

Canterbury City Council
Military Road,
Canterbury,
Kent,
CT1 1YW

Date: 12 May 2026

Our ref: 72444/01/SSL/MIB/41134892v1

To Whom It May Concern

Canterbury District Local Plan (2042/43) – Regulation 19 Consultation - Representations on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK

We write on behalf of our client, Taylor Wimpey Ltd (TW), who welcomes the opportunity to engage with Canterbury City Council (CCC) on the draft Local Plan. This letter comprises TW's formal representations to the Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) Canterbury City Council Local Plan Review consultation.

This representation letter follows the structure and questions of the survey on the Council's online Local Plan consultation website. It has been provided as a single response alongside our online representations submitted to the survey.

Contact Information

Name: Mia Busby of Lichfields, on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Email: [REDACTED]

House name/number: Lichfields UK, The Minister Building

Street: 21 Mincing Lane

City: London

Postcode: EC3R 7AG

Q1. Are you responding as?

A business, organisation or a community group – Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Q2. Would you like to be notified of the following stages of Canterbury Local Plan

- i When the Canterbury District Local Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State for the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government for examination [✓]
- ii When the Planning Inspector's Report is published [✓]
- iii When the Canterbury District Local Plan is adopted [✓]

Would you like to appear at the Independent Examination?

Yes, TW wish to reserve the right to participate in hearing session(s).

Which chapter/s of the Regulation 19 consultation would you like to comment on?**Chapter 1: Spatial Strategy****Policy SS1 (Environmental Strategy for the District)**

The policy is positively prepared: Yes

The policy is justified: No

The policy is effective: No

The policy is consistent with national policy: No

Generally, TW supports the principle of Policy SS1 Spatial Strategy and agrees that the overarching principles of the policy are effective. The Policy seeks to improve the district's local biodiversity and local habitats. However, the policy is not sound as currently drafted as it is not justified or consistent with national policy in respect of the requirements for Biodiversity Net Gain ("BNG") and percentage tree cover. Please also refer to TW's response in respect of Policy DS25 (Biodiversity).

Biodiversity Net Gain

The policy requires qualifying major developments across the District to deliver a minimum 20% BNG. This requirement exceeds the mandatory national requirement for 10% BNG introduced through by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (inserted by the Environment Act 2021) and reflected within national policy and guidance.

Planning practice guidance is clear that: "... plan-makers should not seek a higher percentage than the statutory objective of 10% biodiversity net gain, either on an area-wide basis or for specific allocations for development unless justified. To justify such policies, they will need to be evidenced including as to local need for a higher percentage, local opportunities for a higher percentage and any impacts on viability for development. Consideration will also need to be given to how the policy will be implemented".

Further, the Government's approach set out in the draft NPPF, recently published for consultation, is a relevant material consideration. Draft Policy N1 clearly states that plan-makers should only set standards for BNG which are in excess of the statutory net gain requirement, where this is for specific site allocations, and is fully justified and deliverable. Furthermore, it is noted in draft Policy N2 that, when making decisions, development plan policies that require gains above the statutory minimum are

to be given no weight. Therefore, should the revised NPPF be adopted as per its current drafting then – notwithstanding the fact the Council’s emerging plan is not being examined against the new NPPF – the Policy SS1 requirement seeking a 20% BNG would have no weight in decision-making. As the policy stands, there is a direct conflict with national policy, with no assessment to determine if the policy is achievable or realistic in practice.

The Council has not sufficiently demonstrated through its evidence base why a district-wide uplift of 20% (double the statutory requirement) is necessary or acceptable. Importantly, by imposing a blanket requirement above the national mandatory standard, the policy risks undermining development viability and delivery across the plan area. In the absence of robust and proportionate evidence to justify a higher threshold, the policy is not considered justified, and therefore not consistent with national policy.

The policy should therefore be amended to align with the national mandatory minimum requirement of 10% BNG.

Tree Cover

In addition, the policy requires developments of over 300 homes to incorporate a minimum of 20% tree cover across the site. Whilst the general policy intention is recognised, TW consider this requirement to be insufficiently flexible and consider that it is likely to be impractical from a master planning point of view. For example - it does not allow for consideration of site’s existing characteristics and land use, or specific site constraints and opportunities, which are typically undertaken at the planning application stage.

The requirement risks constraining efficient and effective site master planning and could adversely affect development viability and deliverability. This is particularly the case when the requirement is combined with other policies of the draft plan – for example 20% BNG. The Council must consider and prepare evidence (including on viability) to demonstrate that the two policy requirements are deliverable alongside each other, and in the round with all other policies. TW consider that it is likely to be difficult to meet these requirements without significantly reducing the developable area of a site.

The Council has not clearly demonstrated through proportionate evidence why the requirement is justified, nor tested its deliverability. There is insufficient flexibility to ensure implementation across a range of development scenarios.

The policy should be amended to provide greater flexibility by requiring tree planting and canopy cover to be delivered proportionately and appropriately having regard to site-specific circumstances, viability, and good design principles. For example, a general requirement for requiring any trees lost to be replaced, where possible would be more appropriate and deliverable.

Policy SS2 (Sustainable Design Strategy for the District)

The policy is positively prepared: Yes

The policy is justified: No

The policy is effective: No

The policy is consistent with national policy: No

Net Zero Requirement for Residential Development

Whilst the aspiration to support the transition to net zero carbon development is supported in principle by TW, Policy SS2 Part 1 currently steps above national policy requirements - it requires that all new residential development must be designed to achieve net zero carbon ready standards, in accordance with Appendix 4. The NPPF recognises climate change mitigation and the transition to a low-carbon economy as key objectives, however it does not mandate that all residential development must achieve net zero operational carbon. Further, TW understands that requirements will be enforced via Future Homes Standards, due to come into force next year – and there is not a need to duplicate this in the Local Plan.

Therefore, the policy wording should be amended to instead align with national planning policy by supporting the transition to net zero and encouraging high standards of sustainable design, rather than imposing an absolute requirement for all residential development to achieve net zero. Consideration should also be had to building regulations, so as not to replicate requirements unnecessarily in policy.

Open Space and Sports/Leisure Provision

Part 7 of Policy SS2 requires proposals to incorporate a range of open space typologies – this includes sports and leisure facilities. The principle of this part of the policy is supported; however, as drafted, the policy is not clear and does not recognise that the need for, and appropriateness of, specific forms of open space and recreational infrastructure is most appropriately assessed at the planning application stage, informed by site-specific evidence and relevant strategies. As currently drafted, the policy could be interpreted as all developments to provide sports and leisure facilities on site regardless of scale or demonstrated need. This presents the policy as ineffective and inflexible.

Part 7 of the policy should be amended to clarify that open space and recreational provision will be determined proportionately at the planning application stage, having regard to the scale, nature and context of development and evidence of local need and existing supply. This will ensure that Part 7 is clear and effective.

Masterplans and Design Code

Part 8 of Policy SS2 requires that proposals for over 100 dwellings produce a masterplan prepared in collaboration with the community and be subject to design review. Further, proposals of more than 300 homes, or multi-phased residential development, will also be required to include a design code developed through effective community engagement.

As drafted, the policy provides no guidance or flexibility to acknowledge when a masterplan or design code may or may not be appropriate, or beneficial. For example, TW do not consider it to be appropriate for a design code to be prepared in support of a full (detailed) planning application. Further, a masterplan is not likely to be appropriate for a smaller, constrained urban site. The requirement for design codes and masterplans is likely to be most appropriate in the context of large-scale strategic allocations where detailed design parameters are not yet established. Applying this requirement to all qualifying schemes is not considered effective or justified.

Overall, it is considered the requirements for masterplans and design codes are likely to slow down the planning application process, and therefore the delivery of homes. It is recommended that further

careful consideration is given to these requirements and that, if they are to be kept, due justification must be provided in published evidence base, to ensure they are effective. Policy wording should also be carefully reviewed for effectiveness and clarity.

Therefore, while the objectives of Policy SS2 are broadly supported, several elements are not sufficiently effective as drafted. The policy should be amended to provide clearer, proportionate, and more flexible requirements that align with national policy and support deliverable development, in respect of net zero, sports/leisure provision and design codes/masterplans.

Policy SS3 Policy (Development Strategy for the District)

The policy is positively prepared: No

The policy is justified: Yes

The policy is effective: No

The policy is consistent with national policy: Yes

Policy SS3 is overall supported as it seeks to deliver a plan-led approach to meeting Canterbury's housing needs, assessed using the latest standard method, to 2042/43. This approach is consistent with national policy to plan to meet housing needs and the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes.

However, TW note that the policy states at Part 8 that '*appropriate agriculture and viticulture development will be supported while housing will be only supported in very limited circumstances where specified within this plan*'. Whilst the intention to manage development in the countryside is understood given the Council is proposing to meet objectively assessed needs, the policy, as drafted, could limit the Council's ability to respond positively and flexibly to changing housing land supply circumstances over the entirety of the plan period.

To ensure the policy is positively prepared, and therefore sound, the Council should consider including flexibility within the Policy which allows for appropriate housing development in countryside locations in certain circumstances, including where there is a deficit in the five-year housing land supply ("5YHLS"). A criteria-based mechanism should be included with reference to sustainable development and applying to sites that are well integrated to existing settlements and infrastructure. Maidstone has taken a similar approach in its Local Plan Review – Policy LPRSP9.

Policy SS6 (Infrastructure Strategy for the District)

The policy is positively prepared: Yes

The policy is justified: Yes

The policy is effective: No

The policy is consistent with national policy: No

The inclusion of reference to viability considerations within Policy SS6 is supported in principle, as it provides flexibility which appropriately recognises the importance of deliverability. However, the policy states that deviation from policy requirements on viability grounds at the planning application stage will "only be accepted in limited circumstances", as set out in Policy DS15.

This wording does not align with the NPPF, which refers to viability being reconsidered in “particular circumstances” rather than “limited circumstances.”

The use of the phrase “limited circumstances” introduces a more restrictive test than that set out in national policy and could unduly constrain the consideration of site-specific viability matters where these arise. To ensure consistency with national policy, the wording should be amended to align directly with the NPPF.

Chapter 6: District-wide Strategic Policies

Policy DS1 (Affordable housing)

The policy is positively prepared: Yes

The policy is justified: Yes

The policy is effective: No

The policy is consistent with national policy: Yes

Part 7 of Policy DS1 states ‘*affordable housing should be dispersed throughout the site, avoiding large clusters of affordable homes, and integrated with the market housing to create a cohesive community*’.

As drafted, this part of the policy is not considered to be effective. The wording is overly prescriptive and fails to recognise the operational and management requirements of Registered Providers (RPs). In practice, RPs and affordable housing operators will often seek a degree of clustering of affordable homes to support efficient management, maintenance, servicing and long-term stewardship of affordable housing stock. Too much dispersal across a site can create practical difficulties for management arrangements and may adversely affect the attractiveness of schemes to RPs, with implications for site deliverability.

The policy should therefore be amended to provide greater flexibility and to acknowledge that the distribution of affordable housing should be informed by site-specific considerations, to be determined at the planning application stage.

Policy DS2 (Housing Mix)

The policy is positively prepared: Yes

The policy is justified: No

The policy is effective: No

The policy is consistent with national policy: Yes

The policy establishes a district-wide housing mix and affordable housing tenure mix which major housing developments “must” broadly align with. Part 3, a and b are supported in so far as they allow for circumstances where departure may be justified – this includes where supported by “robust evidence”, or where the nature of the site clearly indicates the requirements cannot be achieved. However, to ensure that the policy is effective, TW considers that greater flexibility should be allowed for in the policy, and reference to ‘must’ should be replaced with ‘should’. The policy should also usefully make reference to site specific factors, such as having regard to market signals, viability

considerations, site characteristics and up-to-date evidence of local need at the time an application is brought forward. A more flexible approach would better support delivery and ensure schemes can respond to changing circumstances over the plan period.

Further, in respect of affordable housing, part 3 of Policy DS2 states *‘Developers will be expected to identify a Register Provider to take on the affordable housing in the process’*.

Whilst early engagement with Registered Providers (“RPs”) is supported in principle, the policy fails to include flexibility to recognise the current challenges within the affordable housing sector and the increasing difficulties associated with securing RP interest and Section 106 acquisitions. The requirement should therefore be amended to acknowledge situations and provide flexibility where an RP cannot reasonably be secured at an early stage despite reasonable endeavours by the applicant. This aligns to the principle of the Government’s recent announcement on the Section 106 Affordable Housing Clearing Service.

The policy further requires developments of over 300 dwellings to incorporate provision for self/custom build housing and build-to-rent housing. TW object to this policy on the basis self/custom build housing will not be appropriate or viable on all sites. The suitability of such provision should instead be determined having regard to site-specific circumstances, market demand, deliverability and overall scheme design considerations.

TW’s experience indicates that interest in self-build plots tends to be for larger plots in rural locations or in smaller settlements, and not so typically on plots within larger housing sites. As such, it is not clear that even the annual ‘need’ figure derived from people putting their names on waiting list would all seek a plot on a larger housing scheme on an urban extensions site, for example. As a minimum, the policy should include greater flexibility linked to demonstrated need within a particular locality.

To ensure that the policy is justified, it would be prudent for the Council to estimate, based on allocated sites and the expected size of windfall sites, how many self-build plots it estimates this policy will generate (averaged, per year) and how this compares with the historic trend in number of applicants on its Register. This is likely to show that the number of plots yielded by the policy is substantially higher than is likely to be needed, and thus the Council can set the threshold higher and adopt a flexible approach.

TW also object to the requirement for sites of 300 or more dwellings to provide a minimum of 10% older persons housing. This requirement is not effective as it may not always be appropriate to deliver 10% of a scheme as older persons housing as an absolute minimum. Older persons accommodation is highly dependent on operator requirements and market demand. Such provision often requires a minimum critical mass, bespoke design approaches, specific location and operational models that may not be suitable or deliverable on each site. The policy should therefore allow for a more flexible, evidence-led approach based on site-specific considerations and demonstrable need. Therefore, more flexible wording is required to ensure the policy is effective.

Policy DS12 (Net zero carbon ready and water efficiency)

The policy is positively prepared: Yes

The policy is justified: Yes

The policy is effective: Yes

The policy is consistent with national policy: No

TW support the Council's overarching ambition to reduce carbon emissions and improve environmental performance of new development. However, TW object to Policy DS12, on the basis that it is not consistent with national policy. Please refer to TW's response to Policy SS1, where this requirement is repeated.

The requirement for all new residential development to be "net zero carbon" is considered overly prescriptive and insufficiently flexible, particularly in the context of evolving national policy, Building Regulations and the forthcoming Future Homes Standard. The policy appears to exceed current national requirements without clear evidence to demonstrate that the proposed standards are consistently deliverable and viable across all development typologies and site circumstances anticipated over the plan period. Further, there should not be duplication with building regulations.

Whilst the aspiration to deliver lower-carbon development is supported in principle, the policy should more appropriately recognise that the ability to achieve net zero carbon outcomes will vary depending on a range of factors, including site-specific constraints, abnormal development costs, infrastructure requirements, technological advancements and overall scheme viability.

Policy DS17 (Active and sustainable travel)

The policy is positively prepared: Yes

The policy is justified: Yes

The policy is effective: No

The policy is consistent with national policy: Yes

TW support the overarching objectives of Policy DS17 in promoting active and sustainable travel, and in particular the requirement for development to maximise opportunities for high-quality active travel connections. The flexibility in the transport options and the aim to reduce reliance on private car travel is also positive.

Part 5 of the draft policy requires schemes of more than 300 dwellings to incorporate a mobility hub, including provision for alternative transport modes, such as e scooters and cycle hire. As drafted, the policy is not sufficiently flexible and to be effective, it should instead allow for a proportionate, evidence-based approach, whereby the need for and scale of any mobility hub is determined having regard to the characteristics and accessibility of the site and the extent of existing nearby provision. Overall, the trigger point of 300 dwellings should not be fixed and greater flexibility should be provided to enable the need for mobility hubs to be considered on a site-by-site basis.

Similarly, whilst the requirement for proposals of 10 or more homes within urban areas to be located within 400 metres of a frequent bus service is supported in principle, the policy should allow greater flexibility in circumstances where compliance may not be achievable. This could include sites where improvements to public transport accessibility can be secured through development and S106 contributions, or where other sustainable transport options are already reliable and available.

To ensure the policy is effective and deliverable, it should be amended to provide greater flexibility and to recognise that sustainable transport measures should be applied on a site-specific basis.

Policy DS25 (Supporting Biodiversity Recovery)

The policy is positively prepared: Yes

The policy is justified: No

The policy is effective: Yes

The policy is consistent with national policy: No

TW object to the proposed requirement for developments of 300 dwellings to provide 20% tree cover and qualifying major development to provide 20% BNG. Please refer to the reasons as set out in response to Policy SS1.

In summary, these requirements are not adequately justified by the Council in published evidence base and are not aligned with national policy or legislative requirements:

- The Environment Act 2021 establishes a mandatory minimum requirement of 10% biodiversity net gain, and no clear evidence has been provided by the Council to justify why a higher 20% requirement is necessary, viable, or deliverable across development scenarios. The policy should instead align with national requirements, at 10% BNG, as it is currently a direct conflict with national policy.
- Similarly, the requirement for 20% tree cover lacks sufficient flexibility and does not appear to take account of site-specific characteristics, constraints, density considerations, or wider placemaking objectives. Such matters should instead be considered on a proportionate, site-by-site basis through the design process, and this must be stated in the policy.

Overall, both policies will limit the developable area of sites and could therefore impede the Council's ability to meet its objectively assessed housing needs. Robust assessment and justification is missing from the evidence base (including, importantly, viability) in support of these requirements; and, therefore, they are not sound.

Further, it must be carefully considered whether the thresholds for biodiversity and tree cover are incompatible, as it is not likely all habitats are compatible with tree replacement. This must be carefully considered by the Council, in the round.

The policy as currently drafted is not justified and should be amended to align with national requirements and to provide greater flexibility having regard to site-specific circumstances and viability considerations.

Concluding Remarks

We trust that the Council will find these comments useful as it continues to progress the draft Local Plan. We hope that our comments set out above are clear, however should you have any queries or wish to discuss please do not hesitate to contact me or my colleague, Sally Furminger.



Yours faithfully



Mia Busby
Planner

Annex 1:

Canterbury District Local Plan - Proposed Revised Text to Policies (Regulation 19)

Introduction

This annex supports the representations made by Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd. It sets out suggested wording amendments to policies the emerging Canterbury District Local Plan (Regulation 19) which Taylor Wimpey consider are required in order to make those relevant policies and the plan as a whole ‘sound’ (i.e. justified, effective and legally compliant).

Proposed Policy Amendments

Policy SS1: Environmental Strategy for the District

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)
... 5. Qualifying major development across the district will need to incorporate measures to deliver a minimum 20% biodiversity net gain, while qualifying non-major development will need to deliver a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain in line with Policy DS25. Proposals must have regard to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, and the council will work with partners to implement the Strategy. 6. New developments of over 300 homes should incorporate a minimum of 20% tree cover across the site, in line with Policy DS25, and all developments should incorporate new trees and hedgerows in areas of appropriate landscape character, to help restore and enhance degraded landscapes, screen noise and pollution, provide recreational opportunities, help mitigate climate change and contribute to floodplain management. ...	... 5. Qualifying major development across the district will need to incorporate measures to deliver a minimum 20% biodiversity net gain, while qualifying non-major development will need to deliver a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain in line with Policy DS25. Development across the district will need to incorporate measures to deliver a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain in line with Policy DS25. Proposals must have regard to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, and the council will work with partners to implement the Strategy. 6. New developments of over 300 homes should seek to incorporate a minimum of 20% net increase in tree cover across the site, where appropriate, in line with Policy DS25, and all developments should incorporate new trees and hedgerows in areas of appropriate landscape character, to help restore and enhance degraded landscapes, screen noise and pollution, provide recreational opportunities, help mitigate climate change and contribute to floodplain management. ...

Policy SS2: Sustainable design strategy for the district

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)
1. New residential and commercial development in the district should be designed to achieve net zero operational carbon emissions. Proposals for development should make efficient use of land, should be designed to maximise energy and water efficiency and should integrate sustainable drainage and water management measures.... 7. High-quality, accessible open space should be delivered in line with Policy DS28, and be incorporated into proposals with appropriate layouts, sizes and distances from highways to promote healthy lifestyles. This includes: a. sports and leisure facilities for use by the whole community, including existing residents, and co-located with other uses, where appropriate; b. a wide range of high-quality and inclusive play opportunities which are challenging and fun for children of all ages and abilities, including youths, are accessible, safe and are well overlooked, with additional areas of public realm designed as places for incidental and independent play; c. integration of food growing opportunities at all scales such as planters, fruit trees, hedgerows, community orchards and allotments d. natural and semi natural greenspaces connecting communities to nature by supporting wildlife conservation, biodiversity and environmental education and awareness and spaces providing opportunities for informal recreation by the whole community; e. parks and gardens with opportunities for informal recreation and community events; and f. amenity green space and green corridors providing opportunities to connect wildlife, and access to open space near homes... ... 8. New communities of more than 100 homes will require a masterplan, prepared in collaboration with the community and be subject to a design review during the design process. New communities of more than 300 homes, or multi-phased residential developments will also be required to produce a design code. Design codes will be secured through planning	1. New residential and commercial development in the district should be designed to to achieve net zero operational carbon emissions—minimise carbon emissions and support the transition towards net zero, in line with national requirements and regulations. Proposals for development should make efficient use of land, should be designed to maximise energy and water efficiency and should integrate sustainable drainage and water management measures.... 7. High-quality, accessible open space should be delivered in line with Policy DS28, and be incorporated into proposals with appropriate layouts, sizes and distances from highways to promote healthy lifestyles. This includes Where appropriate, proposals should support/contribute toward a range of open space, recreation and green infrastructure measures, which may include: a. sports and leisure facilities for use by the whole community, including existing residents, and co-located with other uses, where appropriate; b. a wide range of high-quality and inclusive play opportunities which are challenging and fun for children of all ages and abilities, including youths, are accessible, safe and are well overlooked, with additional areas of public realm designed as places for incidental and independent play; c. integration of food growing opportunities at all scales such as planters, fruit trees, hedgerows, community orchards and allotments d. natural and semi natural greenspaces connecting communities to nature by supporting wildlife conservation, biodiversity and environmental education and awareness and spaces providing opportunities for informal recreation by the whole community; e. parks and gardens with opportunities for informal recreation and community events; and f. amenity green space and green corridors providing opportunities to connect wildlife, and access to open space near homes... ... 8. Where appropriate:

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (<i>key amends in bold red</i>)
condition and should be developed through effective community engagement and reflect community aspirations for development in the area.	(a) new communities of more than 100 homes will may require a masterplan, prepared in collaboration with the community and be subject to a design review during the design process. Where appropriate, masterplans should form part of the design review and public consultation material. (b) Outline planning applications for new communities of more than 300 homes, or multi-phased residential developments will may also be required to produce a design code. Design codes will be secured through planning condition and should be developed through effective community engagement and reflect community aspirations for development in the area.

Policy SS3 – Development Strategy for the District

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (<i>key amends in bold red</i>)
... 8. Within the countryside, which is defined as any part of the district outside of the settlement boundaries of the Urban Areas, Rural Service Centres and Local Service Centres, priority will be given to protecting the rural character of the district. In this context, appropriate agriculture and viticulture development will be supported while housing will only be supported in very limited circumstances where specified within this plan. Existing community facilities within the countryside will be protected, while new and improved facilities and other forms of non-residential development will be supported where these meet the specific requirements of other policies in this plan....	... 8. Within the countryside, which is defined as any part of the district outside of the settlement boundaries of the Urban Areas, Rural Service Centres and Local Service Centres, priority will be given to protecting the rural character of the district. In this context, appropriate agriculture and viticulture development will be supported while housing will only be supported in very limited circumstances where specified within this plan. Should the council determine, through the annual monitoring process that the housing delivery position has altered such that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply, then proposals for additional residential development in the countryside will be supported, on sites where they are: A. Broadly consistent with, not prejudicial to and contributing towards the positive achievement of the plan's overall spatial vision and spatial strategy; and b. In a sustainable location and of a scale and nature commensurate to the deficit in required housing and the Plan's spatial strategy; and c. Able to demonstrate the ability to contribute in a timely and proportionate manner to addressing the deficit in housing supply; and

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)
	d. In all other respects in accordance with other Local Plan policies, in so far as they apply. Existing community facilities within the countryside will be protected, while new and improved facilities and other forms of non-residential development will be supported where these meet the specific requirements of other policies in this plan....

Policy SS6 – Infrastructure Strategy for the district

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)
... 3. Infrastructure and policy requirements within this plan have been appropriately tested for viability. Deviation from policy requirements on the grounds of viability at the planning application stage will therefore only be accepted in limited circumstances, as set out in Policy DS15.	3. Infrastructure and policy requirements within this plan have been appropriately tested for viability. Deviation from policy requirements on the grounds of viability at the planning application stage will therefore only be accepted in limited-particular circumstances, as set out in Policy DS15.

Policy DS1 – Affordable Housing

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)
.. 7. Affordable housing should be dispersed throughout the site, avoiding large clusters of affordable homes, and integrated with the market housing to create a cohesive community. Affordable homes should accord with Policies DS12 and DS13 so that quality and design is of an equally high standard to that of the private units on site....	.. 7. Affordable housing should be appropriately integrated into the development, taking into account the size, scale, layout and character of the scheme. The distribution should be informed by design principles and engagement with Registered Providers, as appropriate . dispersed throughout the site, avoiding large clusters of affordable homes, and integrated with the market housing to create a cohesive community. Affordable homes should accord with Policies DS12 and DS13 so that quality and design is of an equally high standard to that of the private units on site....

Policy DS2 – Housing Mix

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)
... 3. ...Developers will be expected to identify with a Registered Provider to take on the affordable housing	...2 The district-wide housing mix requirements for new market housing is set out below:

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)
early in the process. Proposals must include an affordable housing mix that is broadly aligned with the council's requirements, unless:... 4. Development proposals for more than 300 dwellings must consider for an identified need that could be addressed proportionately on site for: a. Self and custom built housing; and b. Build-to-rent housing. Any provision would form part of the market housing, not affordable housing.... ... 5. To ensure that new major residential developments provide for the needs of different groups within the community: ... b. Proposals for 300 or more homes will provide a minimum of 10% of the homes as older persons housing. The type of provision should be based on robust evidence of local needs.	Proposals for major residential development should must include a market housing mix that is broadly aligned with the council's requirements, unless: a. Other robustly prepared local evidence on housing mix indicates an alternative mix would better meet local housing needs; or b. The nature of the site, including its location, size, and characteristics clearly indicate the borough-wide mix requirements cannot be achieved in which case any alternative housing mix should reflect local evidence, as far as possible. ... 3. ...Developers will be expected to identify a Registered Provider to take on the affordable housing early in the process. Where no registered provider or appropriate alternative provider is available, the full affordable housing provision requirement will be cascaded to another provider and/or site or via a commuted sum, its calculation having regard to the full amount of market housing that has been achieved on the site; Proposals should include an affordable housing mix that is broadly aligned with the council's requirements, unless:... 4. Where appropriate, development proposals for more than 300 dwellings should must consider whether there is an identified need that could be addressed proportionately on site for: a. Self and custom built housing; and b. Build-to-rent housing. Any provision would form part of the market housing, not affordable housing... ...5. To ensure that new major residential developments provide for the needs of different groups within the community:b. Proposals for 300 or more homes should seek to provide a minimum of 10% of the homes as older persons housing where appropriate. The type of provision should be based on robust evidence of local needs....

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)

Policy DS12 – Net zero carbon ready and water efficiency

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)
.. 2.To minimise the carbon footprint new build residential development must deliver net zero carbon ready standards,...	..2. To minimise the carbon footprint new build residential development should be designed to minimise carbon emissions and support the transition towards net zero where appropriate, in line with national requirements and regulations must deliver net zero carbon ready standards,..

Policy DS17 – Active and sustainable travel

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)
..... - Proposals for 10 or more homes within the Urban Areas should be located no more than 400 metres from a frequent bus service. Where appropriate, developments must include bus priority measures within sites, and high-quality bus stop infrastructure, including high kerbs, shelters with real time information and timetables, to maximise the convenience and attractiveness of public transport. The council will use appropriate legal mechanisms to secure a commuted sum to cover future maintenance and developers may be required to contribute to improvements in bus services. - Proposals for more than 300 homes should maximise opportunities for alternative and innovative travel options from the site through the provision of a mobility hub in order to further reduce the need to travel by private car, such as through e-scooter* and cycle hire, parcel collection lockers, rail real-time travel information, shared transport services and car clubs. Consideration should be given to opportunities for autonomous technologies for deliveries. Schemes should integrate effectively with existing networks and public transport, including through use of standard	 - Proposals for 10 or more homes within the Urban Areas should be located no more than 400 metres from a frequent bus service. Where appropriate, developments must include bus priority measures within sites, and high-quality bus stop infrastructure, including high kerbs, shelters with real time information and timetables, to maximise the convenience and attractiveness of public transport. The council will use appropriate legal mechanisms to secure a commuted sum to cover future maintenance and developers may be required to contribute to improvements in bus services. Where appropriate, proposals for more than 300 homes should maximise consider opportunities for alternative and innovative travel options from the site, including through the potential provision of a mobility hub in order to further reduce the need to travel by private car, such as through e-scooter* and cycle hire, parcel collection lockers, rail real-time travel information, shared transport services and car clubs. Consideration should be given to opportunities for autonomous technologies for deliveries, where practical. Schemes should seek to integrate effectively

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)
payment platforms. Consideration should be given to the scope for car-free areas and zero-emission transport zones as part of the scheme design....	with existing networks and public transport, including through use of standard payment platforms. Consideration should be given to the scope for car-free areas and zero-emission transport zones as part of the scheme design....

Policy DS25 – Supporting biodiversity recovery

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)
...	...
2. All proposals for major development must be accompanied by a Green and, where appropriate, Blue Infrastructure Strategy which takes account of relevant local strategies, such as Biodiversity Strategy; Green Infrastructure Strategy; Pollinator Action Plan; Tree, Woodland and Hedgerow Strategy; Biodiversity Opportunity Areas; Local Nature Recovery Strategy; and Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan. In addition to the non-major development requirements set out in point 1 above, proposals for major development must demonstrate through their Green/Blue Infrastructure Strategy:	2. All proposals for major development must be accompanied by a Green and, where appropriate, Blue Infrastructure Strategy which takes account of relevant local strategies, such as Biodiversity Strategy; Green Infrastructure Strategy; Pollinator Action Plan; Tree, Woodland and Hedgerow Strategy; Biodiversity Opportunity Areas; Local Nature Recovery Strategy; and Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan. In addition to the non-major development requirements set out in point 1 above, proposals for major development must demonstrate through their Green/Blue Infrastructure Strategy:
...	...
g. On new developments of over 300 homes, proposals must also:	g. On new developments of over 300 homes, proposals should also:
i. Provide a minimum of 20% tree cover (existing and new) across the site, in line with the council's Tree, Woodland and Hedgerow Strategy. Where appropriate, the tree cover can contribute to SuDS, open space and local Biodiversity Net Gain contributions; and	i. Seek to provide net additional 20% (existing and new) tree cover across the site, in line with the council's Tree, Woodland and Hedgerow Strategy. Where appropriate, the tree cover can contribute to SuDS, open space and local Biodiversity Net Gain contributions; and
...	...
3. All development must demonstrate and deliver Biodiversity Net Gain, other than where exempt through national legislation, calculated using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric and taking consideration of any national or local guidance on what values / multipliers should be used:	3. All development must demonstrate and deliver the statutory minimum, which is currently 10% , Biodiversity Net Gain, other than where exempt through national legislation, calculated using the Statutory Biodiversity Metric and in accordance with the hierarchy set out in point 4 below.
a. Non-major development must achieve the statutory minimum Biodiversity Net Gain, which is currently 10%, in accordance with the hierarchy set out in point 4 below.	...
b. Major developments must deliver 20% Biodiversity Net Gain. This is made up of a 10% statutory net gain	

Reg 19 Proposed Text	TW Proposed Amended Text (key amends in bold red)
and a 10% local net gain. The 10% statutory net gain must be in accordance with the hierarchy set out below, however for the purposes of the 10% local net gain, the council will apply points 4(b) (ii), (iii) and (iv) of the hierarchy flexibly.....	