC14 - It is important that healthcare facilities are accessible by public transport: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC14 - Parish councils should be consulted on proposals in their areas: 1 comment | Parish councils are always notified of any planning application consultations in their area so that they can respond to the consultation accordingly. |
| HNC14 - Local residents should be consulted on proposals in their areas: 1 comment | Local residents are always notified of any planning application consultations in their immediate area so that they can respond to the consultation accordingly. |
| HNC15 - (A) offers better control: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC15 - Support (B) as it is important to be proactive: 14 comments | Noted. |
| HNC15 - Support (B) as renewable energy is vital for the future: 4 comments | Noted. |
| HNC15 - Renewable energy projects will not work in established urban areas: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC15 - Each application should be considered on a case-by-case basis: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC15 - Policies should reflect the cumulative impact of proposed developments: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC15 - Large scale solar PV should be limited to non-BMV land: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC15 - Solar farms should not be permitted near housing developments: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC16 - Support (B): 3 comments | Noted. |
| HNC16 - (B) gives more certainty than the other options: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC16 - Support (C) as developers should contribute to the communities they affect: 2 comments | Noted. |
| HNC16 - This option offers a good way of saving time and resources by thinking ahead: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC16 - Support the timely provision of sports infrastructure: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC16 - The right infrastructure should be put in place in a timely manner before any development takes place: 15 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC16 - Local residents and parish councils should be consulted on infrastructure developments in their areas: 3 comments | Local residents and parish councils are always notified of any planning application consultations in their area so that they can respond to the consultation accordingly. |
| HNC16 - Developers cannot always afford to fund the required infrastructure: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will need to be supported by viability evidence to demonstrate that policy requirements are achievable.  |
| HNC16 - Object to development-led infrastructure: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC16 - The council needs to work with Kent County Council to improve the highways infrastructure: 1 comment | The council works closely with KCC on the preparation of the Local Plan.  |
| HNC17 - (B) would ensure developers are held to the details of their plans: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC17 - (C) would prevent developers finding loopholes: 4 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC17 - (C) would prevent developers avoiding the provision of social housing and affordable housing: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC17 - Concern the current approach allows viability assessments to be prone to gaming: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC17 - Current approach does not reflect that viability will change according to fluctuating markets and build costs: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC17 - Proper monitoring and enforcement of this is essential: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| HNC17 - Limit the scope of new viability evidence by setting clear criteria of the stage/s at which it will be accepted: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC17 - Ensure all proposals meet the core requirements of the Local Plan: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC17 - Planning applications must be complete and clear from the outset: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC17 - Infrastructure costs can adversely impact the viability of developments: 2 comments | Noted. The Local Plan will need to be supported by viability evidence to demonstrate that policy requirements are achievable.  |
| HNC17 - The council should use the upper end of any ranges to calculate fees and profit margins: 2 comments | Noted. The Local Plan will need to be supported by viability evidence to demonstrate that policy requirements are achievable.  |
| HNC17 - There needs to be a balanced approach to land values: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| HNC17 - Local residents should be consulted on applications in their areas: 1 comment | Local residents are always notified of any planning application consultations in their immediate area so that they can respond to the consultation accordingly. |
| HNC17 - Insufficient detail given to be able to form an opinion: 1 comment | Noted.  |

1. **Employment and the local economy**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| EMP1 - Support (B): 2 comments | Noted. |
| EMP1 - Support (C): 6 comments | Noted. |
| EMP1 - Support (C) as trust the council’s judgment: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP1 - Support (C), but it must be achieved without a loss in the total employment land coming forward: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will need to identify a sufficient supply of land to meet employment needs.  |
| EMP1 - Flexibility is important, but the right infrastructure must be put in place: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP1 - Flexibility is important, but there is not enough housing to warrant the need for additional job creation: 1 comment | The Economic Development and Tourism Study has identified a need for additional employment space over the period of the Local Plan. |
| EMP1 - Flexibility is important, but economic development and inward investment must be the priority | Noted.  |
| EMP1 - The council should take over empty retail units and rent them to small businesses and start-ups: 1 comment | This is outside of the scope of the Local Plan. |
| EMP1 - Develop Wincheap industrial estate: 1 comment | The Local Plan will include a policy for the development of the Wincheap area. |
| EMP1 - Develop unused brownfield sites rather than using greenfield sites: 1 comment | Suitable brownfield sites can be prioritised. However, not all brownfield sites are suitable and development on agricultural land will be required to meet identified employment needs. |
| EMP1 - Ensure existing sites are developed and not landbanked: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP1 - Look at alternative ways to attract employers to the district: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP1 - Businesses requiring deliveries by large lorries should not be situated in rural villages: 2 comments | Noted. |
| EMP1 - Large business spaces are not needed, instead coffee shops and small restaurants are needed to boost tourism: 1 comment | The Economic Development and Tourism Study has identified a need for additional employment space over the period of the Local Plan. |
| EMP1 - Mixed developments work well in the city centre: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP1 - Opportunities for expanding employment land allocations within the AONB are very limited: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP2 - Support (C) as there is a need for more high quality employment opportunities locally: 6 comments | Noted. |
| EMP2 - Support (C) as it is the most likely to maximise job creation: 5 comments | Noted. |
| EMP2 - Concern (C) would lead to the development of greenfield sites: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP2 - A variety of sites suitable for all employment types need to be provided: 2 comments | Noted. |
| EMP2 - The market will dictate what opportunities there are for businesses: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP2 - Provide a variety of locations to enable people to work closer to home and reduce transport emissions and congestion: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP2 - Offer incentives to attract employers to the district: 1 comment | This is outside the scope of the Local Plan. |
| EMP2 - Need to grow the science and technology sector in the district: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP3 - Support (C) as it is a flexible approach: 7 comments | Noted. |
| EMP3 - Concern (C) would lead to the development of greenfield sites: 1 comment | Noted. Suitable brownfield sites can be prioritised. However, not all brownfield sites are suitable and development on agricultural land will be required to meet identified employment needs. |
| EMP3 - Concern (C) would give developers a get out clause: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP3 - Do not allow employment sites to be developed on farmland: 1 comment | Suitable brownfield sites can be prioritised. However, not all brownfield sites are suitable and development on agricultural land will be required to meet identified employment needs. |
| EMP3 - The council needs to plan more for economic development: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP3 - Allocated employment sites are the most attractive option to businesses: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP3 - There is a need for more high quality employment opportunities locally: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP3 - The district is in the wrong location to attract employment growth: 1 comment | Canterbury is well connected both by road and rail, with the A2 running through the city and high speed rail connections to London. |
| EMP4 - Support (C) as it is a forward thinking approach: 9 comments | Noted. |
| EMP4 - (C) would be difficult for small businesses to achieve: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP4 - Broadband infrastructure is essential: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP4 - The council can’t force people to work near to where they live, people make their own choices and move around: 2 comments | Noted. |
| EMP4 - It is important that all new employment developments are digitally connected: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP4 - The threshold of 300 homes is too high: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP4 - Fibre broadband should be available to everyone, not only on new developments: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP4 - The council needs to work with employers to develop transport plans to reduce emissions: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP4 - Market forces will dictate long term viability: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP5 - (A) is the least worst option: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP5 - Support (D) as urgent action is needed: 12 comments | Noted. |
| EMP5 - Support (D) as new developments should be designed to the best possible energy efficiency: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP5 - Support (D) but it must be backed up by law: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP5 - Support (D) but concerned over the cost implications: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will need to be supported by viability evidence to demonstrate that policy requirements are achievable.  |
| EMP5 - The delivery of (D) should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP5 - There should be legal and financial penalties for non-compliance: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP5 - The council should adopt the same standards as the rest of Kent: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP5 - It is unrealistic for historic buildings to become zero carbon: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will include policies for retrofitting historic buildings to improve energy efficiency.  |
| EMP5 - Solar panels on roofs should become the norm: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP6 - (B) is the best option: 6 comments | Noted. |
| EMP6 - Support (B) as it offers a holistic approach: 4 comments | Noted. |
| EMP6 - (B) is the most transparent to local communities: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP6 - The universities’ growth plans sometimes conflict with local views: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| EMP6 - Aligning the Local Plan with the universities’ growth plans puts the council at risk in terms of future proofing: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP6 - The council should assess the viability of the universities’ growth plans and not just accept them at face value: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| EMP6 - The universities’ growth plans should be aligned to the Local Plan, not the other way around: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP6 - The council needs to support the universities to help deliver high quality employment opportunities: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| EMP6 - This section should mention further education as well as higher education: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP6 - This section should mention the University for the Creative Arts: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP6 - Large areas of land owned by the University of Kent should be protected from housing development: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP6 - Also aim to attract graduates from other areas: 1 comment | This is outside the scope of the Local Plan. |
| EMP7 - Support (B) as it is more in line with national policy than the preferred option is: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP7 - Support (C): 8 comments | Noted. |
| EMP7 - Support (C) as a greater variety of tourist accommodation is needed: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP7 - (C) would help develop the tourism and hospitality offer across the district: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP7 - Concern (C) could lead to development on greenfield sites: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP7 - Tourist accommodation in rural areas could cause problems for residents in those areas: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| EMP7 - Providing tourist accommodation in rural areas will support the rural economy: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP7 - Focus on repurposing existing empty accommodation: 2 comments | The Local Plan will set out policies for existing commercial units.  |
| EMP7 - Focus on providing tourist accommodation in the coastal towns: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP7 - Within the AONB, the focus should be on smaller sites: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP7 - Stricter control over AirBnBs is needed to prevent them making hotels and B&Bs unviable: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP7 - There is a need for more high quality tourist accommodation: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP7 - Small, attractive tourist accommodation options are needed: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP8 - Support (A): 5 comments | Noted. |
| EMP8 - Support (B): 4 comments | Noted. |
| EMP8 - (B) offers a flexible approach for sites to be assessed on a case-by-case basis: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| EMP8 - (B) allows increased flexibility for the provision of rural employment: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP8 - Support (B) as it makes sense to develop adjacent to existing sites: 1 comment | Noted. |
| EMP8 - Unclear if (B) only applies to sites adjacent to existing sites or also to new sites elsewhere: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP8 - Develop existing sites in order to minimise the impact on farmland: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP8 - Focus on agricultural and environmental employment growth: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP8 - Consider agricultural tourism: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP8 - Important to deliver a range of suitable employment opportunities in rural areas: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| EMP8 - There is a need to improve broadband and road infrastructure in rural areas: 2 comments | Noted.  |

1. **Town centres and local facilities**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| TCLF1 - Support (B): 9 comments  | Noted. |
| TCLF1 - There is sufficient capacity in town centres without the need to consider additional locations: 3 comments | Noted. The Retail and Leisure Study shows a significant reduction in the level of retail floorspace needed, compared to the equivalent study for the 2017 Local Plan.  |
| TCLF1 - This may need frequent revision due to changing shopping habits: 1 comment | Noted. We will look to update our retail evidence as necessary.  |
| TCLF1 - Concern that out-of-town retail parks are undermining the viability of city and town centres: 2 comments | Noted. |
| TCLF1 - 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 | Noted. Parking charges are outside the scope of the Local Plan.  |
| TCLF2 - Support (A): 5 comments | Noted. |
| TCLF2 - (A) keeps more future options open: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF2 - Support (B): 6 comments | Noted. |
| TCLF2 - (B) could allow housing to be provided without needing to develop greenfield sites: 2 comments | Noted. However, development on agricultural land will be required to meet the housing target set by government. |
| TCLF2 - (B) reflects government policy: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF2 - Support the flexibility of (B) as it is difficult to predict what will happen in the future: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF2 - Unclear what the current approach is: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF2 - Wincheap industrial estate is in a prime location for redevelopment as housing: 3 comments | Noted. The Local Plan will include policies for the redevelopment of Wincheap.  |
| TCLF2 - Support proposed reduction in retail space at Wincheap: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will include policies for the redevelopment of Wincheap.  |
| TCLF2 - Object to repurposing retail units as residential accommodation: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF2 - Concern out-of-town retail parks take trade away from the city and town centres: 2 comments | Noted. |
| TCLF2 - The road network would need improving to cope with any expansion of out-of-town retail sites: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Wincheap - (B) offers the most protection to local facilities: 4 comments | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Wincheap - (B) would allow Wincheap to be developed in line with the Wincheap 2020 vision: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Wincheap - (B) would encourage growth in Wincheap: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Tankerton Road - (D) offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Herne Bay Road - (F) offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Sea Street - (H) offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Canterbury Road - (J) offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Reculver Road - (L) offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Faversham Road - (N) offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Zealand Road - (P) offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Zealand Road - (P) recognises the importance of the local facilities and encourages residents to use them rather than driving into the city centre: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Hawe Farm Way - Support (Q) as existing provision serves the community well: 1 comment  | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Hawe Farm Way - (R) offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Poplar Drive - (T) offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 St Dunstan’s - Support (V): 3 comments | Noted. |
| TCLF3 St Dunstan’s - (V) encourages residents to use the local facilities rather than driving into the city centre: 2 comments | Noted. |
| TCLF3 St Dunstan’s - (V) formalises the position of St Dunstan’s as a local centre: 2 comments | Noted. |
| TCLF3 St Dunstan’s - (V) offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 St Dunstan’s - St Dunstan’s offers facilities which are not available in the city centre: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 St Dunstan’s - Maintain the connection between St Dunstan’s and the city centre by providing good wayfinding and signage: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 St Dunstan’s - Work to encourage local businesses and start-ups on Station Road West: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Canterbury Road - Support (W) as existing provision serves the community well: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF3 Canterbury Road - (X) offers the most protection to local facilities: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF4 - Support (A) as the boundaries of villages should not be extended: 3 comments | Noted. |
| TCLF4 - Support (B) offers the most protection to village facilities and communities: 14 comments | Noted. |
| TCLF4 - Support (B) as it would allow sustainable rural growth: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF4 - Concern (B) offers a get out clause to those wishing to remove local services: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF4 - Unclear how (B) would benefit villages such as Littlebourne which already have well-established local facilities and do not need more: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF4 - Unclear whether (B) applies only to new uses, or also to existing uses: 1 comment | Noted. |
| TCLF4 - (B) should be expanded to include all village centres: 1 comment | Noted. |

1. **Movement and transport**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| MT1 - Support (B): 5 comments | Noted. |
| MT1 - (B) promotes active transport which is beneficial to people’s health: 4 comments | Noted. |
| MT1 - The delivery of (B) should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT1 - All new developments should have footpaths and cycle paths: 9 comments | Noted. |
| MT1 - Active travel is essential to mitigate the effects of climate change: 3 comments | Noted. |
| MT1 - Unconvinced developers would provide the required infrastructure: 1 comments | Noted. Local Plan policies can set out clear requirements for developments, such as for walking and cycling infrastructure, which would need to be met at planning application stage. |
| MT1 - The strategic sites do not meet these standards: 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT1 - (A) and (B) should be combined: 5 comments | Noted. The Local Plan can accommodate both approaches to support the objectives around increasing opportunities for active travel.  |
| MT1 - Develop a complete network of active travel pathways connecting villages and towns: 3 comments | Noted. This will be considered as part of the council’s Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plan.  |
| MT1 - Developments should not be granted planning permission unless they provide active travel options: 2 comments | Noted. |
| MT1 - Developers should fund the provision of a safe cycling network: 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT1 - Developers must ensure their sites are linked to sustainable transport: 5 comments | Noted. The Local Plan can include policies to require this.  |
| MT1 - It is important that pathways are properly maintained: 4 comments | Noted. |
| MT1 - Pedestrian and cyclist needs should be considered as early as possible: 2 comments | Noted. |
| MT1 - Cyclists should have dedicated lanes, away from roads: 2 comments | Noted. |
| MT1 - New developments should be within a 15 minute walk of local services: 2 comments | Noted. |
| MT1 - Neither (A) nor (B) consider the costs of providing and maintaining such facilities: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will be subject to viability assessment to ensure that the costs of specific policies are affordable.  |
| MT1 - Sustainable transport needs improving across the whole district: 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT1 - Defined routes should be signposted and lit: 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT1 - Look to introduce bicycle hire schemes: 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT1 - New developments have previously been shown to have a negative impact on active travel: 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT1 - Do not build new roads as this encourages car usage: 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT2 Roads - Support (B): 10 comments  | Noted. |
| MT2 Roads - The council must work with developers and bus operators to ensure (B) can be delivered: 2 comments | Noted. |
| MT2 Roads - The delivery of (B) should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT2 Roads - Current approach does not work as major developments exploit green spaces: 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT2 Roads - Important to ensure bus routes serve new developments: 10 comments | Noted. The Local Plan can include policies to require this.  |
| MT2 Roads - Public transport plays an important role in minimising emissions and congestion: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| MT2 Roads - It is important to ensure access to bus travel so that people who don’t drive are not isolated: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT2 Roads - Developments should not be granted planning permission unless they have public transport connections: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT2 Roads - (A) and (B) should be combined: 2 comments | Noted. The Local Plan can accommodate both approaches to support the objectives around increasing opportunities for sustainable travel.  |
| MT2 Roads - Need to provide integrated transport links between bus and railway stations: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT2 Roads - Bus fares need to be made cheaper to encourage people to travel more sustainably: 12 comments | Noted. The cost of bus fares is outside the scope of the Local Plan.  |
| MT2 Roads - Bus frequency needs improving to encourage people to travel more sustainably: 11 comments | Noted. Transport improvements will be considered through Transport Modelling and Transport Strategy for the Local Plan, in discussions with KCC and transport infrastructure providers, to improve bus frequency and journey time reliability.  |
| MT2 Roads - Bus operators should use electric buses: 6 comments | Noted.  |
| MT2 Roads - New developments should be served by frequent hopper buses: 5 comments | Noted.  |
| MT2 Roads - Bus operators should use smaller buses: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| MT2 Roads - Public transport should be prioritised over car usage: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| MT2 Roads - Focus on encouraging more walking and cycling rather than public transport usage: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT2 Roads - Work is needed to reduce emissions from public transport: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - Support (D): 11 comments | Noted. |
| MT2 Train - Explore the option of new developments near to railway stations to facilitate (D): 5 comments | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - It is right that the onus should be on developers to facilitate (D): 2 comments | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - Need to provide integrated transport links between railway and bus stations: 4 comments | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - (C) and (D) should be combined: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - Open smaller railway stations as part of new developments to minimise the number of people using the larger stations: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - Rail fares need to be made cheaper to encourage people to travel more sustainably: 7 comments | Noted. The cost of rail fares is outside the scope of the Local Plan.  |
| MT2 Train - Rail travel needs to be made more sustainable: 5 comments | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - Rail links need improving to encourage people to travel more sustainably: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - The council needs to work with rail operators to improve the existing infrastructure: 2 comments | Noted. Transport improvements will be considered through the Transport Strategy for the Local Plan, in discussions with KCC and transport infrastructure providers, to improve access to rail services.  |
| MT2 Train - The council should lobby rail operators to keep rural stations open: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - Use solar panels on public buildings to help make trains more sustainable: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - Create railway stations close to Wincheap and Harbledown: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - In order to promote active travel, do not provide car parking at railway stations: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - Do not create a tram network through the countryside: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - Local residents should be consulted: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT2 Train - Access is needed to Canterbury West railway station from the northern side of the track: 1 comment | Noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2019) includes the provision of this scheme and this will be reviewed as part of the new Local Plan. |
| MT3 - (A) does not work as improvements are needed to the charging infrastructure: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| MT3 - Support (A) as a flexible approach is needed: 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT3 - It is important to deliver (B) to help tackle climate change: 19 comments | Noted. |
| MT3 - (B) should include a transition period to allow time for the right infrastructure to be put in place: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| MT3 - It is important to deliver (B) as electric vehicles will be the dominant mode of transport by 2030: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT3 - The right infrastructure must be put in place to support residents to move to electric vehicles: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| MT3 - Not everybody moving into a new property will need an electric vehicle charging point: 2 comments | Although not everybody will need a charging point in the immediate future, as all new cars sold after 2030 must be electric, over time more and more people will be driving electric vehicles and will need a charging point, therefore this approach helps future proof our housing. Building regulations have also been updated to ensure that where parking spaces are allocated to a specific property, they are now required to have an electric vehicle connection.  |
| MT3 - (A) and (B) should be combined: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT3 - Electric vehicles will not prevent traffic congestion, instead the focus should be on promoting active travel: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT3 - Charging points should be installed on existing developments, not just new sites: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT3 - The council should commit to providing charging points in all of its car parks: 1 comment | Noted. This is outside the scope of the Local Plan. |
| MT3 - More charging points are needed: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| MT3 - Faster charging points are needed: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| MT3 - Introduce a network of electric buses: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| MT3 - Encourage electric taxis: 1 comment | Noted. This is outside the scope of the Local Plan.  |
| MT3 - Charging points should be installed in car parks as it is too problematic to install them on street: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT3 - Increase public transport to take more private traffic out of towns and villages: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT4 - (B) is the most flexible approach: 7 comments | Noted. |
| MT4 - Support (B) as the current system does not work: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT4 - (C) would help reduce car usage and encourage people to use public transport or walk: 9 comments | Noted.  |
| MT4 - It is too soon to consider (C), it would exacerbate parking issues: 8 comments | Noted.  |
| MT4 - Support (C): 6 comments | Noted. |
| MT4 - (C) would help limit car usage and relieve congestion: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT4 - Do not remove parking standards, take an evidence-based approach: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| MT4 - Maintain the current approach but also encourage behaviour change: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| MT4 - All new developments should include car parking spaces for residents: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| MT4 - Provide more cycle parking in the city centre to encourage active travel: 2 comments | This will be reviewed as part of the council’s Transport Strategy.  |
| MT4 - Encourage car sharing: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| MT4 - Ban cars from the city centre: 1 comment | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan. Vehicular access to the city centre may be considered as part of the council’s Transport Strategy and in work to tackle air quality issues.  |
| MT4 - Locate car parks further away from city and town centres to encourage active travel: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT4 - Create a Park and Ride at the University of Kent: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT4 - Consider a Council Tax reduction for residents who do not own a car, or an additional charge for those who do: 1 comment | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan. |
| MT4 - Some parking will still need to be provided for disabled and/or elderly people: 3 comments | Noted.  |
| MT4 - Some parking will still need to be provided in sustainable rural locations: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT4 - More parking enforcement is needed: 1 comment | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan.  |
| MT4 - Parking availability should be based on proximity to urban areas and facilities: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT4 - Consider how campus parking can be provided to reduce the number of students parking in residential streets: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT4 - Need to know how the rest of the transport infrastructure will work: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT4 - 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 | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan. Parking charges are reviewed every year as part of our budget setting process and are consulted on accordingly.  |
| MT5 - (A) does not work as developers do not always deliver what is required: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| MT5 - Support (B): 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT5 - Support (C) as it covers a range of developments: 10 comments | Noted. |
| MT5 - As part of (C), transport assessments must be vigorously checked to ensure they are realistic: 10 comments | Noted.  |
| MT5 - Support (C), it is important to be creative: 1 comment | Noted. |
| MT5 - As part of (C), need to monitor the cumulative impact of developments: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT5 - All planning applications should have to show the total load on resources: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| MT5 - It is important to achieve a sustainable transport network: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT5 - Employers should have home to work travel plans and offer incentives to their staff to travel sustainably: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT5 - Developments should be planned around existing railway stations: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT5 - Small developments should also have travel plans: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT5 - The council should follow “Better Planning, Better Places 2019”: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT5 - Local residents should be consulted: 2 comments | We promote all council consultations as widely as possible to ensure residents are able to give their views. |
| MT5 - Transport assessments should have to be approved by the relevant parish council/s: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| MT5 - All transport plans should consider future technology: 1 comment | Noted.  |

1. **Heritage and the natural environment**

| **Comment** | **Officer response** |
| --- | --- |
| NE1 - Support (A) as current policies help preserve our World Heritage Site: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE1 - Support (A) as only a light touch review is needed: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE1 - Support (A), but conservation areas need regular review and renewal: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE1 - Support (A) as the Heritage Strategy and Action Plan provide good guidance: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE1 - Support (B) as current policies are insufficient and need strengthening: 13 comments | Noted. These policies will be subject to further review through the preparation of the Local Plan.  |
| NE1 - Concern Canterbury may risk losing its World Heritage Site status if excessive development is carried out: 6 comments | Noted.  |
| NE1 - The council needs to be more proactive in protecting heritage assets: 4 comments | Noted. |
| NE1 - An updated management plan for the World Heritage Site is needed: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE1 - 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 | Noted. The council will keep a watching brief on potential planning reforms.  |
| NE1 - In order to protect heritage assets, a new freestanding settlement is needed instead of continuing to develop Canterbury: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE1 - The council must not consider extending the built city boundaries on a piecemeal basis: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE2 - Support (B): 9 comments | Noted. |
| NE2 - (B) offers opportunities to improve water efficiency: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE2 - (B) offers a more appropriate and sustainable approach to adapting historic buildings: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE2 - Support (B), it is important to be proactive: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE2 - (B) will help with long term carbon neutrality: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE2 - Support (B), clear guidance is critical: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE2 - Unclear how (B) would be funded: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| NE2 - The council should offer advice and support to residents on how they can improve the energy efficiency of their homes: 5 comments | Noted.  |
| NE2 - It may not be possible to improve the energy efficiency of some historic buildings, provision must be made for this: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE2 - Restrictions around solar panels should be relaxed: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE3 - Support (A) as this is a more achievable target: 4 comments | Noted. |
| NE3 - (A) needs strengthening to ensure protection and enhancement materialise: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE3 - (B) mirrors the Environment Bill’s proposed legal requirement for 10% net gain: 4 comments | Noted. |
| NE3 - support (C) as there is a need to maximise biodiversity net gain: 21 comments | Noted. |
| NE3 - The delivery of (C) should not be reliant on the preferred growth option: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE3 - support (C), it is important to protect green spaces: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE3 - (C) is not a sound approach to policy making regarding biodiversity net gain: 1 comment | Noted. The Local Plan will be subject to viability assessment to ensure that the costs of specific policies are affordable.  |
| NE3 - A 20% net gain may not be viable for all developments: 4 comments | Noted. The Local Plan will be subject to viability assessment to ensure that the costs of specific policies are affordable.  |
| NE3 - Seek to maximise biodiversity net gain across all types of green infrastructure and developments: 5 comments | Noted. |
| NE3 - Create links between green and blue spaces and all relevant council strategies such as the Transport Strategy and the Green Infrastructure Strategy: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE3 - The council should encourage residents to become custodians of green spaces to enhance awareness and appreciation of them: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 North Kent Marshes - (B) ensures the protection of the area: 6 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 North Kent Marshes - Support (B), the new name would create more awareness of the site: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 North Kent Marshes - Support (B), it is only an administrative change: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 North Kent Marshes - Extend the LLD to cover Graveney Marshes: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 North Kent Marshes - A more flexible approach to boundaries is needed: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 Wantsum Channel - Support (C): 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 Wantsum Channel - (D) ensures the protection of the area: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 Wantsum Channel - Support (D), it makes sense to align the site with the district boundary: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 Wantsum Channel - Support (D), it makes sense to include the shoreline: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 Wantsum Channel - The area covered should be expanded further: 1 comment | The assessment carried out did not recommend expanding the area. We do not rule out further expansion, but it would be helpful to know the extent of any expansion people would like to see.  |
| NE4 North Downs - Support (E): 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 North Downs - (F) ensures the protection of the area: 4 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 North Downs - Support (F), AONB designation provides higher protection than LLD status: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 North Downs - Boundaries need to be reassessed as parts of Chartham are not currently included, but should be: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 Blean Woods - Support (G) as the boundaries should remain as currently identified: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 Blean Woods - Support (H) as it provides additional protection to farmland: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 Blean Woods - (K) ensures the protection of the area: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 Blean Woods - Extend the boundary to include Neals Place and Duke's Meadow: 6 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 Blean Woods - Extend the boundary to the east of Blean Woods, to include area C4, Ford and Maypole farmland: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 Stour Valley - Support (L): 4 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 Stour Valley - (L) places greater emphasis on maintaining the ecological integrity of the Stour Valley: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 Stour Valley - (M) ensures the protection of the area: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 Stour Valley - More protection needs to be given to the Stour Valley in and around Canterbury: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 Canterbury AHLV - (N) provides more protection than option (O): 11 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 Canterbury AHLV - (N) allows a more flexible approach: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 Canterbury AHLV - (O) ensures the protection of the area: 6 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 Canterbury AHLV - The criteria-based approach (O) offers would best address potential impacts: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE4 Canterbury AHLV - Retain Canterbury AHLV as currently identified: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 Canterbury AHLV - Disagree that the landscape is not high quality enough to justify a landscape designation: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE4 Canterbury AHLV - Boundaries need amending to restrict development, not to allow for more: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 - Support (A) as development in green gaps should remain tightly restricted: 10 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 - (B) ensures the protection of the area: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 - (B) maximises the health benefits of open green space: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 - (B) is acceptable providing any development does not have a negative impact: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 - Concern (B) would allow planning permission to be granted for housing and roads in green gaps: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 - Insufficient detail given on proposed boundary changes to be able to form an opinion: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 - Introduce a policy of no further residential or commercial development in green gaps, as and when needed to apply this: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 - Green gaps need to be protected: 10 comments | Noted. The Local Plan will include policies to protect the green gaps from inappropriate development.  |
| NE5 Sturry/Westbere - (C) ensures the protection of the area: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 Sturry/Westbere - Support (D): 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 Sturry/Westbere - Support (D) as the inclusion of the building to the east seems to serve no purpose: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 Sturry/Hersden - (E) ensures the protection of the area: 4 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 Sturry/Hersden - Support (F): 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 Sturry/Hersden - Support (F) as the inclusion of the garage site seems to serve no purpose: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 Herne Bay/Whitstable - Support (G) as it seems reasonable to keep some areas in the gap even if they are not open countryside: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 Herne Bay/Whitstable - (H) ensures the protection of the area: 4 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 Sturry/Broad Oak - (J) ensures the protection of the area: 6 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 Sturry/Broad Oak - No need to change the boundary: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 Canterbury/Tyler Hill - (K) prevents potential settlement merge: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 Canterbury/Tyler Hill - (L) ensures the protection of the area: 5 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 Canterbury/Tyler Hill - Support (L): 4 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 Canterbury/Bridge - Support (M): 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 Canterbury/Bridge - (N) ensures the protection of the area: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 Canterbury/Bridge - Support (N) as it allows for boundary changes to be considered in the future: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 Canterbury/Bridge - The boundary should be extended: 1 comment | The assessment carried out did not recommend expanding the area. We do not rule out further expansion, but it would be helpful to know the extent of any expansion people would like to see.  |
| NE5 Canterbury/Bridge - Retain the boundary as currently identified and do not think about opportunities to change it: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 Canterbury/Sturry - Support (P): 6 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 Canterbury/Sturry - Support (P), strict development control in this area is very much needed: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 Canterbury/Sturry - (P) ensures the protection of the area: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 Blean/Rough Common - Support (R): 6 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 Blean/Rough Common - (R) ensures the protection of the area: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 Blean/Rough Common - 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 | Noted. |
| NE5 - Support (S): 9 comments | Noted. We will undertake further review on the potential for new green gaps as we prepare the Draft Local Plan.  |
| NE5 - (S) ensures the protection of green gaps: 6 comments | Noted. We will undertake further review on the potential for new green gaps as we prepare the Draft Local Plan.  |
| NE5 - Support (T) as limited land is available for development: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 - New green gaps may be needed, particularly if a new freestanding settlement is developed: 4 comments | Noted. We will undertake further review on the potential for new green gaps as we prepare the Draft Local Plan.  |
| NE5 - Green gap between Rough Common and Canterbury should be defined: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 - Green gap between Sturry and Herne should be defined: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 - Green gap between Thanington and Chartham should be defined: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE5 - Green gap between Harbledown and Canterbury should be defined: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 - Green gap between Fordwich and Canterbury should be defined: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 - Green gap between Lower Herne and Canterbury should be defined: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE5 - Green gap between Radfall and Chestfield should be defined: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE6 - Support (B): 16 comments | Noted. |
| NE6 - (B) would enhance dark skies: 4 comments | Noted. |
| NE6 - (B) allows tighter control than the current approach: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE6 - The council should work with developers to achieve minimum glare from domestic and street lighting: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE6 - Light is needed in residential areas for safety: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE6 - Downlighting can be used to provide security: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE6 - Outdated street lighting needs modernising: 1 comment | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan. The vast majority of street lighting within the district is owned and managed by Kent County Council, not Canterbury City Council. |
| NE6 - Low level direction lighting is needed in order to preserve tranquillity: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE6 - Street lighting should be turned off at 11pm in suburban and rural areas: 1 comment | This is not within the scope of the Local Plan. The vast majority of street lighting within the district is owned and managed by Kent County Council, not Canterbury City Council. |
| NE7 - Support (A), it is important to protect wildlife: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE7 - Support (A), it is important to protect green spaces: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE7 - Support (A) as (B) would allow for more development: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE7 - Support (B) as it offers the most protection: 24 comments | Noted. |
| NE7 - (B) should include criteria relating to historic character and significance: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE7 - Support the commitment to renewing the Open Spaces Strategy: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE7 - Explore the option of a Stour Valley regional park: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE7 - Involve local residents in agreeing any compensation issues for loss of open space: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE8 - Support (A): 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE8 - Support (B): 9 comments | Noted. |
| NE8 - Support (B) as the current approach does not work: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE8 - Support (B) as it offers a more structured approach: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE8 - (B) seems sensible: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE8 - There is no need for specific sites for sports as they can be played in any open space: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE8 - Sports provision must be in addition to, not instead of, public open spaces provision: 2 comments | Noted.  |
| NE8 - Consult local residents on what sports facilities they would like provided: 2 comments | This consultation was open to all residents and sought views on these issues. |
| NE9 - Support (B), it is essential to protect and enhance green spaces as they are vital to people’s wellbeing: 16 comments | Noted. |
| NE9 - Work proactively with communities to assess the potential for new local green spaces: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE9 - Consult local residents to see what they think: 1 comment | This consultation was open to all residents and sought views on these issues. |
| NE9 - Encourage residents to use their local green spaces more: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE10 - Support (A) as the strictest measures need to be taken to ensure coastal protection: 7 comments | Noted. |
| NE10 - Support (A) as it is safer to prevent all development in these areas: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE10 - (A) needs to account for climate change affecting water levels: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE10 - Support (B) providing it does not inhibit the delivery of future coastal protection work: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE10 - Support (B) as a case-by-case approach to coastal protection seems sensible: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE10 - (B) is acceptable providing it only applies to existing properties and there would be no new development in these areas: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE10 - (B) must be approached with caution as coastal erosion may occur in unexpected ways: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE10 - Seasalter is susceptible not just to wave overtopping but also to coastal erosion: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE11 - Support (B), SuDS make economic and environmental sense: 13 comments | Noted. |
| NE11 - Support (B) but it needs strengthening: 3 comments | Noted. |
| NE11 - (B) would minimise the impact on public sewers: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE11 - It is fairer that SuDS should apply to all developments rather than only major ones: 3 comments | Noted. The Local Plan can set policies for the types of development where SuDS will be required.  |
| NE11 - SuDS should apply to all developments of 10 or more dwellings: 1 comment | Noted.The Local Plan can set policies for the types of development where SuDS will be required. |
| NE11 - All drainage options should be considered for deliverability as SuDS may not be suitable for all developments: 3 comments | Noted.The Local Plan can set policies for the types of development where SuDS will be required. |
| NE11 - Insufficient evidence provided to be able to form an opinion: 1 comment | Noted. Further information will be provided during our next phase of consultation.  |
| NE11 - The council should provide guidance on SuDS for all development applications as a matter of course: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| NE12 - Support (B): 13 comments | Noted. |
| NE12 - Support (B) as it better protects groundwater supplies: 6 comments | Noted. |
| NE12 - Support (B) as water safety is very important: 2 comments | Noted. |
| NE12 - Support (B) as an accurate assessment of current capacity is essential: 1 comment | Noted. |
| NE12 - Encourage the provision of water holding tanks for homes to use: 1 comment | Noted.  |
| NE12 - Insufficient evidence provided to be able to form an opinion: 1 comment | Noted. Further information will be provided during our next phase of consultation.  |