**Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045**

# **Chapter 3: Whitstable**

| **Policy** | **Number of written comments** |
| --- | --- |
| W1: Whitstable Town Centre strategy | 140 |
| W2: Whitstable Harbour | 100 |
| W3: Whitstable urban area | 154 |
| W4: South Whitstable | 202 |
| W5: Land at Brooklands Farm | 528 |
| W6: Land south of Thanet Way | 171 |
| W7: Land at Golden Hill | 144 |
| W8: Bodkin Farm | 173 |
| W9: St Vincent’s Centre | 74 |
| W10: Kingsdown Park | 74 |
| Other comments | 62 |

## Policy W1: Whitstable Town Centre Strategy

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Traffic congestion is a problem | 23 |
| Sewers are struggling | 17 |
| No new homes | 16 |
| Object to Brooklands Farm development | 14 |
| Infrastructure needs improving | 14 |
| Support Crab and Winkle extension | 9 |
| Utilise brownfield sites and build in urban areas | 8 |
| Sustainable travel is not practical | 6 |
| Object to Brookland Farm development | 6 |
| Proposal lacks detail | 5 |
| Support local community infrastructure, leisure centre etc. | 5 |
| Protect wildlife and habitats | 5 |
| Chestfield will no longer be a village | 5 |
| Protect green field sites | 5 |
| Policy is vague | 5 |
| Improve all infrastructure | 3 |
| Complete facilities lost by the fire at the crab and winkle | 3 |
| Pleased with new trees being planted | 3 |
| No more homes | 3 |
| Car parking for health centre at the harbour | 3 |
| Stop developments in town centre | 3 |
| Parking to be provided in new developments | 2 |
| Proposed development would devastate the area | 2 |
| Leave Whitstable as it is | 2 |
| Have a park and ride for day visitors | 2 |
| Protect green spaces | 2 |
| Have more residential accommodation in town centre | 2 |
| Less focus on night time economy | 1 |
| Build on brown sites | 1 |
| Use of sustainable transport is not practical | 1 |
| Crab and winkle is dark and dangerous at night | 1 |
| Plan is not viable | 1 |
| Pedestrianise harbour street | 1 |
| Improve walking/cycling routes | 1 |
| Town is over taken by visitors | 1 |
| Local people can't afford homes | 1 |
| Don’t destroy habitats | 1 |
| Parking is an issue | 1 |
| Development no benefit to local community | 1 |
| Stop allowing second homes | 1 |
| Concern of flood risks | 1 |
| Swimming pool / leisure centre needed | 1 |
| Protect green belt, avoid urban sprawl | 1 |
| Lack of medical care | 1 |
| Stronger emphasis on impact on the environment | 1 |
| Sort the problem of empty shops | 1 |
| Implement a one way system | 1 |
| Install EV charging | 1 |
| Include more on retaining character of the town | 1 |
| Too much dependence on development | 1 |
| Retain the harbour as a working harbour, not an attraction | 1 |
| Protect the beach | 1 |
| Further detail needed on how to reduce traffic | 1 |
| Install residents only parking permits | 1 |
| Make high street more pedestrian friendly | 1 |
| Expand car parks | 1 |
| Do not support park and ride | 1 |
| Provide community spaces for residents | 1 |
| Engage residents with all growth | 1 |
| Town is becoming an urban sprawl | 1 |
| Problem with sewage in town | 1 |
| Not clear how park & ride would reduce congestion | 1 |
| Prioritise affordable housing for local people | 1 |
| Stop second homes | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered.

Comments regarding the improvement of infrastructure have been considered and up-to-date infrastructure considerations have been outlined in the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2024).

## Policy W2: Whitstable Harbour

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Maintain a working harbour | 11 |
| Improve infrastructure | 7 |
| Need affordable housing for locals | 4 |
| Object to the policy | 4 |
| Consider a one way system | 3 |
| Incorporate marine plan policies | 3 |
| Concern of traffic congestion | 3 |
| Not enough support for intended growth | 3 |
| Support fishing industry to survive | 3 |
| Object to residential accommodation | 3 |
| Protect original harbour | 3 |
| Cannot just be a holiday town | 3 |
| Lacking detail | 2 |
| Stop SW dumping sewage in the sea | 2 |
| Further harbour development may be limited | 2 |
| No new houses | 2 |
| Protect greenfield sites | 1 |
| Restore the fish market | 1 |
| Improve infrastructure | 1 |
| Prioritise urgent work | 1 |
| Improve traffic and public transport | 1 |
| Specifics needed to not harm the current characteristic | 1 |
| Disagree with fishing | 1 |
| Start a small ferry service in the harbour | 1 |
| Make the harbour a year round destination for residents | 1 |
| Development is unnecessary | 1 |
| Park and ride needed | 1 |
| Strategic plan is not accessible online | 1 |
| Move Brett gravel to another location | 1 |
| Any changes should reflect marine environment | 1 |
| Reinstate crab and winkle line to mark historic significance | 1 |
| Instal playground and under cover shops | 1 |
| Cycling is not appropriate in the harbour | 1 |
| Disagree with residential use | 1 |
| Support the policy | 1 |
| Don't commit to different types of usage for the site | 1 |
| Commercial use should include health care | 1 |
| Concern it will move trade away from high street | 1 |
| Areas are included that are not within the harbour estate | 1 |
| Need to split the harbour estate and near harbour land | 1 |
| Improve walking/cycling from the station | 1 |
| Conflicting policy DM8 | 1 |
| Infrastructure assessment needed to address requirements of DM8 | 1 |
| Agree with redevelopment of harbour | 1 |
| Support residential development | 1 |
| Develop area around the swimming pool and bowling alley | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Policy wording has been added to ensure existing uses such as fishing and mineral handling are sensitively integrated within any redevelopment. A point has been added to the policy that the council will prepare a detailed Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the site to ensure an appropriate balance of uses, and that proposals for residential development ahead of this SPD will not be supported.Community facilities and services have also been added as appropriate uses for the site.

## Policy W3: Whitstable urban area

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Infrastructure needs improving | 23 |
| Keep green space | 20 |
| Keep rural landscape the way it is | 19 |
| Concerns of over population | 16 |
| Stop second homes | 13 |
| Will create more traffic congestion | 13 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 13 |
| Concern of sewage problems increasing | 12 |
| Concern for wildlife losing their habitats | 10 |
| Should keep farmland | 8 |
| How are KCC going to afford all the new roads and schools | 7 |
| Object to Brooklands Farm development | 7 |
| Object to Bodkin Farm development | 7 |
| Will have a big negative impact on the town | 4 |
| Object to the plan | 4 |
| Consider the wellbeing and open spaces for residents | 3 |
| Improve infrastructure | 3 |
| Do not over develop urban areas | 3 |
| Encourage physical exercise | 3 |
| Strengthen policy wording | 3 |
| Keep rural landscape the way it is | 3 |
| No more building, avoid urban sprawl | 3 |
| Concern of sewage issues | 3 |
| Prevent development until sewage is sorted | 3 |
| Object to park and ride | 3 |
| Concern of losing heritage | 3 |
| Increase health facilities | 2 |
| Will create more traffic congestion | 2 |
| Build housing that locals can afford | 2 |
| Area is already over developed | 2 |
| Disagree that whitstable has seen limited growth | 2 |
| Protect environment and landscape | 2 |
| Keep bodkin farm as a green gap | 2 |
| Improvements needed to public transport | 1 |
| Need another secondary school | 1 |
| Bodkin Farm is wrong location for secondary school | 1 |
| Chestfield will no longer feel like a village | 1 |
| Put the park and ride somewhere else | 1 |
| Approve improvements to crab and winkle line | 1 |
| Make parking more affordable for locals | 1 |
| Sustainable travel is unrealistic | 1 |
| Much stronger commitment to community facilities needed | 1 |
| Need to recognise significance of Victory Wood | 1 |
| Need to maintain and repair existing pathways | 1 |
| Build more homes closer to Canterbury | 1 |
| Support new school development | 1 |
| Disagree with new schools | 1 |
| Concern of increase in ASB | 1 |
| Locate sports facility near Chestfield cricket ground | 1 |
| Point 8 to include PRoW | 1 |
| Add West Cliffe Bank in point 8 | 1 |
| Support development of Bodkin Farm | 1 |
| Support developments of schools | 1 |
| Need more detail in the policy | 1 |
| Need to look at green sustainable developments | 1 |
| Concern increase of traffic and safety along Chestfield Rd | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The provision of new A299 slip roads has been added to the policy. Following representations from Whitstable Medical Practice, reference to the provision of health infrastructure at Estuary View has also been added to the policy. Following representations from KCC, reference has also been added to the England Coast Path National Trail as a specific area to be protected.

## Policy W4: South Whitstable

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Improve infrastructure | 25 |
| Existing sewage system cannot cope | 21 |
| Too many houses | 18 |
| Object to Brooklands Farm | 16 |
| Keep rural landscape the way it is | 15 |
| Improve crab and winkle line | 14 |
| Need to improve overall infrastructure | 12 |
| Sufficient crossings will be needed on Thanet Way | 11 |
| Have good sizes pathways and clear cycle lanes | 11 |
| Stop London Councils buying homes | 11 |
| Only build on brownfield sites | 10 |
| Local highway improvement needed | 9 |
| Brooklands Farm is SSSI site | 8 |
| Risk to endangered species on the sites | 8 |
| Reduce amount of second homes | 8 |
| Improve public transport | 8 |
| Concern of overpopulation | 7 |
| Too many other developments in the area | 7 |
| Should allow Grasmere and Thanet Way developments to settle before approving more | 7 |
| Concern of flood risks | 7 |
| Development will change the nature of the area | 5 |
| Roads are already congested | 5 |
| Concern KCC can't afford 5 new schools | 4 |
| Chestfield should remain a village | 4 |
| Object to building on greenfield sites | 4 |
| Scheme for making money for developers | 4 |
| Object | 3 |
| South Whitstable is artificial and inaccurate | 3 |
| Improving sewage system must be priority | 3 |
| Welcome new school facilities | 3 |
| Concern losing farmland for food security | 3 |
| Chapters 1 and 2 need to be addressed | 2 |
| Need greenfield sites to produce quality housing areas | 2 |
| Plan enables Whitstable for further growth | 2 |
| Support the policy | 2 |
| Access to Blean Woods for equestrians | 2 |
| Need to include increased health care provision | 2 |
| Improve local transport and sustainable travel to Brooklands site | 2 |
| Concern of traffic increase on Old Thanet Way | 2 |
| Clear plan on what the community hub is | 2 |
| Improve transport links | 2 |
| Too many houses | 2 |
| Avoid urban sprawl | 2 |
| Question the need for diversion of South Street | 2 |
| Development threaten the green gap | 2 |
| Roads are already too congested | 2 |
| Existing sewage system can't cope | 2 |
| Build more bungalows | 1 |
| Improve infrastructure before building | 1 |
| Keep rural landscape the way it is | 1 |
| Strongly object to policy | 1 |
| Local people won’t be able to afford the new homes | 1 |
| How will the doormouse be protected | 1 |
| Will reduce quality of life for residents | 1 |
| Reduce the number of houses being built on Brooklands farm | 1 |
| Development will create a bottleneck of traffic | 1 |
| Inadequate diagrams | 1 |
| Too many developments happening in the area | 1 |
| Concern of reducing farm land | 1 |
| Build on brownfield sites first | 1 |
| This is an area of high biodiversity value | 1 |
| SSSI status should remain | 1 |
| Would destroy the nature of Whitstable | 1 |
| Eliminate second home owners | 1 |
| Improve leisure facilities for residents | 1 |
| Proposed sites are outside settlement boundary of Whitstable | 1 |
| In favour of SEN school | 1 |
| Increase amount of affordable housing | 1 |
| More open spaces are needed | 1 |
| Agree with park and ride | 1 |
| Protect the wildlife | 1 |
| Out of town greenfield sites are not suitable for older persons accommodation | 1 |
| Keep the green gaps | 1 |
| More social housing needed | 1 |
| Build a new GP surgery | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The policy status has been removed to allow for more flexibility and avoid repetition from the other policies in this chapter. The text is now included as supporting commentary.

## Policy W5: Land at Brooklands Farm

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Strongly object | 187 |
| Area needs agricultural land for food security | 111 |
| Improve sewage system | 85 |
| Improve infrastructure | 63 |
| Too many other developments in the area | 61 |
| Concern of flooding risk | 56 |
| Will have a negative effect on local residents | 55 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 54 |
| Keep the landscape how it is | 47 |
| Concerns of overpopulation | 37 |
| Impact assessment to be carried out on the woods | 33 |
| Concern if developer is unable to deliver | 32 |
| Conflicts other policies | 29 |
| Object to Molehill Rd housing land | 17 |
| Brooklands is too far removed from current town facilities | 13 |
| Full traffic assessment needed for Tankerton and Chestfield | 12 |
| Limited capacity for water supply | 9 |
| Site design needs to avoid water pipes | 6 |
| Strengthen wording to protect trees | 6 |
| Local housing need does not justify site | 4 |
| Disperse higher density dwellings | 3 |
| Garden city approach not feasible | 3 |
| SEN school should be attached to a general school | 3 |
| Do not support proposed new green gap | 3 |
| New slip roads needed | 3 |
| Area needs agricultural land for food security | 3 |
| Will have a negative effect on local residents | 3 |
| Development is too big | 2 |
| Strongly object | 2 |
| Concern of loss of character | 2 |
| Protect wildlife | 2 |
| Homes are unaffordable | 2 |
| Improve infrastructure | 2 |
| Keep the green gaps | 2 |
| Have a smaller development at Brooklands Farm | 2 |
| Little evidence more retail space is needed | 1 |
| Will ruin character of chestfield | 1 |
| Proposed entrance will not be able to meet demand | 1 |
| Concern of traffic pollution | 1 |
| Only build on brownfield sites | 1 |
| Maintenance needed on Invicta Way | 1 |
| Area is of high landscape value as part of Blean Woods | 1 |
| Less housing and more open space | 1 |
| Impressed with clarity of the design | 1 |
| Artefacts on the site need to be protected | 1 |
| Improve public transport | 1 |
| Build the schools first | 1 |
| Build homes for local people | 1 |
| Clarity on what the community infrastructure covers | 1 |
| Protect Church Street | 1 |
| Do not take away the cricket club | 1 |
| Walking and cycling routes need to include equestrian | 1 |
| Health care provision is needed | 1 |
| Bungalows should be 5% of overall development | 1 |
| Demand for older persons now does not mean there will be one in future | 1 |
| Community hub to be centrally located between development and Whitstable | 1 |
| Support the change to landscape boundary | 1 |
| Suggest new woodlands and hedging to reduce noise impact | 1 |
| Development proposes harm to Swalecliffe brook | 1 |
| Plans lack recreational open space | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. A number of new criteria have been added to the policy in response to representations made. Point 1c has been added for the provision of a new cricket pitch and facilities for Chestfield Cricket Club, point 2g requires the location of older persons housing to be within the community hub, point 3c requires the site to assess potential for functionally linked land for golden plover and point 3e requires the site to retain and protect ancient woodland.

Comments on transport and traffic concerns have been noted. The council is progressing with transport modelling work to better understand the mobility patterns in the area and how the development can best accommodate these. More detailed evidence will be published for the next iteration of the draft Local Plan.

Comments regarding the improvement of infrastructure have been considered and up-to-date infrastructure considerations have been outlined in the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2024).

The yield for the site has been revised following further assessment to reflect the latest available evidence. Further information on these changes is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy W6: Land south of Thanet Way

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Object to the plan | 23 |
| Improve sewage system | 21 |
| Improve infrastructure | 19 |
| Too many other developments | 17 |
| Do not build on valuable farmland | 16 |
| Consider future health care provision | 15 |
| Good location with access to facilities | 12 |
| Will ruin open spaces in the area | 9 |
| Extra infrastructure is not required for this development | 5 |
| Support sustainable development | 5 |
| Water resource has limited capacity | 4 |
| Park and bus facility needed | 4 |
| Concern of increased traffic | 3 |
| Greater provision of bungalows needed | 2 |
| Save the rural landscape | 2 |
| No more houses | 2 |
| Houses are unaffordable for locals | 2 |
| Improve ASB in the town centre | 2 |
| New schools are needed | 1 |
| Area is exempt from development | 1 |
| Save the green gaps | 1 |
| Better health care provision | 1 |
| Avoid urban sprawl | 1 |
| Negative impact on residents | 1 |
| Risk of flooding | 1 |
| Build sustainable housing | 1 |
| Will destroy the character of the town | 1 |
| Artefacts likely to be found on site | 1 |
| No connection with Crab and Winkle | 1 |
| Use an existing car park for park and ride | 1 |
| Oppose creation of cycle route | 1 |
| Restrict amount of development | 1 |
| Not a suitable site for development | 1 |
| Conserve the open space | 1 |
| Concern in increase of air pollution | 1 |
| Plan goes against biodiversity net gain aims | 1 |
| Walking and cycling routes to include equestrian | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Point 3c has been added to the policy for the site to assess potential for functionally linked land for golden plover, following representations from Natural England.

Comments regarding the improvement of infrastructure have been considered and up-to-date infrastructure considerations have been outlined in the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2024).

The yield for the site has been revised following further assessment to reflect the latest available evidence. Further information on these changes is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy W7: Land at Golden Hill

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Improve infrastructure | 21 |
| Strongly object | 18 |
| Too many developments | 17 |
| Do not build on farmland | 12 |
| Keep green gaps | 10 |
| Improve sewage system | 7 |
| Does not contribute to park and bus facility | 5 |
| Concern increase in traffic | 4 |
| Homes are unaffordable | 4 |
| Consider this site in separate policy | 3 |
| Do not build on farmland | 3 |
| Avoid urban sprawl | 3 |
| Build single story homes | 2 |
| No concern for wildlife or environment | 1 |
| Improve public transport | 1 |
| Will destroy character of town | 1 |
| Developers must pay for better sewage | 1 |
| Concern of flood risk | 1 |
| Scrap park and ride | 1 |
| No benefit to walkway to Golden hill | 1 |
| Site unsuitable for development | 1 |
| Include equestrian on walking and cycling routes | 1 |
| Improve health care | 1 |
| Have negative impact on local residents | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Due to concerns around land availability and a conflict with a green infrastructure designation, the policy has been removed from the plan. Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

## Policy W8: Bodkin Farm

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Infrastructure needs improving | 42 |
| Concern of increase in traffic | 31 |
| Keep the green gap | 29 |
| Do not build on farmland | 16 |
| Improve sewage | 15 |
| Save wildlife and ecosystem | 13 |
| Too many other developments | 13 |
| Strongly disagree | 10 |
| Do not direct traffic down Maydowns Road | 10 |
| Welcome new school facilities | 8 |
| Site has drainage issues | 6 |
| Too many houses | 5 |
| Leave as green space | 4 |
| Only build on brownfield sites | 3 |
| Extra school is not needed | 3 |
| Extend the schools we already have | 2 |
| Prioritise this development | 2 |
| Wrong location for secondary school | 1 |
| Will spoil area for existing residents | 1 |
| Just build a school, no houses | 1 |
| Will ruin character of local area | 1 |
| Cycle path needs widening | 1 |
| Information on health care needed | 1 |
| Concern of flood risk | 1 |
| Schools does not solve the issue in town | 1 |
| Site is unsuitable for homes | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. A policy criterion has been added to retain and redevelop the existing Bodkin Farm buildings, where appropriate (point 2g).

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy W9: St Vincent’s Centre

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Essential to provide parking | 10 |
| Improvement to the junction needed | 7 |
| Concern in noise and traffic pollution | 6 |
| Strongly object |  |
| Make housing affordable | 6 |
| This should be removed from the plan | 4 |
| Improve sewage | 3 |
| Site should have secondary school instead of housing | 2 |
| No more houses | 1 |
| Include community facilities | 1 |
| Should be used for St Mary's school | 1 |
| Negative affect on local residents | 1 |
| Policy is too vague | 1 |
| Identify where healthcare provision will be | 1 |
| Zero carbon building | 1 |
| Build for local housing need | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. Numerous representations were received expressing concern about the loss of school drop off/pick up parking. However, through KCC Education, confirmation was received from Kent Catholic Schools Partnership that there is no agreement between St Mary’s Primary School and St Vincent’s Centre to use the car park. A requirement for a parking study has been added to the policy (point 4d).

For all site allocation policies, the detailed open space figures and housing mix requirements have been removed from the policies themselves and replaced with a reference to the relevant policy later in the Local Plan (DS1, DS2 and DS24). These changes provide greater clarity and to aid policy interpretation, in order that the appropriate mix of housing and open space provision is secured at application stage.

## Policy W10: Kingsdown Park

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Too many houses | 8 |
| This is now a family home | 6 |
| Keep within the character of the area | 4 |
| Improve the junction | 4 |
| Concern of environmental issues | 3 |
| Strongly object | 3 |
| Area is over developed | 3 |
| Use it for St Mary’s school | 2 |
| Do not change the junction | 1 |
| Essential to provide parking spaces | 1 |
| Good use of space | 1 |
| Improve sewage | 1 |
| Stop second home owners | 1 |
| Restore the current building | 1 |
| Retain existing trees | 1 |
| Sustainable carbon housing | 1 |
| Meet local housing need | 1 |
| Policy has little detail | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. It was recognised that the property had been sold and contact was made with the new owners via post. As no response was received from the new landowner, it was presumed that the site was no longer available for development and the site has now been removed from the plan. Further information on the removal of this policy is contained within the Development Topic Paper (2024).

## Other comments

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Improve walking and cycling routes | 11 |
| Do not over develop the town | 9 |
| Improve the sewage | 9 |
| Parking is too expensive | 9 |
| Keep farmland to produce food | 9 |
| Provide allotments and green space | 9 |
| Keep the character of Whitstable | 9 |
| Local plan needs to be changed | 8 |
| How will KCC cope with costs of new schools | 5 |
| We have a declining population with no need for housing | 4 |
| Too many developments in the area | 4 |
| Keep the green gaps | 3 |
| Concern of increase traffic | 3 |
| Do not build on Bodkin Farm | 3 |
| Put a police station back in Whitstable | 2 |
| Keep housing for local people | 2 |
| Require a new school in the area | 2 |
| Stop second home ownership | 1 |
| Protect wildlife | 1 |
| Plan lacks detail | 1 |
| Build more social housing | 1 |
| Flooding risks | 1 |
| Retain character of Chestfield | 1 |
| Improve health care provision | 1 |
| Avoid urban sprawl | 1 |
| No reference to marine environment | 1 |
| More opportunities for development in Whitstable | 1 |

All of the representations made on this chapter have been analysed and considered. Based on feedback, the number of new homes planned for has been reduced and a number of allocations removed from the draft Local Plan.

Improvements to walking and cycling routes have been reviewed and are outlined in an updated draft Local Cycling and Walking Implementation Plan (LCWIP) which forms part of the draft Canterbury District Transport Strategy (2024).