**Draft Canterbury District Local Plan to 2045**

# Chapter **4: Herne Bay**

| **Policy** | **Number of written comments** |
| --- | --- |
| HB1: Herne Bay Town Centre strategy | 28 |
| HB2: Herne Bay Town Centre regeneration and opportunity areas | 22 |
| HB3: Herne Bay urban area | 32 |
| HB4: Land to the west of Thornden Wood Road | 38 |
| HB5: Land comprising nursery industrial units and former Kent Ambulance Station | 18 |
| HB6: Hawthorn Corner | 20 |
| HB7: Former gas holder site | 15 |
| HB8: Altira | 22 |
| HB9: Former metric site | 17 |
| HB10: Eddington Business Park | 21 |
| Other comments | 9 |

## **Policy** HB1**: Herne Bay Town Centre Strategy**

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Support for development | 4 |
| Flawed Consultation Process (Inaccessible for many) | 3 |
| Draft plan focuses on inadequate and inaccurate proposals | 2 |
| Oppose Solar Farm Development | 2 |
| Consultation Bias towards Property Developers | 2 |
| Brownfield Sites to be built on rather than Green belt land | 2 |
| Mortimer Street is Herne Bay's de facto High Street and should remain so | 2 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper illegitimate | 2 |
| Any New Developments should focus on Sustainability credentials | 1 |
| Call for more Sand Based activities | 1 |
| Time limit should be set for cyclists (from 12pm) | 1 |
| Proposal of land for development at Thanet Way from Pegasus Group | 1 |
| No inclusion of Broomfield or Herne in the Local Plan | 1 |
| No new houses needed | 1 |
| No ring roads needed | 1 |
| Improve Transport Links | 1 |
| Car parks should not be built on | 1 |
| One school is not enough for Herne Bay | 1 |
| No mention of parking requirements | 1 |
| Increased Pedestrian Provision for any new developments | 1 |
| Improve Condition of Band Stand and King's Hall | 1 |
| Focus on Regenerating the Sea Front | 1 |
| Waste Provision (Bins) | 1 |
| Consider crossing by Herne Bay Cemetery | 1 |
| Improve Traffic flows | 1 |
| More emphasis on Walking/Cyclists | 1 |
| The Parish is not included in the Hierarchy of Settlements in the Canterbury area | 1 |
| No mention of infrastructure that would be needed | 1 |
| Focus on preserving Herne Bay's existing character | 1 |

While all representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered, the majority were in support. Two points have been added to the policy. Point 7 outlines that the council supports redeveloping and improving the pier and Point 9 has been amended to require bin storage to be located to the rear of buildings.

## Policy HB2: Herne Bay Town Centre regeneration and opportunity areas

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Regenerate Brownfield Land | 2 |
| Flawed Consultation Process (Inaccessible for many) | 1 |
| Plan based on Inadequate and Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Consultation Bias towards Property Developers | 1 |
| More Efforts to Tackle Antisocial Behaviour | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper illegitimate | 1 |
| More Resident Engagement/Consultations | 1 |
| Increase Planting of vegetation | 1 |
| Ensure Free Passage does not become Wind Tunnel | 1 |
| Reconsider One Way System | 1 |
| Regenerate Wimereux Square | 1 |
| Give Specific reference to PRoW Network & England Coast Path National Trail | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm Development | 1 |
| Sewage Improvements | 1 |
| Preserve Existing Character | 1 |
| Create Master Plan for Brownfield Sites | 1 |
| Retain William Street Coach Park | 1 |
| Don't build on Car Parks | 1 |
| Road Network improvements to support development | 1 |
| Oppose New Ring Road | 1 |

All representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. A criterion has been added to the policy that the council must prepare detailed Development Briefs for all Regeneration Opportunity Areas to quantify development potential and ensure attractive and sustainable design.

## Policy HB3: Herne Bay urban area

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Strongly Oppose Policies SS1-5 and C1-26 | 2 |
| Policy DS8 and HB10 should be reconsidered | 2 |
| Draft Plan Based on Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Number of Residential Units is Excessive and Should be Reconsidered Based on Census Data | 1 |
| Wording of Policy Lacks Sustainability Credentials Which Would Make It Received More Positively | 1 |
| Too Much Emphasis on Herne Bay As A Tourist Destination | 1 |
| Upgrade Existing Social Housing/Private Rent Stock | 1 |
| More Focus On Youth Facilities/Activities | 1 |
| Expansion of Indoor Sports Facilities | 1 |
| Thanet Way Development Potential Should be Recognised | 1 |
| Plan Has Great Reliance On Development In Canterbury | 1 |
| Create Master Plan for Brownfield Sites | 1 |
| Regenerate Brownfield Land | 1 |
| Give Specific reference to PRoW Network & England Coast Path National Trail | 1 |
| Reduction in Proposed Development Numbers | 1 |
| Provision of More Open Space In New Housing Developments | 1 |
| Upgrade Viking Way Cycle Path From Whitstable to Reculver | 1 |
| More Efficient Pedestrian/Cycle Routes Connecting Town To Support New Development | 1 |
| Fast Bus Service To Whitstable | 1 |
| Sewage Improvements | 1 |
| Improve Infrastructure and Facilities Before Authorising Further Development | 1 |
| Employment Development Areas Are Too Focused On Locations Which Will Increase Congestion | 1 |
| Economy Will Become Commuter Dominated | 1 |
| Oppose Housing Development | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm Development | 1 |
| Consultation Bias Towards Developers (Inaccessible) | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper illegitimate | 1 |
| Development at Altria Park Is Too Far From Centre of Herne Bay | 1 |
| No Provision for Independent Businesses at Altria | 1 |
| Further Consultation With Local Residents Required | 1 |
| Independent Businesses need protecting at all costs | 1 |
| Support for New School | 1 |
| New Secondary School Should Not be Funded By Developments In Canterbury | 1 |
| Provision Of Just One School Is Not Enough | 1 |
| Existing Road Network to be Maintained Before Further Development | 1 |
| New Footpath From Thorndon Woods to Crab and Winkle as Existing too Muddy | 1 |
| Protect the Natural Environment | 1 |
| General Grounds Maintenance Needs Improving | 1 |
| Oppose Housing Development | 1 |
| Oppose New Ring Road | 1 |
| Regenerate Brownfield Land | 1 |

All representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. No changes have been made to the policy.

## Policy HB4: Land to the west of Thornden Wood Road

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Traffic and Congestion Concerns | 4 |
| Oppose Building In Green Gap | 3 |
| Support for New Schools | 2 |
| The green gap to W8 must be maintained | 2 |
| Preserve Existing Natural Landscape | 2 |
| New Housing Developments Should Be For Local People | 1 |
| Further assessment work to see if any of proposed coastal site allocations are likely to result in loss of functionally-linked land which is critical for supporting designated site populations of mobile bird species | 1 |
| KCC request further detail and explanation | 1 |
| Development Could Be Larger/Denser | 1 |
| Focus On Independent Businesses Rather Than Large Retail Ones | 1 |
| Improve Sustainability Credentials Of New Developments | 1 |
| Improve Open Space Provision Of New Developments | 1 |
| School Should Be Built At Same Time As Any Housing Developments | 1 |
| New School Should Be In East Of Herne Bay | 1 |
| More Housing Near Proposed School To Alleviate Pressure Elsewhere | 1 |
| Drainage Improvements Before Development | 1 |
| Policy Encourages Urban Sprawl Westwards Without Infrastructure Improvements | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| No Further Residential Or Commercial Development | 1 |
| Call For More Social Housing Provision | 1 |
| Local People Need To Be Able To Afford New Housing | 1 |
| pre 2017 allowance for affordable housing set at 35% should be brought back | 1 |
| Concern over the vehicular access to A2990 and risk to Thornden Wood Rd rat run | 1 |
| If Council Are Trying To Make Herne Bay A Shopping Destination They Should Focus Their Efforts Centrally In The Town Not The Periphery. | 1 |
| Additional Traffic Will Require An Upgrade to The Chestfield to Tyler Hill Road-Environmentally Damaging | 1 |
| Further Consultation Required | 1 |
| Include Equestrian Use To Policy HB4 | 1 |
| Shouldn't Need to Develop Another 150 Homes To Justify The Provision Of A New School | 1 |
| Secondary School Should Not Be Funded By Developments In Canterbury | 1 |
| School Provision Shouldn't Be At The Expense Of The Green Gap Between Herne Bay and Whitstable | 1 |
| New Developments Environmentally Damaging | 1 |
| Existing Public Transport Could Be Overwhelmed | 1 |
| New Schools Should Not Be Within Such Close Proximity To Each other | 1 |
| Oppose Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 1 |
| Traffic Impact Assessments required for new School Developments | 1 |
| Strongly Oppose Policies SS1-5 and C1-26 | 1 |
| Regenerate Brownfield Land | 1 |
| No New Housing Development | 1 |
| No New Ring Road Required | 1 |
| Further Greenfield Development Unjustified. | 1 |
| Consultation Bias towards Developers | 1 |
| Consultation Inaccessible | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| More Amenities To Support New Housing Developments | 1 |
| Cohesion Between Secondary Schools to decrease the demand for Grammar School places outside of the town | 1 |

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

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 HB5: Land comprising nursery industrial units and former Kent Ambulance Station

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| New Housing Developments Opposed | 2 |
| Strongly Oppose Policies SS1-5 and C1-26 | 2 |
| All New Developments Should Focus On Sustainability Credentials | 2 |
| Excessive Housing Does Not Meet Local Need | 1 |
| Concerns of Noise, Traffic and Light Pollution | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| New Ring Road Opposed | 1 |
| Should Be Allocated to New Industrial Businesses at Peppercorn Rent | 1 |
| Regenerate Brownfield Land | 1 |
| Many Site Policies are Not Strategic And Should Be Removed. | 1 |
| Many Of Sites Discussed in This Plan Are Minor & Do Not Require Discussion | 1 |
| Consultation Bias towards Developers | 1 |
| Consultation Inaccessible | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| More Amenities To Support New Housing Developments | 1 |

All representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. No specific changes have been made to the policy.

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 HB6: Hawthorn Corner

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Traffic And Congestion Concerns | 2 |
| Further Commercial Space Not Required | 2 |
| Preserve Natural Environment-Concerns for Loss of Biodiversity | 2 |
| Existing Sites Can't fill with Commercial Operators-Nor will Hawthorn Corner | 2 |
| Use Land To Expand Desperately Needed Sewage Works and Improvements | 2 |
| Strongly Oppose Policies SS1-5 and C1-26 | 2 |
| Protection and Enhancement of Heritage Assets Vital | 1 |
| New slip Road Needed London Bound | 1 |
| Use Area For Residential Instead | 1 |
| Area Already Overdeveloped | 1 |
| Development Is Too Close To Sewage Works | 1 |
| Safe Pedestrian Routes Required. | 1 |
| Oppose New Ring Road | 1 |
| Oppose New Housing Development | 1 |
| Regenerate Brownfield Land | 1 |
| Too Close To Existing Residential | 1 |
| Road Infrastructure Improvements Required To Support Development | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based on Inaccurate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Consultation Bias towards Developers | 1 |
| Consultation Inaccessible | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| More Amenities To Support New Housing Developments | 1 |

All representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. No specific changes have been made to the policy.

## Policy HB7: Former gas holder site

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Strongly Oppose Policies SS1-5 and C1-26 | 2 |
| Strongly Support Proposals | 1 |
| Use Land For Residential Instead | 1 |
| All New Developments Should Focus On Sustainability Credentials | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Many Of Sites Discussed in This Plan Are Minor & Do Not Require Discussion | 1 |
| Many Site Policies are Not Strategic And Should Be Removed | 1 |
| Oppose New Ring Road | 1 |
| Oppose New Housing Development | 1 |
| Preserve Natural Environment | 1 |
| Regenerate Brownfield Land | 1 |
| Consultation Bias towards Developers | 1 |
| Consultation Inaccessible | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| More Amenities To Support New Housing Developments | 1 |

All representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. No specific changes have been made to the policy.

##

##

## Policy HB8: Altira

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Improved Pedestrian/Cycle Routes Connecting Proposed Areas Of Development Required | 2 |
| Existing Roundabout on Margate Road Unable to Sustain More Traffic | 2 |
| Road Infrastructure Improvements Required | 2 |
| Strongly Oppose Policies Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| KCC requests ‘off-site community infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) is further defined to ensure it includes all of KCC’s services sought | 1 |
| Use Area For Housing Instead | 1 |
| Focus OnHerne Bay As Destination for Large Events | 1 |
| Provide New High End Hotel | 1 |
| Proposed Pedestrian/Cycle Route Through Parsonage Road is Unviable as it is a Private Road | 1 |
| New Developments Should Focus On Sustainability Credentials | 1 |
| Commercial & Business Development Very Important | 1 |
| Research Into Potential Links with New Medical School and Universities In Canterbury | 1 |
| Protection and Enhancement of Heritage Assets Vital | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based on Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| Rename Policy as 'Altria Park and Blacksole Farm' | 1 |
| Designation Should be changed to 'Mixed use' | 1 |
| Wish To Work Collaboratively with CCC On this Policy | 1 |
| Parcel Allocation Policies Must be Flexible & Support Investment | 1 |
| Separation of Business, Commercial & Employment use Is Confusing & Does not Promote Flexibility | 1 |
| Reference To The Two Listed Buildings Can be Removed As They Will Be Demolished | 1 |
| Further Improvements to Cycle/Pedestrian Routes could be Delivered | 1 |
| Oppose Criterion 5a of Emerging Policy | 1 |
| Consultation Bias towards Developers | 1 |
| Consultation Inaccessible | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| More Amenities To Support New Housing Developments | 1 |
| Housing Aspect Needs Recognition that 1/2 Bed Dwellings Needed in Urban Areas | 1 |

All representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The proposed Pedestrian/Cycle Route Through Parsonage Road has been removed from the policy. The point on the protection of Heritage Assets has been removed as the heritage assets in question (Barn at Black Sole Farm and Black Sole Farm) have been knocked down. Point 3c has been added to the policy and requires the site to assess potential for functionally linked land for golden plover.

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 HB9: Former metric site

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Strongly Oppose Policies Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| Consultation Bias towards Developers | 1 |
| Consultation Inaccessible | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| More Amenities To Support New Housing Developments | 1 |
| Road Infrastructure Unable to Cope With Further Development | 1 |
| Oppose Further Development Of This Area | 1 |
| Number of Proposed Housing Units Is Too Great for This Site | 1 |
| Retain Commercial Designation | 1 |
| Many Site Policies are Not Strategic And Should Be Removed. | 1 |
| Protection and Enhancement of Heritage Assets Vital | 1 |
| Draft Plan Based On Inaccurate/Inadequate Proposals | 1 |
| Question Need for Further School Provision | 1 |
| Would Like to See Support for Pick up/Drop Off Scheme at Reculver Primary School | 1 |
| Oppose New Ring Road | 1 |
| Oppose New Housing Development | 1 |
| Preserve Natural Environment | 1 |
| Regenerate Brownfield Land | 1 |
| KCC requests ‘off-site community infrastructure’ (para 1 b)iii) is further defined to ensure it includes all of KCC’s services sought | 1 |
| Would Like to See Two Passing Places included in Reculver Lane | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The heritage point in the policy has been strengthened following representations from Historic England.

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 HB10: Eddington Business Park

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Plan should include land from Mitcham Building Supplies | 2 |
| Development should be mixed use to maximise density | 2 |
| Strongly Oppose Policies Policies SS1-5 and C1- 26 | 2 |
| Traffic Congestion Concerns | 2 |
| Sites In Herne Bay Need to Be Maximised to Potential, Due to Reliance On Delivery Of Development In Canterbury. | 1 |
| Draft Plan Focused On Inadequate/Inaccurate Proposals | 1 |
| New Developments Should Focus On Sustainability Credentials | 1 |
| Give Specific reference to PRoW Network & England Coast Path National Trail | 1 |
| Bus Route Serving Site Should be Considered | 1 |
| Site Will Likely Remain Dormant | 1 |
| Consider Commercial Usage Here Instead Of Hillborough | 1 |
| Site Unsuitable For Housing Development | 1 |
| Noise Concerns | 1 |
| Use Area for Housing Instead | 1 |
| Consultation Bias towards Developers | 1 |
| Consultation Inaccessible | 1 |
| Climate Change Topic Paper Illegitimate | 1 |
| Oppose Solar Farm | 1 |
| More Amenities To Support New Housing Developments | 1 |
| Oppose New Ring Road | 1 |
| Oppose New Housing Development | 1 |
| Preserve Natural Environment | 1 |
| Regenerate Brownfield Land | 1 |

All the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. The policy has been strengthened to require: a transport assessment; for development to be located outside of the Flood Zone; for development to relate to the character of the surrounding area; and for development to protect the privacy for residents from adjacent employment uses.

## Other comments

| **Comment** | **Number of comments** |
| --- | --- |
| Herne Bay is in most need of regeneration | 1 |
| Support for more housing development to aid regeneration | 1 |
| Council should endeavour to support the next iteration of the Local Plan with a full suite of evidence | 1 |
| Local Plan could benefit from more succinct policy wording with less duplication of policies throughout the document (DS1/DS21) | 1 |
| Consultation bias towards developers | 1 |
| Consultation was inaccessible | 1 |
| The Climate Change Topic Paper is illegitimate | 1 |
| Oppose solar farm | 1 |
| Unable to identify and discriminate between the several major sites and larger number of relatively minor sites | 1 |
| More amenities are needed to support new housing developments | 1 |

All of the representations made on this policy have been analysed and considered. No housing or commercial draft allocations have been removed from Herne Bay. Regeneration in Herne Bay will be supported throughout the Local Plan period, in particular at the Regeneration Opportunity Areas (policy HB2).