

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### 8. OBJECTIONS TO THE CHAPTER ON INVESTING IN OUR COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

#### POLICY C1 - THE CANTERBURY TRANSPORT PLAN - AND PREAMBLE IN PARAGRAPHS 7.1-7.14

##### Objections and Key Issues

###### *Paragraph 7.1 – Our Transport Objectives*

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne (2326, 2331)

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2343)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1862)

- Specifically acknowledge the growth of traffic in Canterbury's south-east quadrant and put forward some suggestions for its reduction and management
- Canterbury Transport Plan should be part of local plan to allow a full public debate
- Containing rural traffic is not mentioned in the traffic objectives although there is an objective which specifically concentrates on containment of the traffic growth in urban areas
- The traffic problem is growing faster than the measures suggested can solve it

*Re: A7/001 – Paragraph 7.3*

RD090 Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council (20199)

- There should be recommendations for alleviating acknowledged rural traffic growth problems

###### *Paragraph 7.4 - Our Transport Objectives*

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2352)

- Transportation - What are your objectives? How do you unlock the chaos in Canterbury?

###### *Paragraph 7.5 - Our Transport Objectives*

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne (2325)

- The plan recognises the problems of traffic and vehicle speed in villages, but makes no specific recommendations to alleviate any of the rural problems

###### *Paragraph 7.7 – Road hierarchies*

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2552)

- If Littlebourne Road (A257) is a primary route, Littlebourne will need a by-pass

###### *Paragraph 7.8 – The Local Transport Plan*

RN067 Whitstable Society (692)

- Local Transport Plan is key to planning town centre; difficult to see how key decisions affecting Local Plan can be made before Action Plan's completion. Identify issues Action Plan must address

*Re: A7/004 – Amended Paragraph 7.8*

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20642)

- Insert reference to Regeneration Zone at Hersden & opportunity for reopening Chislet Halt as a station for Hersden as part of integrated housing employment & transport strategy

###### *Paragraph 7.10 – The Canterbury District Transport Action Plan*

RN086 Thomas (442)

RN255 GOSE (1719)

- Plan fails to make connection between Canterbury, traffic problems and the need for Herne Bay residents to travel to Canterbury for shopping. A better spatial provision of retail provision would be beneficial
- The Canterbury Transport Plan should refer to the County Local Transport Plan and show areas of common ground and how conflicts would be dealt with

###### *Paragraph 7.11 - The Canterbury District Transport Action Plan*

RN161 Ramblers Association (1911)

- Fully support safer routes with good road crossing facilities. The A2 and its bus stop and public rights of way crossings very much comes to mind

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

### *Paragraph 7.13 - The Canterbury District Transport Action Plan*

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2553)

- This paragraph should support the Kent & Canterbury Hospital

### *Policy C1 – Canterbury District Transport Action Plan*

RN001 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (9)

RN024 Gogrin (641, 643, 644, 645)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1575)

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1861)

RN164 Railtrack PLC (600)

RN185 Lowe (158)

RN232 Bartlett (1620)

RN281 Martin (978)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2554)

- The policy is framed around the Canterbury Transport Plan which does not yet exist
- A stronger commitment should be made to assess all industrial development proposals, adjacent to railway lines, for the potential of transporting freight to and from the development (part e)
- Extend A2 link under Patricbourne to link to Sandwich Road at Bramling up to A28 between Hersden and Upstreet
- A tramway from the coach park and bus station, which the respondent suggests should be provided at the site of the railway station he proposes in Wincheap, should be installed to the city and Sturry
- Should have a coach park and bus station at area at back of Wincheap which respondent proposes should be used to provide a railway station
- This policy should address rat runs through country lanes
- Canterbury transport plan should be part of local plan to allow a full public debate
- Criterion (e) needs to give preference to proposals which do not require the use of cars or lorries for access or deliveries; and (f) should seek improvements in environmental conditions
- There should be proposals for a Canterbury (A28) bypass

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.1 Objectors to the Local Plan made their representations before the adoption of the Canterbury District Transport Action Plan in March 2004. The document has been developed alongside the Local Plan, with the aim to “tackle the problem of traffic congestion, by improving accessibility, choice and road safety, whilst maintaining the economic vitality for business and safeguarding the environment for the residents in the District” (CD7.8). The actions and targets within it are fed into the second Local Transport Plan for Kent (2006-2011). No doubt the supporting text setting the context for the Chapter will contain necessary factual changes to reflect the position when the Plan is finally adopted.
- 8.2 I consider that the objections seeking particular action have been briefly but well answered in the Council's schedules of responses to representations (CD1.3, CD1.22). Some requests for action are realistically unachievable. On occasions, the matter disputed is treated elsewhere in this Plan Chapter.
- 8.3 A little alteration could improve the proposed Policy, which now reads more as a statement of intent, only loosely related to the planning process. The opening words of the Policy would be better re-drafted to read: “In considering the location or control of new development, or the relocation of existing activities, the Council will always take account of the following principles of the adopted 2004 Canterbury District Transport Action Plan: ”.

Recommendation

8.4 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 8.3 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C2 – BUS AND RAIL TRANSPORT – AND PARAGRAPHS 7.15-7.18

Objections and Key Issues

*Re: A7/012 – Amended paragraph 7.15 Improving Travel Choices*

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20643)

- Add fourthly: locating homes close to the large clusters & concentrations of new & existing employment development

*Paragraph 7.17 – Improving Travel Choices*

RN345 Oaten Hill & District Society (2448)

- The bus station is unwelcoming. Add to second part of sentence: "and Canterbury's new station has failed to remedy this"

*Paragraph 7.18 - Improving Travel Choices*

RN164 Railtrack PLC (1801)

RN207 Reeves and Neylan (753)

- 7.18 should include reference to a Parkway railway station & safeguard & identify land for this purpose. Access to existing stations very crowded
- The reference to investigating increases in rail freight with railway companies needs to be more explicit and wider

*Re: A7/074 – New Paragraph 7.18a*

RD124 Stansfield (20340)

- Any parkway station should not be carried out so that facilities for passengers wishing to arrive within walking distance of the city are lost. Canterbury West should represent an impressive arrival into the City

*Policy C2 – Bus Priority Measures and Rail Network Improvements*

RN185 Lowe (159)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1505)

RN285 Strategic Rail Authority (831)

- Add at end: "and in particular the Council will give favourable consideration to reopen the former Chislet railway station at Hersden in association with other development on former colliery land"
- The policy needs to support new railway stations, and implement circular rail routes around East Kent and between Canterbury stations
- Policy too restrictive: add other rail improvement proposals, whether or not they are included within the Transport Plan

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.5 Articulate objection has been made to the less than ideal arrangements and faulty detailed planning of the new Canterbury bus station newly built beside the Whitefriars development. The objectors are unwilling that the text should give unmerited praise to the new station. Honours might be even if the opening of paragraph 7.17 was recast to say: "Canterbury has a new bus station as part of the Whitefriars development. However, buses and trains continue to have a relatively poor image, and stations and stops are often unwelcoming". I think it possible that continued articulate and constructive criticism may help further improve the new bus station, given the existing mechanisms for consultation

and improvement. As to the possible Parkway station, there must be real doubts about its credibility, but it is very likely the Council will have more detailed knowledge of the full ramifications of the CTRL for station building and/or upgrading by the time the Local Plan is adopted, and I can say nothing useful on the matter.

8.6 To relate the Policy better to the planning process, I consider it would be desirable to reword it to read: "Planning permission will not be granted for proposals that prejudice effective implementation of the bus priority measures or the rail network improvements arising from the Canterbury District Transport Action Plan".

### Recommendation

8.7 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 8.6 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

\*\*\*\*\*

## POLICY C3 – CYCLING AND WALKING – AND PARAGRAPHS 7.19-7.22

### Objections and Key Issues

#### *Paragraph 7.19 – Cycling and Walking*

RN301 Wanstall (2264)  
 RN166 Pedestrian Association (1823)  
 RN010 Wilks (325, 326, 364, 369)

- Title and text should be described as 'Walking and Cycling', not the other way round
- Walking is not good for health if worried about cyclists on footpaths etc. Establish a proper walking/disability officer without any connection to the cycle lobby group
- Object to total lack of consultation on cycling and walking proposals. Before proposals are adopted all groups must be consulted especially pedestrians, the blind and disabled etc.
- New policy required: Review and record access ways for pedestrians and horse riders to reach the beaches from Faversham Rd, Seasalter. Clear those obstructed and provide new ways, if review shows it is desirable
- Faversham Rd (esp. between Blue Anchor Corner and Red Sluice) is dangerous for walkers. Could widen verge by taking up some carriageway or provide walkway along sea wall (owned by EA). Could be acknowledged as footpath

#### *Paragraph 7.20 - Cycling and Walking*

RN274 Davis (1730)  
 RN301 Wanstall (2265)  
 RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2379)  
 RN161 Ramblers Association (1914)  
 RN103 McCabe (591)  
 RN083 C. E. Murch Ltd. (419)

- Object to total lack of consultation on cycling and walking proposals. Before proposals are adopted all groups must be consulted especially pedestrians, the blind and disabled etc.
- Propose the upgrading of footpath links CH23, CH24, CH21, which connect the Herne Village centre, to the status of a cycle lane
- The pedestrian / cycle routes have been identified on the map prior to full consultation. In the absence of full information on sharing, segregation and width, must object to the proposals
- Would welcome a cycle path along the coast from Seasalter to Reculver to link with a coastal route to Thanet
- Object to opening of the Canterbury to Whitstable railway line as a cycle path because the area is well supplied with paths. It was previously agreed there was no pressure to open the railway and land is in other use.
- No further duplication of the Crab and Winkle Line route is needed down the old line which is in private ownership, part of farms and gardens and a nature reserve. Amend the proposed cycle routes

#### *Re: A7/014 – Amended paragraph 7.20*

RD017 Christophers (20024)

# INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RD090 Bekesbourne with Patricbourne Parish Council (20200)

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20563)

- Re-instate cycle route from Bekesbourne to Littlebourne
- Re-instate the Northgate to St John's car park route. A valuable link for pedestrian and cyclists using Northgate shops and students walking from North Holmes Road to leisure facilities without using busy roadside pavement
- Insert new 2nd sentence. Any new route must be safe for all users and should not compromise the efficient operation of any of the sites it links or provides access to

## *Paragraph 7.21 - Cycling and Walking*

RN274 Davis (1731)

RN301 Wanstall (2266)

RN166 Pedestrian Association (1825, 1826)

- Canterbury's cycle standards do not conform to the County's
- Object to total lack of consultation on cycling and walking proposals. Before proposals are adopted all groups must be consulted especially pedestrians, the blind and disabled etc.
- Walking is also of local and national importance on a much larger scale. Pedestrians require decent safe pathways. The unsafe and unhealthy practice of shared use routes should be stopped
- Rather than facilities for cyclists there needs to be a safer cycling policy adopted. Equally, pedestrians should have more public toilets and benches provided. Include enforcement of illegal cycling

## *Paragraph 7.22 - Cycling and Walking*

RN301 Wanstall (2267)

RN166 Pedestrian Association (1827, 1829, 1830)

RN010 Wilks (327)

- The biggest hindrance is allowing cyclists onto footpaths, pavements and promenades. Stop the practice of 'shared use' and painting white lines on all pedestrian routes
- It is disgraceful that the walking and cycling strategies are not yet prepared. It needs to be incorporated into the local plan so that it can be considered at the public inquiry
- Object to total lack of consultation on cycling and walking proposals. Before proposals are adopted all groups must be consulted especially pedestrians, the blind and disabled etc.
- Cyclists should not be on any footway. It is an unhealthy and unsafe practice. 'No cycling' signage should be promptly put up (e.g. Promenade at Tankerton) and police and council support is required
- The requests from the pedestrian and disability groups to the Walking Strategy should not be called a wish list. The walking strategy should not be weakened by dividing people up

## *Policy C3 – Proposed Pedestrian and Cycle Routes*

RN008 H. Mount and Sons (301)

RN010 Wilks (328, 329, 330, 331, 340, 341, 342, 371)

RN083 C. E. Murch Ltd. (420)

RN103 McCabe (592)

RN164 Railtrack PLC (1802)

RN166 Pedestrian Association (1828, 1832)

RN209 PACE (785)

RN287 Safer Walking & Cycling Campaign (834, 987)

RN288 Canterbury & District Access Group (971)

RN289 Design & Management Consultants (976)

RN290 Atkins (977)

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patricbourne (2327, 2328)

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2380)

RN333 Hubbard (2418)

RN355 Transco represented by Lattice Property (2492)

- Objects to the cycle route across the Gas Holder Station, Wincheap as the land is operational and this proposal raises health and safety issues
- Object to opening of the Canterbury to Whitstable railway line as a cycle path, particularly through Amery Court Farm, Blean, because the area is well supplied with paths. It was previously agreed there was no pressure to open the railway and land is in alternative use. Adverse effect on nature conservation, and activities like spraying and shooting
- Object to proposals for cycle path through Woolton Farm

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- The alleys in Whitstable should be kept clean and tidy and those that are obstructed should be opened up
- Acknowledge alleys described in the WUDC survey of 1951/52 as public ways; the remaining alleys should be investigated as to their correct status and value to the built environment of Whitstable
- A new policy should be set out which recognises the value of town alleys: a traffic free way to use the built environment and an asset loved by visitors
- As part of policy, include plans for enforcement and explain how juveniles are to be incorporated into cycle routes without damage to themselves and others. Remember that to pedestrians, cyclists are traffic
- Note that Tankerton Parade is a public footpath
- The policy needs to include reference to supporting additional routes as the opportunity arises
- No permissive cycle routes to be set out
- Include in policy that all changes from public footpath status (KCC definitive rights of way maps) are done under the Cycle Tracks Act 1984
- Opposes a route through the garden and driveway of The Malt, Tyler Hill Rd. Will be intrusive and impact upon privacy, wildlife and countryside when there is no need for an additional route
- Need for further arterial cycle routes linking major urban clusters & upgrading of whole Crab & Winkle route. Also routes to Ashford & secure the old Elham Valley Railway line as a cycle route
- Objection, as no consultation with groups such as visually impaired and blind, the disabled, the elderly, vulnerable, pedestrians and ramblers
- Object to proposed cycle routes affecting Preston Parade area including Admiralty Walk
- Remove existing Sustrans NCR1 route from BR footpath at Whitstable Station, through Stream Walk, past Westmeads School, through 'one way' Albert Street and back. It includes steps and a one way street.
- Objection because of lack of consultation with organisations representing the disabled and vulnerable
- No further duplication of the Crab and Winkle Line route is needed down the old line which is in private ownership, part of farms and gardens and a nature reserve. Amend the proposed cycle routes
- Propose the upgrading of footpath links CH23, CH24, CH21 which connect the Herne Village centre to the status of a cycle lane
- Proposed cycle route from Bekesbourne to Littlebourne not an alternative to the route parallel to Bekesbourne Lane, linking Bekesbourne to Littlebourne which has been requested for years
- Only include new proposed cycle routes in the plan after they have been discussed and agreed in principle with the landowner
- CCC and KCC have not adhered to DETR's shared use by cyclists and pedestrians brochure and consultation guidelines. Policy C3 should be withdrawn and re-established with better consultation, including ROSPA
- Where proposed cycle routes pass over, under or across railways and are only designated as public footpaths or bridleways, CCC should enter an agreement with Railtrack regarding the increased burden
- Breaches govt guidance; proposed cycle routes don't recognise that walkers are at top of vulnerable highway users hierarchy; consultation on proposed routes inadequate; walking & cycling strategies need to be linked

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.8 The Canterbury District Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy of April 2003 (CD7.10) has yet to be adopted, but I am informed that this is likely to occur between receipt of my report and the adoption of the Local Plan. However, the Council says the Strategy has already been approved by the County and District Councils. Apart from its propagation of the benefits of using these modes to a greater extent, the land use aspects of the Strategy comprise indicated cycle/pedestrian routes on the Proposals Map. The Strategy states that the routes shown would be “subject to further local public consultation as schemes come forward for implementation”. The Council says there that it intends to work closely with the Joint Walking and Cycling Forum, whose members include the Pedestrians Association, and to consult them on the detailed design of all walking and cycling schemes, at an early stage. Of course, it will be necessary to seek the agreement of landowners.
- 8.9 The objections show a strong number of fears and complaints about the perceived dangers stemming from shared use of certain parts of proposed cycle routes within the District. The Council's evidence to the Inquiry indicated that “the decision to prepare a joint walking and cycling strategy was prompted by groups representing pedestrians and

mobility impaired people when the coastal cycling route was first being considered. This has enabled the walking side to catch up with the considerable amount of work already carried out in respect of cycling...”.

- 8.10 I do understand what lies behind some of the concerns of the anti-shared use objectors, and the passage quoted indicates the strange position where cycling – an admirable, practical but minority activity with vocal and well placed advocates – can be portrayed as “go-ahead” and unquestionably virtuous while walking, a universal but almost uncelebrated activity save in the guise of “rambler” activity, can be seen as mundane and scarcely worthy of extensive policy formulation. It would be desirable and sensible to title the section of text from paragraph 7.19 onwards “Walking and Cycling”, echoing the title of the Strategy document.
- 8.11 I have visited the areas where all the proposed Cycle and Pedestrian Routes run, to assess the practicality and general acceptability of what is proposed in the Draft Walking and Cycling Strategy. Given the requirement for detailed consultation and problem solving, and the need to comply with statutory procedures, I do not consider it necessary to voice any planning reservations on the routeing shown on the Proposals Map, or what is said clearly and concisely in the Policy and supporting text, save in one instance.
- 8.12 In planning shared cycle/pedestrian routes, it is obviously necessary to bear in mind that it needs only a very few cyclists to act aggressively or inconsiderately, for the fast moving and heavy rider/bicycle combination to become a very dangerous weapon on any shared thoroughfare demarcated by nothing more than a painted white line. I agree with objectors’ concerns about the public footpath which is Tankerton Promenade, where the path is relatively narrow, with an un-walled steep drop to the beach below. This is a well-used seaside footpath of course, but numbers of the pedestrians using it walk across, rather than along the path, between the beach area and Tankerton Slopes, the latter well-lined with beach huts and access paths. This cross-path pattern of movement on a narrow space, used much more by pedestrians than cyclists, will inevitably cause problems and incidents if anything less than exemplary, slow cycling is practiced by every cyclist at all times. At the very least, I consider that this potential hazard should rule out shared use of the Tankerton Promenade footpath from the early morning to the early evening during the conventional seaside seasons of the year.
- 8.13 I realise that that there are articulate proponents of cyclists having access along the lower promenade, and that this idea has been promoted for some years. I, though, see no good reason why cyclists should not use the perfectly feasible alternative of an unconstrained cliff-top route along the axis of the relatively quiet and under-trafficked Marine Parade. This could run along either a marked section of the carriageway itself, or perhaps a newly constructed, low key cycling path over the grassed area near the cliff top, surfaced in a material like hoggin, if a good sea view is considered the real priority. I should like the Council to consider this matter dispassionately, before finally deciding the cycle and pedestrian route through Tankerton.

Recommendation

- 8.14 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified in accordance with actions suggested in my paragraphs 8.13 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C4 - TRANSPORT ASSESSMENTS AND TRAVEL PLANS - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.23-7.25

Objections and Key Issues

*Paragraph 7.23 - Coaches*

RN128 Dean and Chapter of Canterbury (119)

RN 345 Oaten Hill & District Society (2446)

- Specify that the dropping off facilities should be within the area of the city centre
- The City Council should identify a permanent coach park for Canterbury

*Paragraph 7.24 – Freight Travel*

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2556)

RN025 Cutler (658)

RN164 Railtrack PLC (1803, 1804)

RN285 Strategic Rail Authority (826)

- Plan doesn't sufficiently address the importance of transferring freight movements to rail & the movement of freight by means other than road
- Should consider the use of country lanes for access to farms. Produce could be collected in smaller lorries for delivery to a central point served by lorries
- Council should carry out a study about potential sites that could be designated as a rail freight interchange (in accordance with PPG13)
- Refer to the important part Canterbury District can make to SRA's National Transport Strategy; show support for the 80% growth target for rail freight
- Is Council having any input into suggestion for foreign lorry charging

*Paragraph 7.25 – Travel Plans*

RN274 Davis (1737)

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1574)

- The paragraph is framed around the Canterbury Transport Plan which does not yet exist
- Traffic needs reducing as safer routes to school, children walking or sharing minibuses will assist

*Re: A7/016 – Amended paragraph 7.25*

RD022 Bartlett (20054)

- Add after “air quality” the words "and traffic noise"

*Policy C4 – Transport Assessments and Travel Plans*

RN139 Pelham Homes Ltd Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (1573)

RN185 Lowe (161)

RN226 BT Group Plc Represented By RPS (1682)

- Clarify “major development”. All developments that will have significant transport implications should be supported by Transport assessments/Travel Plan
- The policy does not make reference to PPG13
- To add that all major proposals must be supported by a Transport Assessment showing how transport demand is to be reduced and how monitoring arrangements will be secured

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.15 The objectors to this policy and text in general want it to say much more, and more vigorously. However, I consider that the present degree of coverage is adequate, either because – as with coach parking – the answers are not yet worked out, or because the kind of additional text wanted is unnecessary, impractical or merely rhetorical.

8.16 The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC7/001, adding traffic noise as a consideration in the last sentence of Paragraph 7.25, which I consider an improvement. Using the text of PPG13 as a guide, I think it would be more practical to rephrase the opening of the Policy to read: "Development proposals considered by the Council to have significant transport implications are to be supported by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan..."

### Recommendation

8.17 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC7/001, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 8.16 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

## POLICY C5 - ROAD BUILDING - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.26-7.37

### Objections and Key Issues

#### *Paragraph 7.26 – Road Building*

RN052 Parkinson (62)

- Council should have a road pricing policy

#### *Paragraph 7.28 - Road Building*

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne (2329)

- Welcome additional slip roads at the A2 / Patrixbourne interchange, but the benefits for Partrixbourne should be recognised as well as the reduction of traffic in the Canterbury urban area

#### *Re: A7/017 – Amended paragraph 7.28*

RD090 Bekesbourne with Patrixbourne Parish Council (20201)

RD150 H. Mount and Sons Ltd (20389)

- Proposed cycle route (no. 31) a good idea in principle, but need to see detailed plans for the route
- Known benefits should be itemised specifically in the plan

#### *Policy C5*

RN052 Parkinson (60)

RN311 Bridge Parish Council (2284)

- Objects to A2 link roads
- Object to alteration of interchanges on the A2, without specific alterations proposed and clear policy statement

#### *Paragraph 7.30 –Road Schemes*

RN311 Bridge Parish Council (2286)

RN112 Canterbury City Partnership (516)

RN183 Sturry Parish Council (20)

RN315 Blean Parish Council (2298)

- Remove references to developer-funded road schemes in the plan. Could serve their own requirements only
- Eastern relief route is essential to Sturry due to effect of Manston and Hersden on Traffic levels
- Make reference to the Whitstable Road link road
- More measures are need to remove traffic from the city, particularly from A28

#### *Re: A7/018 – Reworded paragraph 7.30*

RD022 Bartlett (20055)

RD093 Austin (20225)

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- After Military Rd area, say it remains for consideration whether the possible benefits would outweigh the significant environmental damage which it would cause, since it would traverse an AHLV which is currently unaffected by traffic noise & movement
- Removal proposals for short Sturry bypass. Environmental implications of developer funded bypass not identified i.e. several hundred houses which is totally unacceptable, will transfer traffic problem, no indication of the route lack of clarity

### *Paragraph 7.31 – Road Building*

RN359 Harbledown Conservation Association (1947)

RN057 Harbledown Parish Council (1939)

- Against idea of a western link road. This would negate the Plan's environmental policies applied to Harbledown parish, the Canterbury AHLV review and Conservation Area policies

### *Re: A7/019 – Reworded paragraph 7.31*

RD004 Blean Parish Council (20216)

RD106 Bridge Parish Council (20292, 20293)

- Remove reference to Eastern bypass
- Objects to western link road from A2050 to A290 as this will generate extra traffic through Blean
- Para 7.31 seems contrary to para 7.28. Unlocking the gridlock suggests alteration to the interchange on existing bypass, but no map details are given

### *Paragraph 7.32 - Road Building*

RN311 Bridge Parish Council (2285)

RN228 Kent County Council (1644)

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patricbourne (2330)

RN209 PACE (786)

- The Barrack Link would not necessarily relieve congestion in the city centre, and the reasons for abandoning the Eastern Bypass need to be explained.
- Object to the inclusion of the A28/A2 Eastern Bypass. Remove mention of the scheme as it is reported it is unlikely to receive funding from public sources
- Mention should be made of the benefit to the villages in the south east quadrant of Canterbury by the creation of a Canterbury Eastern Bypass
- Eastern Traffic By-pass would decimate areas of high scenic value & increase car usage. Traffic in eastern area could be overcome by upgrading Tourtel Rd to Littlebourne Rd link

### *Re: A7/020 – Deleted paragraph 7.32*

RD090 Bekesbourne with Patricbourne Parish Council (20202)

- Deletion of Eastern Bypass means no solution is suggested. Plan should address growth of traffic in SE Quadrant & suggestions for reduction & management of traffic

### *Paragraph 7.33 - Road Building*

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (1302)

- Object to building of a Herne bypass. Re-designation of the A291 as a B road would discourage heavy traffic.

### *Paragraph 7.34 - Road Building*

RN054 Councillor Attwood (85)

RN228 Kent County Council (1645)

RN328 Westbere Parish Council (2413)

RN183 Sturry Parish Council (21)

- Paragraph misleading and should be omitted. Funding would need to be substantial and restrictions of para. 2.52 of the draft would preclude any development in the vicinity
- There should be a strong policy objection to further retail along Sturry Road by reason of heavy traffic through Sturry/ A28
- Objects to the Sturry By-Pass. Delete this Paragraph in its entirety
- The A28 Multi Modal Study considered a short by-pass as an option and this could be mentioned

# INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

## *Paragraph 7.36 - Traffic management*

RN052 Parkinson (61)

RN131 Clarke Cooper & Co (112)

RN185 Lowe (162)

- Traffic management should introduce road charges; add a policy to protect traffic management systems
- The Council should reduce congestion by reducing speed of traffic
- No solutions are offered to traffic and parking problems

## Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.18 I find no great weight or content in the objections to Policy C5 and its supporting text. The Council's premise is that traffic must be kept moving, but that road building proposals must show real environmental benefits and must be accompanied by traffic management schemes. More detail is available in the Canterbury District Transport Action Plan, so I find what is said in the Plan quite adequate. The Council's given reasons for not pursuing a road pricing policy are realistic.
- 8.19 The Plan text from paragraph 7.30-7.35, amended in the Revised Deposit Draft, performs what I consider a useful function. It brings into the open concepts that have been envisaged or advocated in public, but which have no specific allocation or approval. The text contains specific caveats about some schemes, and I find that it generally maintains an even-handed tone. Of course, to some objectors any mention of a possible scheme is interpreted as actual Council support, but discussion of a matter is not the same as its endorsement. I do think that it would be helpful to Plan users to insert some additional text; this would briefly spell out that none of the concept schemes is seen as likely to come forward for implementation within the Local Plan period, but it would also indicate the procedure for any scheme to be formally brought forward through the Local Transport Plan for Kent. It would also be wise to add to paragraph 7.30 a statement that there is no potential development envisaged to fund any of the schemes mentioned.
- 8.20 The one exception to what I have said concerns Sturry. Here, the long-standing saga of successive aborted bypass schemes means that any text must be very nicely judged. This vulnerable village needs to maintain its separate identity from the periphery of the City. I find that the text following the bullet point in paragraph 7.30 does raise as many fears as it seeks to dispel; development to fund a Short Bypass might affect the degree and quality of separation between Village and City. If the Council accepts my recommendation for a Broad Oak housing allocation, that development would be accompanied by an east-west road between Herne Bay Road and Shalloak Road with some of the characteristics of a Sturry Bypass, and other transport funding benefiting Sturry. It is for the Council to decide if that new road would effectively remove any realistic case for a separate Short Bypass. I leave it to the Council to devise new text about the Sturry situation.
- 8.21 The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC7/002, bringing in mention of environmental impact to the first sentence of paragraph 7.30. This should certainly be incorporated in any re-drafting of the paragraph.

## Recommendation

- 8.22 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC7/002, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraphs 8.19-8.20 above, but that no other modification be

made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C6 - PARK AND RIDE IN CANTERBURY - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.38-7.39, 7.41-7.42

Objections and Key Issues

*Paragraph 7.38 – Park and Ride in Canterbury*

RN061	PACE (38)
RN209	PACE (784, 787)
RN021	Leatham (634)
RN186	Strutt & Parker (178)
RN025	Cutler (657)
RN185	Lowe (163)
RN010	Wilks (334)
RN210	Furley Page Solicitors (798)
RN024	Gogrin (642)
RN228	Kent County Council (1660)

- The Park and Ride car park should be extended to the railway station the respondent proposes at back of Wincheap (see comment 641)
- Current park and ride scheme, though meeting the needs of certain sectors of the community is not suitable in terms of speed & convenience for business
- Is park and ride really reducing cars?; the buses always look mostly empty
- Park and ride sites a waste of the precious agricultural land resource
- Park & Ride sites haven't been developed in a manner that maximises their utility. City edge P&R should have been smaller; should be small P&R on axial public transport routes into the City
- Although true to say 'The City's PARC Plan strategy has been successful in contributing to the reduction of urban traffic levels over the past 10 years', this is now a misleading statement
- Any allocation of the 4th park and Ride at Halls Place, Harbledown should respect its existing or potential alternative use
- Objects to site from area N.W. Wincheap Industrial Estate adjacent to A2 to Canterbury/Ashford railway not being identified as a site for extending the Wincheap Park and Ride

*Paragraph 7.41 - Park and Ride in Canterbury*

RN311	Bridge Parish Council (2287)
RN209	PACE (793)
RN183	Sturry Parish Council (22)

- Bridge PC has concerns that expansion of all three park and ride sites is envisaged. The South Canterbury site should not be expanded
- Expansion of the PARC sites is welcomed. Satellite park and ride sites for Sturry could be considered to gather up those travelling from Herne Bay and Thanet before reaching Sturry
- Under no circumstances should the present Park and Ride facilities be enlarged

*Policy C6 – Sturry Road Park and Ride extension*

RN208	Thanet District Council (767)
RN209	PACE (789)

- Under no circumstances should the present P&R facilities be enlarged.
- Objection to safeguarding further land for car parking expansion at Sturry Park and Ride; will attract more shopping trips from outside the District. Delete extension & apply other traffic management measures

*Re: A7/028 – Amended paragraph 7.41*

RD106	Bridge Parish Council (20295)
-------	-------------------------------

- Disappointed to see no reference to the expansion of Dover Road P&R site

# INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

*Re: A7/029 – amended paragraph 7.42*

- RD138                      G W Finn & Sons (20529)
- Should be a site on A257

## Reasoning and Conclusions

8.23 This text and Policy deal with a well established concept, which the Council keeps developing and improving on a regular basis. PPG13 sets out in its paragraphs 59-63 a large number of relevant considerations, and says that appropriate schemes may vary considerably in size and purpose. The manner in which the Council operates appears to me to avoid the potential pitfalls and mis-applications of the concept highlighted in PPG13. This text is suitably circumspect about any specific enhancement of two of the three existing park and ride sites and the possible new fourth site on the A257, in association with other measures to reduce travel demand and congestion. It does safeguard an area of land for extension at Sturry Park and Ride facility. I do not find there to be any forceful argument against what is no more than a potential Sturry expansion, save a somewhat far-fetched objection about adverse effects on Thanet District.

## Recommendation

8.24 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

## NEW POLICY C5a – HARBLEDOWN PARK AND RIDE FACILITY, AND PARAGRAPH 7.40

### Objections and Key Issues

*Paragraph 7.40 - Park and Ride in Canterbury*

- RN315                      Blean Parish Council (2301, 2302)
- RN359                      Harbledown Conservation Association (1948)
- RN021                      Leatham (633)
- RN112                      Canterbury City Partnership (515)
- RN017                      Harbledown Parish Council (609)

- Objects to approach to Park and Ride. No additional sites should be identified, rather improvements to existing locations and management and provision of services and facilities
- There does not appear to be a reference to the land set aside for the fourth park and ride
- Land north west of the Wincheap industrial estate to the Canterbury / Ashford railway and adjacent A2 should be re-designated for North Canterbury Park and Ride, Parkway Station and Coach Park
- A Park and Ride site in the Harbledown area could lead to pressure for development
- A disastrous effect on Harbledown Parish in terms of landscape and impact on the Conservation Area. The scheme should be abandoned

*Re: A7/026 – amended paragraph 7.40*

- RD004                      Blean Parish Council (20006)
- RD041                      Leatham (20088)
- RD061                      The Baker Family (20129)

- Object to P&R site: area is congested and a crash black spot, and should be protected as a green gap
- Paragraph 7.40 P&R allocation at Harbledown does not preserve or enhance conservation area, unacceptable harm within AHLV; adverse impact on green space between Rough Common & Canterbury; light & noise pollution; increased traffic through Rough Common; consider alternatives on A2 at Dunkirk

# INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

*Re: A7/027- New policy C5a Harbledown Park and Ride site*

RD003	Ravenscourt Road Residents' Association (20004)
RD004	Blean Parish Council (20007)
RD041	Leatham (20089)
RD060	Beattie (20128)
RD061	Baker (20130)
RD062	Docherty (20131)
RD074	Murdoch (20150)
RD089	George (20196)
RD102	Highways Agency (20267)

- Worse traffic problems, congestion, hazards, reduction of green land between Rough Common/Canterbury
- More traffic and rat running thro Rough Common; need to reduce number of large vehicles using road; dangerous for children trying to cross, site should remain green land; go for alternative sites on A2 & at Whitstable. Should have “village only” traffic policy for Rough Common
- Wincheap park and ride, using new A2 slip roads, should be expanded
- Need to ensure traffic impact of such sites is properly assessed. Say a prior transport assessment will be prepared to consider the impact of the proposed development on surrounding highway network
- Increased pollution for St Michael's Road residents, air pollution, traffic and associated noise, light pollution, loss of rural greenfield view. More appropriate sites at A2/Dunkirk. Decrease in property values

## Reasoning and Conclusions

8.25 The Council has a long-established system of park and ride sites in Canterbury, which appear to operate well. It is undoubtedly true that the absence of a facility in the north-west area of Canterbury amounts to a lost opportunity to keep more Canterbury-bound vehicles away from the Historic City. Clearly, the way in which the concept is fleshed out in a detailed scheme is critical, as regards matters such as siting, the impact on landscape and the curtailment of undesirable rat-running into potentially vulnerable residential areas like Rough Common (where present traffic levels are still well within the capacity of Rough Common Road and its junction with the A290). All this work has yet to be undertaken, and put out for consultation.

8.26 None of the (necessarily un-detailed) objector evidence before me suggests that an expanded Wincheap area, or locations further out on the A2, are inherently better than the land north of Hall Place as a traffic interception point for this north-west area of the City. However, the supporting text in paragraph 7.40 does promise further work on alternative options for park and ride “on the A2 corridor”, which suggests to me that the Council is prepared for alternative thinking if detailed technical examination reveals really serious problems arising from a Hall Place location. Also, the Council has put forward Proposed Change PC7/003, bringing in mention of a transport assessment to consider the impact of any facility on the surrounding highway network, in a new last sentence of Paragraph 7.40. These positive factors lead me to support what I find to be a reasonable concept, which should be capable of considerable refinement before it is built.

## Recommendation

8.27 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC7/003, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C7 - PARK AND RIDE AT HERNE BAY AND WHITSTABLE - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.43-7.44

Objections and Key Issues

*Paragraph 7.43 – Park and Ride along the Coast*

RN228 Kent County Council (1661)

- The Park and Ride sites at the coast should not seek to serve Canterbury. Any link to Canterbury from them should be through improved bus measures

*Paragraph 7.44 - Park and Ride along the Coast*

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2394)

RN207 Reeves and Neylan (749)

- Not convinced there is any need for a Park and Ride at this location. Parking in Herne Bay is not severe, and there an adequate bus service which needs improvement
- In para 3.44 the terms "business innovation centre" & knowledge/research park" are not defined & don't make clear the proposed activity on the safeguarded land at University of Kent

*Policy C7 – Park and Ride at the Coast*

RN208 Thanet District Council (768)

- The Plan should more fully clarify the reasons for allocating an additional Park and Ride facility at Herne Bay, together with its future size and proposed role

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.28 The wording used here indicates that the case for applying the park and ride concept at Herne Bay and Whitstable is yet to be justified in detail. However, the Council has had the foresight to identify a possible park and ride location at Eddington golf course, and the policy and supporting text allow the concept's potential to be exploited and perhaps expanded at some time in the Local Plan period. That seems very reasonable to me.

Recommendation

8.29 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICIES C8 & C9 - PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARKING - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.45-7.54

Objections and Key Issues

*Paragraph 7.45 – Public and Private Parking*

RN156 BSF Planning Consultants (1860)

RN025 Cutler (659)

RN010 Wilks (360)

- Why is there any doubt over controls of non-residential parking as is implied by the phrase in para 7.45 "controls may be introduced"?
- Free car parking would help shopping centres and attract visitors e.g. Newmarket in Suffolk. Label certain car parks 'short visit car park' and 'long visit car park'
- There is no justification for control over private non-residential parking. Delete reference

*Paragraph 7.46 - Public and Private Parking*

RN285 Strategic Rail Authority (832)

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Say adequate car parking for rail users is important to encourage public transport use. In line with PPG13, rail industry should be consulted to establish car parking levels

*Re: A7/031 – New paragraph 7.46a Public and Private Parking*

RD024 Wratten (20058)

- Car parking for resident & visitors is one of main problems for Whitstable & is not addressed (except park and ride). Should state an intent to acquire land for car parking if it becomes available

*Paragraph 7.48 – Residential parking*

RN221 E Kent Hospitals Trust represented by Broadway Malyan (1698)

- The residential parking standards should be amended to reflect Government Guidance.

*Re: Paragraph 7.49 – Improving Travel Awareness*

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2347)

- Village traffic plans should embrace education within their communities. How do we educate those from other communities who use local roads as short cuts?

*Paragraph 7.50 - Improving Travel Awareness*

RN306 Parish Council of Bekesbourne with Patricxbourne (2332)

- Frustrated by the lack of real action on safety on rural lanes. The Quiet Lane schemes have not proved to be of any benefit and any reference to them should be removed from the plan

*Policy C8 – Vehicle Parking Standards*

RN084 WM Morrison Supermarkets Plc represented by Peacock and Smith (1932)

RN088 Lovegrove (717)

RN210 Furley Page Solicitors (802)

- The public will always own at least one car and any new housing should cater for this
- On the basis of current car parking policy, parking on brownfield developments will be inadequate
- Object to appendix 2: Vehicle Parking Standards: The cycle parking standard will be in excess of demand and inefficient use of land. Amend A1 Food superstores to 5% of vehicle parking standards

*Policy C9 – Parking requirements in town centres*

RN085 Marks & Spencer Plc represented by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (1839)

RN125 Snook (107)

RN131 Clarke Cooper & Co (111)

RN184 Kent Maritime Chamber of Commerce (148)

RN255 GOSE (2653)

- This policy will force certain types of business to leave the City centre
- Only implement after satisfactory alternatives have been put in place to safeguard the City centre
- Limiting parking to operational levels will prejudice Council's vision for Tannery by threatening commercial viability. At end of 1st sentence add: "Except where such an approach would prejudice other Local Plan objectives or the redevelopment of key sites"
- Access and parking militate against the economy. Need to consider alternatives
- Reword Policy to allow for assessments/plans only being required for proposals with significant transport implications

*Re: A7/032 – Amended policy C9*

RD079 GOSE (20179)

- In Policy C9 the word "reasonable" makes the Policy unclear

*Re: A7/033 – new paragraph 7.54a Travel Wise*

RD128 Unite represented by Turley Associates (20354)

- Positive connections should be made between the adoption of travel plans with car free development options and good access to public transport

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.30 I find the Council's approach to vehicle parking matters to be well-judged. It sticks to the application of County Council adopted standards, but sets out a reasoned approach to residential parking that seeks to avoid problems like unsightly street parking stemming from unrealistic provision in uncontrolled areas, while displaying an encouraging attitude to new housing with reduced parking and car-free development in appropriate controlled areas. No convincing case has been made out for a departure from the current adopted County standards for particular developments. However, a small rewording in C9 removes a potential conflict on the important Tannery site, without weakening it. I find that in the specific context of this Policy, the use of the subjective term "reasonable multi-modal access" is hard to improve on; it is a matter that will have to be debated in the context of a particular development in a specific location, but that does not show an intrinsic weakness of approach by the Council.
- 8.31 I do not find there is a need to make general comment on parking for rail users in this policy, but there would be no harm and some sense in making a reference to possible enhanced parking demand at Canterbury West Station after CTRL completion, and how this fits with the principles of the C9 Policy. The Council will be in possession of more information by the time it considers my report, and that will determine precisely what is to be said further on the matter. I endorse the Council's three Proposed Changes concerning this text. PC7/014 removes the last sentence in paragraph 7.46 on parking standards. PC7/015 moves paragraph 7.46a to follow 7.48, and PC7/016 expands the text about uncontrolled parking areas in 7.48.

Recommendation

- 8.32 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes Nos. PC7/014, PC7/015 and PC7/016, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 8.31 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICIES C10, C10a & C11 - COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.55-7.60

Objections and Key Issues

*Policy C10*

RN189 South Canterbury Trust (1764)

RN255 GOSE (2643, 2649)

- Rephrase Policy wording
- Refer in the text to cemeteries and places of worship

*Re: A7/036 – Amended policy C10*

RD079 GOSE (20173)

- object to words "will be encouraged"; makes the meaning of the Policy unclear

*Re: A7/037 – New policy C10a Community Use. Allocations*

RD024 Wratten (20057)

RD085 National Grid Company Plc represented by Malcolm Judd and Partners (20300)

- Objects as no community allocation for Whitstable
- Brief for any development at Vauxhall Avenue must take account of high voltage overhead lines

# INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

## *Policy C11 – Loss of Community Uses*

RN118 Dept of Health represented by Inventures (501)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2578)

RN255 GOSE (2637)

- The use of the term community facilities is taken to include NHS health-care buildings or land. It is unclear whether this is the case. Specify that policy does not apply to NHS health care facilities
- Retain health facilities and get the Government to revamp in specialist departments

## Reasoning and Conclusions

8.33 The Council has augmented the text about the types of appropriate social infrastructure in the Revised Deposit Draft. It has also put forward Further Amendment FA7/003, which inserts a new paragraph 7.58a to follow paragraph 7.58. This expands in what I consider to be a useful way on relevant factors when considering new “informal facilities” in rural locations, whether re-using existing building or seeking new premises. Its text can now be altered to refer to PPS7 of 2004, in which para.6 alludes to development of this kind.

8.34 I do not find the use of the words “will be encouraged” inappropriate in Policy C10; the sentiment reflects the Council’s attitude, and it is yoked to a policy oriented to the control of development. The two locations specifically named for community purposes in Policy C10a can be augmented by others so far not identified, under Policy C10. I do believe the opening words of Policy C11 could with profit be made more relevant to the control of development if they read: “planning permission will not be granted for development involving the loss to other uses of public or privately operated buildings, or uses for community purposes, unless there is no....”

## Recommendation

8.35 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment No. FA7/003, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 8.35 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

## POLICY C12 - HEALTH FACILITIES - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.61-7.63

### Objections and Key Issues

#### *Paragraph 7.62*

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2354)

- Retain healthcare facilities, and get the Govt to revamp in specialist departments

#### *Policy C12*

RN068 Bellway Homes Ltd (702)

RN096 Chestfield Parish Council (733)

RN255 GOSE (2650)

- The principle is OK but there may be circumstances where requirement for health facilities will be waived. Insert at end: 'providing this would not prejudice the realisation of other planning objectives'
- Concerned over impacts of 5000 new homes on infrastructure, especially doctors and dentists surgeries; wish to see policy on health expanded to cover these potential problems
- Avoid “appropriate”

# INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

## Reasoning and Conclusions

8.36 There is no basic opposition in principle to this Policy, which confines itself to the planning aspects of provision, and does not venture uselessly into wider health policy issues. The suggested additional wording at the end would only fudge a clear message, and the word "appropriate" is entirely acceptable in this particular verbal context.

## Recommendation

8.37 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

## POLICIES C14 & C15 - EDUCATIONAL NEEDS - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.65-7.76

### Objections and Key Issues

#### *Paragraph 7.65 - Education*

RN229 Property Review & Development (2606)

- Reword last sentence to clarify County Council's role: "The County Council, however, as Education Authority has statutory responsibility for the provision of state education." Make a clear reference to adult education

#### *Paragraph 7.67 – Primary and Secondary Sector*

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2368)

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2155)

- A new primary school should be located on the outskirts of Broomfield to alleviate the capacity problems at Herne and Broomfield
- Future schooling plans should be mentioned. Herne Bay needs more primary school places

#### *Paragraph 7.69 - Primary and Secondary Sector*

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2367)

- There is chronic under-provision of school places in both the primary and secondary sectors

#### *Paragraph 7.72 - Primary and Secondary Sector*

RN229 Property Review & Development (2598)

- Amend to correct school names, add the state sector schools and include consultation with the LEA and church education authorities as appropriate

#### *Paragraph 7.75 - Primary and Secondary Sector*

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2156)

RN096 Chestfield Parish Council (734)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2577)

- Note the possibility of a secondary school in the Green Gap between Herne Bay and Whitstable. But, there is no mention of the possibility of use of the site for sports facilities: would support this use
- Herne Bay will need another secondary school soon to the east of the town centre. A site should be identified
- KCC view is no need for a secondary school at the coast during the lifetime of the Plan. But, there will be a need for a primary school and possibly other education provision on the coast during the Plan period

#### *Re: A7/042 – Reworded paragraph 7.76*

RD086 Sport England (20317)

- Concerned that expansion of schools may lead to loss of playing fields. Suggest '...provided there is no conflict with other Policies in the plan' is added to the end of the last sentence.

#### *Policy C14 – Educational needs arising from new developments*

RN068 Bellway Homes Ltd (703)

RN144 Persimmon Homes represented by Tetlow King Planning (491)

RN221 E Kent Hospitals Trust represented by Broadway Malyan (1699)

# INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN255 GOSE (2651)

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2369)

- Policy is too vague. It does not spell out what the 'appropriate mechanisms' are in the policy or the sub-text
- The principle is OK but may be circumstance where requirement for education facilities will be waived. Insert at end of C15: "providing this would not prejudice the realisation of other planning objectives"
- Agree with policy proposals which support a new secondary school, but suggest that the policies should enjoy a greater degree of urgency
- This policy should acknowledge that such mechanisms will not be necessary where there is existing capacity in local schools

*Re: A7/043 – Amended Policy C14*

RD079 GOSE (20178)

- The word "appropriate" makes the Policy unclear

*Policy C15 - Educational needs arising from new developments*

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2370)

- Agree with policy proposals which support a new secondary school, but suggest that the policies should enjoy a greater degree of urgency.

*Re: A7/044 – Reworded Policy C15*

RD086 Sport England (20318)

- Revised wording weakens the Policy. New Policy would be contrary to advice in PPG17 if it did not include criteria related to the protection of playing fields

## Reasoning and Conclusions

8.38 Apart from those objections lobbying for a particular area need to be filled – a matter for the County Council as Education Authority – the Council has responded positively to accommodate suggested textual improvement and clarification. I find that no planning problem arises from the use of the word "appropriate" in Policy C14, as it is entirely acceptable in this particular verbal context.

8.39 The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC7/004 adding a new last sentence to paragraph 7.76 about expansion that affects playing fields. The Council has also put forward two Further Amendments: FA7/009 and FA7/010; these update and reword the lists of secondary schools, and information about the development plans they are encouraged to prepare, in paragraphs 7.72 and 7.73; the wording accords with the County Council's representations on the matter. I find that another County Council concern, about specific mention of adult education, is satisfactorily met through existing text in paragraph 7.78. All these Changes are uncontentious, in my opinion.

## Recommendation

8.40 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change PC7/004 and Further Amendment Nos. FA7/009 and FA9/010, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C16 AND NEW POLICY C16a – CANTERBURY COLLEGE AND HADLOW COLLEGE – AND PARAGRAPHS 7.77 –7.84.

POLICY C18 - NEW OR EXPANDED CAMPUSES – AND PARAGRAPHS 7.83-7.86.

POLICIES C19 AND NEW POLICY C19a – INSTITUTIONAL LAND AND BUILDINGS – AND PARAGRAPHS 7.87-7.88.

Objections and Key Issues

*Paragraph 7.81 – Higher and Further Education*

RN274 Davis (1745)

RN235 Hadlow College represented by GVA Grimley (1707, 1708, 1709, 1710, 1712, 1713)

- The Council fails to recognise the presence of Hadlow College as a further education institution specialising in agriculture and horticulture
- Make a new policy for the college site, with supporting text about its strategy for the site
- Remove the Open Space designation on the Proposals Map and replace it by educational land at Hadlow College

*Paragraph 7.82 – Canterbury College*

RN212 Canterbury Christ Church University College (803)

- Plan does not show a significant level of support for the University College's own development objectives. Are not optimistic that needs of the College will be met in the urban area

*Policy C16 – Education allocations*

RN010 Wilks (335)

RN062 Hull (446)

RN064 Westhall (444)

RN065 Weiss (686)

RN069 Illes (708)

RN070 Hughes (710, 712)

RN071 Nicoll (713)

RN072 Rogerson (714)

RN073 Storrs (715)

RN075 Brown (56, 57)

RN076 Tyler (97, 98)

RN091 Mackenzie (919)

RN092 Chambers (719)

RN093 Brown (54)

RN101 Spain (920)

RN102 Mackenzie (918)

RN117 Langton & Nackington Residents Association (904)

RN127 Greenway (123)

RN157 Mather (929)

RN165 Hiscot (931)

RN185 Lowe (149)

RN209 PACE (780)

RN213 Martin (806)

RN223 O'Rorke (1201)

RN256 Herbert (2154)

RN273 Phipps (1729)

RN332 Mason (2417)

RN345 Oaten Hill & District Society (2443)

RN346 Miller (2438)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2561)

RN127 Greenway (124)

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RN213 Martin (807)

- Support the AHLV designation in the area at and surrounding the proposed education allocation for Canterbury College (Policy C16)
- Object to allocation of land at Nackington Road for educational use by Canterbury College; impact on the AHLV, traffic congestion, urban sprawl, accessibility and pollution
- Canterbury College should be encouraged to remain local to its existing campus
- Would reduce the status of the site to brownfield, but should be AHLV
- The land would be better as a landscaped public park

*Re: A7/047 – Amended policy C16*

RD040 Beddall (20081)

RD112 Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee (20431)

- Object to the education allocation at Hadlow College, Spring Lane. Impact on neighbouring properties, site is haven for wildlife and flora. Should undertake a study of flora and fauna
- Would like to see restrictions on scale of an educational development on Hadlow site. Currently small scale development for horticultural work in low rise buildings glasshouses & open plots. Over scaled building could adversely impact on residential properties adjacent

*Re: PC7/017: amendment of Proposals Map to identify revised education allocation at Hadlow College (Policy C16)*

APC078 D Hatton (30093)

APC121 Hadlow College, represented by David Hicken Associates Ltd (30156)

- Increase in traffic, diversity of wildlife needs to be maintained, possibility of further building. Objects to reduction in land available for educational use
- Will severely prejudice Hadlow College's ability to provide desired courses

*Re: A7/048 – New Policy C16a – Nackington Road Education allocation*

RD006 Rogerson (20013)

RD007 Tyler (20014)

RD010 Welsh (20017)

RD012 Hughes (20019)

RD013 Baldock (20020)

RD014 Parkinson (20021)

RD023 Spain (20076)

RD031 Westall (20065)

RD033 Brown (20067)

RD034 Brown (20068)

RD047 Mather (20106)

RD057 Earle (20122)

RD065 Langton & Nackington Residents' Association (20135)

RD066 Parkinson (20138)

RD090 Bekesbourne with Patribourne Parish Council (20203)

RD106 Bridge Parish Council (20294)

RD112 Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee (20432)

RD123 Miller (20336, 20337)

RD152 Smith (20738)

- The land at Nackington Road, designated for college purposes, should be returned to its proper designation and should no longer be available for education use
- Object to allocation of new college campus on traffic grounds and loss of grade 1 agricultural land
- The college allocation should be de-allocated and the AHLV reinstated
- Should revert to agricultural land
- Allocation conflicts with reducing travel demand. Exacerbates travel impact associated with secondary schools
- No justification for retaining education allocation, as Canterbury College has withdrawn their application. Permission granted on overriding need can not be applied to just any college

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Should not be allocated in light of results of public inquiry. Unlikely to be need in future with falling birth rate
- Generates urban sprawl
- ODPM refused to acknowledge land was suitable for education; should go before public inquiry
- Why in face of such local opposition is land being allocated? Erodes green land between Canterbury & villages, will increase traffic on rural roads + A2/Patrixbourne interchange
- Inadequate services; remote from City centre and public transport
- Allocation may render site for ever brownfield

### *Paragraph 7.84 – Canterbury Christ Church University College*

RN322 English Heritage (1795)

RN061 PACE (39)

- Canterbury Christ Church University College maintains an option to develop land on the Dover Road. It is misleading not to include this on the development plan
- The development brief should give due consideration to potential impact upon the historic environment and World Heritage Site Management Plan

### *Policy C18 – New Education Campus*

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1511)

RN228 Kent County Council (1662)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2581)

RN345 Oaten Hill & District Society (2445)

- Add criterion "any relocation to the edge of the city shall be on the side of the city corresponding to the direction from which students travelling to the institutions come"
- The policy should recognise and acknowledge the proposals for major growth in the student population
- Amend first sentence: "Planning permission will only be granted for the establishment of a new higher or further education campus." etc

### *Re: A7/052 – Amended Policy C18*

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20575)

- Maintains original objection. Use of word "further" in this context is confusing. Does it mean further & higher or additional education? Clarify

### *Policy C19 – Loss of Institutional Land or Buildings*

RN052 Parkinson (58)

RN118 Dept of Health represented by Inventures (2630, 2631)

RN221 E Kent Hospitals Trust represented by Broadway Malyan (1700)

RN228 Kent County Council (1663)

RN235 Hadlow College represented by GVA Grimley (1711)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2562)

- Nunnery Fields Hospital should be converted properly and not demolished
- Loss of institutional land or buildings will be acceptable where such facilities are vacant and the Council has allocated the site for an alternative form of development
- Modify to deal only with the loss of institutional land and a separate policy for new campuses and expansion of existing. The policy should stop after criterion (c)
- Amend to include no intrusion onto greenfield land, and sustainable transport links being in walking distance

### *Re: A7/054 – Amended Policy C19*

RD079 GOSE (20172)

- Words "will resist" make the Policy unclear

### *Re: A7/055 – New policy C19a*

RD020 Wilks (20087)

RD079 GOSE (20187)

RD086 Sport England (20319)

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20644)

- Reference to the impact of development on recreation and open space in this Policy. It is therefore not in accordance with the advice in PPG17 on Policy for recreation and assessing development proposals
- Include recognition in Policy of need for additional housing to student accommodation requirements, and the hardship for those seeking housing in open market, if needs not addressed by additional housing provision
- Policy appears vague and ambiguous
- Delete "onto previously undeveloped land". This development must go on previously developed land

### Reasoning and Conclusions

8.41 I now consider the long list of objections above, all together and in one place. This is because, since the First Deposit Draft, a series of revisions have highlighted inter-actions between various policies in this chapter that deal with future possibilities for particular bodies. These bodies are: (a) what the Plan calls "Institutions" – a wide category of uses that include education of all kinds, defined in paragraph 7.87 and the subject of Policies C19 and C19a; and (b) Further or Higher Educational Institutions, the subjects of Policies C16, C16a, and C18. The only Institution that everybody implicitly considers to be adequately housed on a large site that can accommodate its foreseeable expansion needs is the University of Kent; I treat objections to Policy C17, devoted exclusively to the University, separately below.

8.42 The passage of policy and text concerning Policies C16 and C16a throws up two main matters. One concerns the appropriate designation of the green field site east of Nackington Road, which the Council wishes to see retained as a potential new campus for an educational institution. The other concerns the way that Hadlow College is treated as an allocation and designated on the Proposals Map. I now address them in turn.

### The Nackington Road Site

8.43 In the April 2002 First Deposit Draft text, paragraph 7.82 was drafted in the expectation that Canterbury College would move there to satisfy its future needs. The College no longer needs the site, as it intends to develop on existing sites within Canterbury. The Council's uncontradicted evidence is that the College opted for redevelopment on its existing site because it was worn down by the lengthy process of trying to get a detailed, implementable permission. There is no evidence that Canterbury Christ Church University College, which also considered the site at one stage, retains any active current interest. The Revised Deposit Draft announced a Council stance that this site should be safeguarded as a potential new college campus, for a user or users as yet unknown, in preference to any other, less desirable green field site that might be advocated if there were no suitable location within the Canterbury Urban Area Boundary. It has put forward Proposed Change PC7/005, requiring Policy C16a to be applied in conjunction with Policy C18, which requires any applicant institution to satisfy six specific criteria for location onto a new site.

8.44 This large site of nearly 29 ha is now largely fallow, but is said to have some residual fruit farming activity. It is in open countryside with a draft AHLV designation, just south of the City's Urban Area Boundary; it had no specific allocation in the 1998 Adopted Local Plan. The allocated land excludes a former agricultural packing station on the Nackington Road frontage at present, although this seems an anomalous exclusion, and the Council may wish to re-visit the reasons for its exclusion.

8.45 The Development Brief prepared by the Council in March 2000 portrays the site as a flat open area, not possessing great visual or landscape sensitivity, with no features of significant ecological or archaeological interest. It considered the best form of

development as a campus of relatively low-rise buildings set within a landscaped parkland. Development principles should not “extend into the green wedge between (any) campus and the village of Bridge”, and should “retain and safeguard open, undeveloped land between (any) campus and the residential areas to the north-east”. The Brief saw vehicular access being obtained from either Nackington Road, or the New Dover Road park and ride site, or both, but with any submission backed by a full transport assessment.

- 8.46 In Inspector O'Rourke's 1997 report she considered a number of issues to do with the desire of further and higher education institutions to relocate. In her paragraph c52.17 she gave a view on the University College's request that the emerging Plan should specifically refer to the south-east quadrant of the City as the most suitable area to meet its expansion needs. She did express the view that the south-east quadrant was a sensible option to pursue. Her reasons were that the land between Nackington Lane and New Dover Road had the topographical benefit of relative containment in the landscape. She also found benefits in the transport links in the south-east: proximity to the nearby park and ride, the latter's potential as a transport node, and the location being on the “right side of the City for ease of links with the existing College campus”. I should add that this ease-of-links consideration also applies, now and for the future, to other existing educational Institutions: Canterbury College, the KIAD and Hadlow College, as well as a number of schools. I appreciate the argument that in a perfect world, this south-east quadrant area would not be an ideal choice for locating institutions, in view of the longer access journeys from other urban areas of the District and Thanet. However, it is not at all clear to me how a better site in transport terms could realistically be found in or around Canterbury City, given other planning and conservation constraints. Moreover, by acknowledging problems and addressing them boldly through a transport assessment and travel plan exercise for any Nackington Road campus scheme, travel perceptions and behaviour might be considerably altered for the better. In this respect, I am influenced by the Council's good past record of decisive action to encourage further use of public transport.
- 8.47 The Nackington Road site also received rigorous examination at a Public Inquiry after which the Secretary of State gave an outline planning permission, in September 2001, for 30,000 m<sup>2</sup> of educational facilities and outdoor sports on this Nackington Road site. His decision was subsequently quashed, because of a failure to deal with Environmental Impact Assessment considerations, but the Inspector's reasoning in her report and the GOSE decision letter both emphatically endorsed the planning merits of the site proposals, seeing them as in accord with the Development Plan. The high agricultural value of the site was not perceived as a serious impediment, given the need argument. A location on the City edge was seen as failing to meet the aims of paragraph 38 of PPG13, because it is not a location that maximises accessibility by public transport. However, the mitigation of this problem by a Green Travel Plan was seen as a way of ensuring that many journeys would be made by public transport. The Inspector shared Inspector O'Rourke's view of the merits of a location in the City's south-east quadrant, and found that the site topography and existing landscape features made the impact of development acceptable.
- 8.48 I acknowledge that I am looking at a policy – C16a – that is not tied to the relocation of a specified institution, but I do not see that this fact makes it unnecessary, or capable of adequate replacement by Policy C18 alone. Further Education is a business, as well as a moral good. Furthermore, it is a growth business, and Canterbury is a showpiece location which grows that specialised kind of business with huge success for a City of its modest size. As I write, it has just been announced that Canterbury Christ Church University College is to gain full university status, a measure that may well lead before long to some

re-appraisal of the scale and range of its activities. The planning process does not allocate sites for housing, or business and employment, requiring knowledge of the future occupants. In like measure, I do not believe it necessary for an unproblematic site, capable of development and occupation without long delays, to be ruled out because no specific institution is knocking on the door in 2005. Allocation seems a prudent measure; it offers opportunities in the next few years for expansion of existing institutions, or the immigration of an expanding institution from elsewhere, or even a brand new institution. An allocation now does not rule out the ability to review, refine or even remove the policy in a future Development Framework. A reliance on Policy C18 alone would be likely to raise all the old problems of delay and uncertainty that blighted beneficial development here before.

- 8.49 Policy C18, as amended in the Revised Deposit Draft, and by a subsequent Proposed Change, to avoid unclear expression, complements Policy C16a and sets relevant tests for any proposed new or expanded campus serving a further/higher education institution. Policy C19a would also apply to any development at Nackington Road, allowing issues of need, design and landscaping to be investigated in detail. The Council has put forward Proposed Change PC7/006, which alters the opening of the Policy C18 wording, to talk of "the establishment of a new or further or higher education campus". C18 is relevant to the site at Nackington Road, or other sites inside or outside the Urban Area Boundary, and I find that it now needs no further amendment.

#### The Hadlow College Site

- 8.50 The Adopted Local Plan of 1998 showed the College's site as existing and protected open space, together with the adjoining area of public open space (King George's Field), and so did the First Deposit Draft of 2002. After objections from the College, the whole of its site was given an education designation in the Revised Deposit Draft. At the end of April 2004, the Council put forward Proposed Change PC7/017, which amends the Proposals Map, identifying a revised education allocation at Hadlow College. This puts a tight boundary round the main block, glasshouses and workshop built immediately north of the Spring Lane entrance in the 1960s. Much the greater part of the College site is re-instated as protected open space, as defined in Policy C20.
- 8.51 Unchallenged evidence reveals that this agricultural and horticultural institution, which has been active on the site since 1968, is in the process of intensifying the amount of land based, post-school education it delivers on this site for the Canterbury area. The College has already put up two temporary buildings in the south-east part of the site, permitted until 2009, and has identified a need for more floorspace in that area of the site. Future development needs are seen as incremental rather than very large, but they will include accommodation space for teachers and administrators as well as students. Active use is made of the various areas of the site. Activities in the open area require a substantial amount of large polytunnels, and some now occupy land in the northern part of the site. There is a substantial low-rise animal care centre complex near the eastern boundary with King George's Field. The majority of the site is now open land, but that land is, and will be, actively used for open air activities affecting the look of the grounds in various ways.
- 8.52 As I saw on visits at different times of year, whether leafed or un-leafed, the central woodland area on the site, together with the effective boundary hedging, still reveal to the outside observer glimpses of structures and activities throughout the College site. I believe that what is seen comprises merely unexceptionable development within a generously landscaped campus. The Council's Open Space Core Proof of February 2004, written before the Council's change of heart, puts the matter well: there is very limited public access, and

“its value as open space is essentially limited to the valuable visual contribution the site makes as a green corner to the wider King George’s Field Open Space”.

8.53 The Council’s stance is still that it sees no impediment to some expansion of activities on site. Amended Policy C16 in the Revised Deposit Draft already states that “any significant redevelopment on (this site) shall be the subject of an approved Development Brief”; I see that as an effective safeguard against proposals that would seriously detract from the perception of this site as a landscaped, tree-fringed site where buildings are set in green surroundings. It is also open to the Council to make use of Tree Preservation Orders to safeguard significant group planting on site. Of course, other normal development control policies like BE1 and NE1 are relevant and applicable here.

8.54 My study of Policy C20 convinces me that its provisions are not an appropriate mechanism for planning control of the majority of this educational institution’s land. Criterion (c) is plainly inapplicable, as it requires an owner to demonstrate that there is no alternative site for a proposed development on site, and that any “harm” resulting from development could be offset by providing other open space of like quality nearby. A Policy C20 designation means that development has to be specifically justified, and that there is a presumption against it. As the Council itself thought, until it was persuaded otherwise in its Proposed Changes (seemingly through local residential pressure), the actual prevention of harm can be just as effectively achieved without a C20 designation. It is open to the Council to develop the words of Policy C16 or its supporting text further, to indicate what kinds of development it wants to constrain or closely control on this site.

Matters concerning Policies C19 and C19a, and the supporting text

8.55 The Council has accepted that the original C19 would be much improved by division into two separate policies differentiating between loss, relocation and expansion. There are two more Proposed Changes in this section. PC7/007 adds a new last sentence to paragraph 7.88, bringing in the necessity for a reference to policies C18 and C19a when assessing new proposals. PC7/008 adds a last sentence to Policy C19a, bringing in reference to Policy C18. I find both unexceptionable. I see no planning reason to make special mention of development impact on recreation and open space in C19a, given the presence of more relevant policies elsewhere in a Plan which has to be read as a whole.

8.56 The reasonable GOSE objection to Policy C19 could easily be met by re-wording the opening line to read: “Planning permission will be refused for proposals involving the loss of institutional land or buildings...”. There is no need for any further alteration.

Recommendation

8.57 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes Nos. PC7/005, PC7/006, PC7/007 and PC7/008, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraphs 8.57 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C17 - UNIVERSITY OF KENT- AND PARAGRAPHS 7.85-7.86

Objections and Key Issues

*Paragraph 7.85 – University of Kent at Canterbury*

RN152 University of Kent at Canterbury represented by BSF Planning Consultants (944)

- Modify text to include "This Master Plan sets out the development needs of the University and has been revised in the University's Estates Strategy 2001-2006"

*Paragraph 7.86 - University of Kent at Canterbury*

RN152 University of Kent at Canterbury represented by BSF Planning Consultants (945)

- Seek deletion of "these needs must also be balanced...other Local Plan objectives" from text of para. 7.86

*Policy C17*

RN152 University of Kent at Canterbury represented by BSF Planning Consultants (947, 948)

- Re requirements for a transport assessment and preparation of travel plan and improvements to Giles Lane/St Stephen's Hill junction. The latter has now been constructed, so delete wording about it. Former is unreasonable save for major developments
- Policy should include the term "educational and ancillary uses"

*Re: A7/051 – Amended policy C17 University of Kent at Canterbury*

RD109 University of Kent at Canterbury represented by BSF Planning Consultants (20402)

- The change in rider to Policy C17 concerning Transport issues does not overcome previous objection
- There should be a separate Inset map for the University with a defining edge

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.58 I have already discussed the objection made by the University to the proposed AHLV designation, in my consideration of Policy R6 above. The Council has stated in evidence that it agrees the Proposals Map should contain a defined campus area of the same dimensions as that in the Adopted Local Plan. It agrees the removal of text in the Policy about the now completed St Giles Lane/St Stephen's Hill junction. It agrees to the requested additional rewording sought in supporting text paragraph 7.85, and to the deletion of the whole of paragraph 7.86, as not really necessary for the interpretation of the Policy. Finally, it is content to reword the last paragraph of the Policy to read: "Major development proposals at the University shall be subject to a transport assessment, within the context of the existing transport impact of the University, and preparation of a Travel Plan".

Recommendation

8.59 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording set out in my paragraph 8.59 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C20 - PROTECTION OF OPEN SPACE - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.88a-7.100

Objections and Key Issues

*Re: A7/057 – New Paragraph 7.88a Open Space*

RD020 Wilks (20083)

- Say PPG17 is to be the deciding factor whenever it is applicable, & to have priority over other Policy from boundary with Thanet to boundary with Swale

# INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

*Re: A7/058 – New Paragraph 7.88c*

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (20451)

- Para 7.88c after “grass” add “sand, shingle”

*Paragraph 7.89 – Open Space*

RN010 Wilks (317)

RN349 Canterbury Conservation Advisory Committee (2459)

- Planning permissions on open spaces should be revoked. This should be achieved, starting with land at Skinners Alley. Development is not more important than open space
- Concerned about its gradual erosion in the development process

*Re: A7/061 – Paragraph 7.90b*

RD020 Wilks (20032)

- Objects to word order of 2nd para: should be the environment, leisure and recreation

*Re: A7/062 – New Paragraph 7.91a*

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20578)

- Maintain previous objection & objections to new para 7.91a. Audit needs to be carried out in partnership with LEA. Reword para 7.91a

*Re: A7/063 – Amended paragraph 7.92*

RD020 Wilks (20033)

RD086 Sport England (20326)

- Concern about possible late production of the SPG. Mention ensuring full consultation
- Clarify that the review of identified deficiency will be based on local standards

*Paragraph 7.94*

RN061 PACE (168)

- Extra provision will be needed for open areas within towns if they are to have higher densities

*Re: A7/064 – Amended Paragraph 7.94*

RD020 Wilks (20035)

- Para 7.94 Object to the fact that not all beaches are included. Should be a continuous length from boundary with Thanet to boundary with Swale

*Re: A7/077- Amended Paragraph 7.97*

RD020 Wilks (20037)

- Para 7.97 amendments should be cancelled. Should be no exceptions; everything has impact on open character of beaches

*Policy C20 – Loss of Protected Existing Open Space*

RN010 Wilks (318, 319, 320, 362, 363, 367, 368, 373)

RN034 National Grid represented by Malcolm Judd & Partners (1604)

RN177 Rogers (208)

RN224 Sport England (1692)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2583)

- Protection of open space at the Canterbury National Grid Station should not restrict the essential utilities development that may be required through expansion of existing operations
- Mark in the policy that the small area of woodland/scrub on the southern edge of the Church Street, Whitstable, playing field must not be taken for any other purpose, especially not car parking.
- The Oval, Whitstable, should be designated as protected open space
- Reeves Beach, Whitstable, should be shown as protected open space
- Area of Benacre wood on south side of A2990 should be treated as protected open space
- Mark in the policy that special protection is given to the green strip (Invicta meadow) behind the gardens of Clifford Road.
- All open space within the district should be set out as protected open space
- Refer to the positive provision of public open spaces. Say public open space will be sought where development of private open space is proposed
- Beaches that are not registered as town or village greens should be designated as open space

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Objects to the word "need" in criteria (b). "Need for" should be replaced by "benefit of"
- This policy potentially affects County Council as service provider and landowner. Amend policy and supporting paragraphs to remove blanket coverage from all playing fields and other green areas within schools, unless they perform, in whole or part, a visual amenity function. Delete the following: Pilgrim's Way CPS, Simon Langton GS for Girls, Orchard School, Beauherne CPS, Kingsmead CPS, Parkside CPS, Joy Lane CPS, Reculver C of E PS, Herne Bay County Infants and Junior Schools
- Policy should read: "Proposals which would result in the loss of protected open space will not be permitted"

*Re: A7/066 – Amended policy C20*

RD020 Wilks (20034, 20038)

RD085 National Grid Company Plc represented by Malcolm Judd and Partners (20301)

RD086 Sport England (20329)

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (20454)

- (d) must be deleted, as all open space has potential in the future
- Open space designation at National Grid Canterbury Substation site may restrict essential utility development
- Add another criterion (e): there would be no incremental future risk to property & human life due to flood risk
- Welcome commitment to an open space SPG does not, however overcome objection to C20
- Beaches must have maximum protection against continuing pressures to develop. Cover all beaches by Open Space protection

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.60 The Council is in the process of preparing an Open Space Strategy for the District, which will form supplementary planning guidance, but no draft of the document was available during my Inquiry, and the Council stance is that the Plan should not be delayed while it is being completed. The Open Space designations on the draft Proposals Map therefore closely echo those in the Adopted Local Plan. The Policy is meant to protect defined existing Open Spaces within urban boundaries. It has four criteria, and the last is drafted in anticipation of the forthcoming Strategy, being a requirement that open space should be assessed as making no positive contribution to the Council's overall strategy on open space, if proposals for its removal are to be countenanced.
- 8.61 I have considered some site-specific objections to this Policy elsewhere, when reporting on particular Council allocations or omission sites. Objections seeking Open Space designation for particular sites have been answered by the Council saying that local needs assessments will be carried out in the Strategy; I accept this is all that can usefully be said until that work is finished, and it would be desirable for the Council to revise the designations and make considered deletions and additions before the Local Plan is adopted. That said, it is obvious that, in the Adopted and emerging Local Plans the Council has pursued an approach which identifies virtually all open areas within the Urban Area Boundaries as "protected open space", rather than identifying only the very best quality open sites. That may change as a result of current Strategy work, but it does not appear likely on present evidence.
- 8.62 The Revised Deposit Draft, like the Adopted Local Plan, has included school grounds and playing fields in the same terms as other open land, as being appropriately protected under C20. This is despite the fact that a separate policy, C21, deals with the loss of public or private playing fields. The Council reasons that, despite little or no public access, the main consideration for their inclusion has been the visual amenity they possess. I have looked at the sites of the schools that particularly concern the County Council as Education Authority, and I cannot disagree that all have an appreciable amount of visual amenity, even where they are relatively inconspicuous to public gaze.

8.63 If, as seems likely, the Council wants to protect a large number of open spaces in urban areas, it will have to face the prospect that at some time in the future, individual protected open spaces will be found to be unavoidable candidates for some sort of needed development, varying from a very small incursion up to major loss of the protected land. I regard the District Council as a responsible body; it should have a right to make its own informed decision on what to protect, rather than me making a number of individual value judgements now, without being in possession of the information in the detailed Strategy. But such a right has consequences, and I consider it inevitable that the wording of C20 has to change. The tenor of the Council's proposed wording might be acceptable if a relatively small number of unarguably valuable sites were allocated, but wide scale designation requires greater flexibility.

8.64 I find that the kind of words favoured by Inspector O'Rourke in her report, when she considered draft policy D39 (CD1.8, page 93) are the most appropriate to use here. Thus, with the addition of the gist of the Council's draft criterion (d), which I find appropriate in present circumstances before the production of the Strategy, I that consider a realistic, equitable and workable policy would read:

Proposals which would result in the loss of protected open space will only be permitted if:

- a. there would be no material harm to the contribution the protected open space makes to the visual or recreational amenity of the area;
- b. where there would be material harm, this would be balanced against demonstrable need for the development;
- c. there is no alternative site available to accommodate the proposed development, and any harm that might result from the development could be offset by the provision of other open space of comparable quality, size, character and usability in the locality;
- d. the open space has been assessed by the Council as making no positive contribution to its overall strategy on open space.

8.65 The Council has made some amendments to supporting text in response to objections, and I find these to be adequate. Some objectors simply want to make virtually all open space inviolate, but that is far too simplistic, especially as designation has so far not been ungenerous. The Policy wording I endorse leads me to conclude that the inclusion of a structure such as a substation – which may need replacement or augmentation – within a designated Open Space, should not cause undue problems to its operator because “need” is specifically acknowledged in the criteria.

8.66 Answering a Sport England objection, the Council has put forward Proposed Change PC7/009, adding mention of locally determined provision standards to paragraph 7.92, when considering local needs, surpluses or deficits of open space. The Council has also put forward Further Amendment FA7/012, but this is overtaken by my new policy wording. I endorse the Proposed Change.

Recommendation

8.67 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Change No. PC7/009, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 8.65 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C21 - PLAYING FIELDS - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.101-7.102

Objections and Key Issues

*Policy C21 – Playing fields*

RN224 Sport England (1695)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2584)

- Policy potentially affects KCC as service provider and landowner. Amend to avoid situation where some building may encroach on edges of playing areas, re-define to relate to loss of non-school playing fields for their recreational or amenity value, Remove last clause of (a); refer to recreation space, not open space in (d); say “for public recreation”, not “as public open space” in (e)
- Replace “need” by “benefit in (b); delete (e) as it weakens policy and its criterion (d)

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.68 The conclusions I have reached on Policy C20 inevitably colour my attitude to C21, since public and private playing fields in the District are presently classified by the Council as protected open space. The draft Policy C21 is very similar to D39 in the Adopted Local Plan, save for a new criterion (a), and a new sustainability consideration in (d). I consider that its wording, and that of the supporting text, sits well with my amended C20 and with the thrust of PPG17 of July 2002. I believe that the suggested alterations would not materially improve its effectiveness in controlling proposed development by taking account of all relevant issues.

Recommendation

8.69 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C22 - OUTDOOR PLAYING SPACE - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.103-7.105

Objections and Key Issues

*Policy C22*

RN068 Bellway Homes Ltd (705)

RN221 E Kent Hospitals Trust represented by Broadway Malyan (1701)

RN224 Sport England (1693)

RN229 Property Review & Development (2585)

RN255 GOSE (2652)

RN144 Persimmon Homes represented by Tetlow King (494)

- Scoring in Appendix 6 too simplistic, without a full range of criteria, or explanation of how arbitrary scores will be applied

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- This policy potentially affects KCC as service provider and landowner. Amend policy and supporting paragraphs to distinguish between new playing field provision and other forms of outdoor recreational space. Be consistent in references to “outdoor playing space” and open space”
- Shouldn't seek contributions to playing space where adequate provision exists. Scale of provision should take into account likely type of occupants. At end of 1st sentence add: “the type of accommodation”
- Policy should recognise that developments should contribute more widely to sport and recreational facilities, including the social infrastructure
- A reduced on-site provision may be allowable to achieve a layout appropriate to a Conservation Area or to maximise regeneration benefits. An off-site provision would suffice in these cases
- Do not use the word “appropriate”

### Reasoning and Conclusions

8.70 The supporting text in paragraph 7.105 preceding this Policy now states clearly that the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Open Space will reflect the provisions of PPG17. That supporting text is most helpful in complementing the Policy wording and keeping it short. I find no planning need to say more, despite the urgings of objectors. I agree with GOSE that in this instance, the inclusion of the word “appropriate” in line one is unnecessary. The Policy makes equally good sense without it.

### Recommendation

8.71 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 8.71 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

### POLICY C23 - LAND AT GREENHILL, RIDLANDS FARM AND FOLLY FARM, AND PARAGRAPH 7.106; AND POLICY C24 – LAND ALONG THE STOUR CORRIDOR, AND PARAGRAPH 7.107

### Objections and Key Issues

#### *Policy C23*

- RN140                    Brett Waste Management Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (64)
- RN164                    Railtrack PLC (1805)
- RN255                    GOSE (2654)
- RN352                    Robert Brett & Sons Ltd represented by Lee Evans de Moubay (2465, 2466)
- Objects to the proposed playing fields on the southern fields of the housing allocation at Folly Farm, Kemsing Gardens, Canterbury, as there are other playing fields in the area within walking distance
  - Site could be a good expansion point for Canterbury, near existing housing
  - The proposed open space at Folly Farm will be adjacent to railway lines. The site should either be moved northwards or appropriate fencing provided and maintained if this is not possible
  - Object to word “protected”

#### *Policy C24*

- RN255                    GOSE (2654)
- object to word “protected”

### Reasoning and Conclusions

8.72 I do not regard the objections from Messrs Brett as any more than the most brief and general of attempts to advance the cause of housing development over playing field provision. The rail-related objection is more a flagging up of problems to be avoided,

than an objection in principle. I find the use of the words “protected from development” in both policies to be clearly understandable in a development control sense, and not to need amendment.

Recommendation

8.73 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICIES C25 & C26 - ALLOTMENTS - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.108-7.109

Objections and Key Issues

*Paragraph 7.108*

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2563)

- Allotments are important; CCC should contribute to their upkeep. Wildlife habitat may not be appropriate

*Policy C25*

RN316 Herne and Broomfield Parish Council (2396, 2397, 2340)

- Allocate land at Lower Herne Road as an allotment
- Allocate David's Field, north of former landfill site and adjacent to the new proposed Broomfield Woodland site as an allotment

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.74 The Council's view is that if there is an identified need for an allotment site (or sites) in Herne and Broomfield Parish, the appropriate means to pursue the idea would be the formulation of a planning application. This sounds sensible to me. It means that the proponents, the Parish Council, must produce convincing evidence that a realistic need exists and that actual take-up of plots would be likely to result if a site were given permission. The attitude of the present land-owners, and who should bid for and produce the purchase price, also need to be worked out before the Council is approached formally. There is certainly not enough information available at present to persuade me to suggest any specific site as a Local Plan allocation.

Recommendation

8.75 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICIES C27, C28, C29 & C30 - FLOODING AND COASTAL DEFENCE - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.110-7.127

Objections and Key Issues

*Paragraph 7.110 – Flooding and Coastal*

RN161 Ramblers Association (1916)

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2157)

- Need for vigilance to continue to ensure that the district throughout is always in a state of readiness in the event of flooding in the future

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- The Chamber of Commerce cannot follow the logic of the Plan's statements on building on flood risk areas with the schedules for housing development. It appears CCC is breaking its own guidelines on flooding

### *Paragraph 7.112 – Flood Scrutiny Panel*

RN257 Herne Bay & District Chamber of Commerce (2160)

- CCC's flood scrutiny panel has better information than is shown in the documentation

### *Policy C27 – Drainage Impact Assessment*

RN178 Southern Water (231)

RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1506)

RN329 Environment Agency (2474)

RN348 Littlebourne Parish Council (2564)

- Parish Councils should be consulted on the drainage impact assessments
- Objects to the area of tidal flooding which appears to cross the railway
- Instead of this policy, say: All areas at risk of flooding or increase of surface water run-off shall be subject to a flood risk assessment, and measures to mitigate affects are installed and maintained
- Include Reference: in policy to the principles of SUDS, and “national guidelines when available”

### *Re: A7/068 – Amended Policy C27*

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20645)

- Add additional wording referring to PPG25 and not removing flood storage capacity by building in the floodplain

### *Paragraph 7.119 – Coastal Flooding*

RN329 Environment Agency (2480)

- This sentence confuses coastal flooding and fluvial flooding

### *Re: A7/069 – Amended Paragraph 7.119*

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (20455)

- Amend para 7.119 - after “coastal floodplain” add “or outside sea defences as shown on the Proposals Map”. Relevant mapping sections are no included in the revised deposit

### *Paragraph 7.123 – Fluvial Flooding*

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2339)

- Tackling the risk of flooding where funds permit is not good enough. Be much more active and allocate funds

### *Paragraph 7.124 - Fluvial Flooding*

RN341 Nasons (2435)

RN140 Brett Waste Management Represented by Jennifer Owen Associates (63)

RN209 PACE (792)

- Objects to Nason's site in Wncheap Estate falling within the Environment Agency's Area at Risk of Flooding as this affects price of land, build costs and regeneration
- Objection to Shelford Waste Management facility site being designated at risk from fluvial flooding
- More sophisticated models needed to replace very primitive Environment Agency mapping of potential flood areas

### *Policy C28 – Development within floodplains*

RN130 Herne Bay and District Residents Association (1606)

RN292 Charles F. Jones & Son (2242)

- Objects to inclusion in area at risk of flooding of site east of Sturry Road Sewage Works
- The Proposals Map should show the up-to-date information from the Flooding Scrutiny Panel.
- Needs an additional paragraph to clarify that extensions to caravan parks – an instance being the Alberta Holiday Village, Faversham Road, Seasalter – would comprise 'exceptional justification' if no additional units were involved and environmental improvement sought

### *Policy C29 - Development within floodplains*

RN130 Herne Bay and District Residents Association (1607)

RN255 GOSE (2656)

RN329 Environment Agency (2476)

- The information from the Flooding Scrutiny Panel should be included on the Proposals Map

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- The policy should be amended to ensure that each case is treated on its own merits having regard to the risks attached
- Change “certain provisos”

### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.76 The emerging Local Plan shows on its Proposals Map the areas at risk of flooding taken from the Environmental Assessment's indicative flood plain maps. The text in paragraph 24 of PPG25 – Development and Flood Risk is quite candid about the limitations of the information on those maps and says that they will be revised and updated over time. The Council's own careful records and the work of the Floods Scrutiny Panel set up in 2001 supplement the broad brush information from Environmental Assessment sources. I agree with the Council that the best course of action in this imperfect situation is to use the Environmental Assessment indicative mapping on the Proposals Map, but also to supplement the Revised Deposit Draft text by pointing out all the other sources of information and necessary consultations for prospective developers. Those objectors who object to inclusion of their land in areas at risk of flooding on the Proposals Map are simply arguing fruitlessly against known facts and the best risk summations available. I see no good reason to write into the Plan text any exceptional justification for extensions to caravan parks; such development has to be argued on its own merits.
- 8.77 The Council's stance on housing allocations in places where there are concerns about flood risk is that it has consulted with the Environment Agency, and has proceeded on the basis that the flood risk can be resolved through appropriate design solutions for particular sites. Nothing in the evidence suggests to me that particular allocations are foolhardy or materially contradict national policy guidance in PPG25. The Council has put forward a number of useful additions to the Revised Deposit Draft text; I consider all of them to be improvements, which make the text about flooding more informative and helpful, and I find no further need for alteration. There are firstly three Proposed Changes. PC7/010 and PC7/011 amend paragraph 7.119 by moving some text on development within a floodplain to the fluvial flooding section in paragraph 7.122. PC7/012 amends Policy C29, adding mention of other local plan policies to the first sentence.
- 8.78 The Council has also has put forward four Further Amendments. FA7/006 further alters and expands text in paragraph 7.119, specifically adding mention of the need to take account of the Council's own detailed flood information; it also states the Council view that flood risk areas could include land seaward of the coastal defences. Further Amendment FA7/007 adds a final informative sentence to paragraph 7.124, to say that the Environment Agency are making continual improvements to flood plain mapping and consult with the Council engineers.
- 8.79 Further Amendment FA7/008 inserts a new paragraph 7.125a, which informs the public how they can find out more detailed information on flood risk from the Council's detailed sources. Further Amendment FA7/011 rephrases and improves the sense of Policy C27, introducing mention of the Council's Guidance Note. However, the word “their” in the last line of the Policy is unclear; presumably it means “the developer”, and these words should be used instead.

### Recommendation

- 8.80 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes Nos. PC7/010, PC7/011 and PC7/012, and Further Amendment Nos. FA7/006, FA7/007, FA7/008 and FA7/011, all as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21,

and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraph 8.80 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C32 – UNDEFENDED COAST – AND PARAGRAPH 7.129

Objections and Key Issues

*Policy C32*

RN010 Wilks (322, 370)

RN322 English Heritage (1793)

- New policy required to protect gaps east and west of 230 Faversham Road, Seasalter - not built on with chalets - from development; they have considerable historic and natural history interest. Existing policies not enough. Village Green protection does not extend to the road where these open patches of beach are
- While scenic quality and character are discussed there is no discussion on the scientific side, which could refer to the archaeological value
- All non Council owned beaches should have Art. 4 Dir. on them. This would bring beaches under tighter planning control (inc. freedom of 28 days use). Not necessary on registered Village greens or below mean HWM

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.81 None of these objections have sufficient substance to merit altering a clear and simply expressed policy. There is no need to introduce mention of archaeological matters when these are caught elsewhere in the Plan. The various little areas of undeveloped land in Faversham Road, Seasalter, do not appear to me to merit a special policy of their own, but there is a measure of protection already, stemming from the land's inclusion within a Special Landscape Area, subject to policies C28 and C32 (Overtopping hazard Zone, and Undeveloped Coast). As to the objection about Article 4 directions and beach protection, this is not an appropriate matter for specific mention in a Local Plan.

Recommendation

8.82 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C33 - PROVISION OF INFRASTRUCTURE - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.130-7.136

Objections and Key Issues

*Policy C33*

RN185 Lowe (150)

- Change wording of the policy to include "will only be permitted"; bear in mind that existing consumers can be adversely affected by new development

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.83 The point sought in this objection would not really alter the meaning or tone of voice of the existing Policy wording, which I find sufficiently forceful. After the withdrawal of objections by proponents of a new reservoir at Broad Oak, the Council has put forward

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

two Further Amendments to deal with the implications of such a scheme. FA7/004 removes all reference to any new reservoir at Broad Oak from paragraph 7.134. Further Amendment FA7/005 inserts a new following paragraph 7.134a; this sets out the actions that would be expected of the proponents of major development options, such as a reservoir, prior to making a formal planning application.

### Recommendation

8.84 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment Nos. FA7/004 and FA7/005, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

\*\*\*\*\*

### POLICY C34 - RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.137-7.138

#### Objections and Key Issues

##### *Paragraph 7.137 – Renewable Energy Sources*

RN026 ETSU for the DTI represented by Terence O'Rourke plc(670)

- Add ref to: paragraph 8, PPG3; reference to government renewable energy target for 2010 & report on renewable energy for SE & renewable sources for Canterbury; need to balance renewable energy benefits with impact on local amenity

##### *Paragraph 7.138 - Renewable Energy Sources*

RN025 Cutler (666)

RN209 PACE (790)

- Weak support is given to wind farms. Promote, as it is an opportunity to reduce dependence on fossil fuels
- As well as solar and wind power, coppiced woodland no longer needed by the paper industry is a source of renewable energy

##### *Policy C34*

RN003 Hollamby Estates represented by Kitewood Estates (403)

RN025 Cutler (662)

RN061 PACE (164)

RN255 GOSE (2657)

- Council should be bolder and give more encouragement to plans for off-shore wind turbines. More marine areas should be designated
- Canterbury Council should set a cut-off date after which it is no longer permitted to build or renovate without incorporating photovoltaic tiling or similar
- Refer to government support for CHP energy sources

##### *Re: A7/071 – Amended Policy C34*

RD079 GOSE (20180)

- The word “support” makes the Policy unclear

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

8.85 As one would expect, objectors are keen to gain the Council's active support for particular forms of renewable energy sources that they especially favour. The Council has chosen to stick with its First Deposit Draft text, save for a mention of combined heat and power generation, and I do not believe that a more fact-filled Policy and supporting text would increase the utility of this section, which is flexible and positive. However, I cannot see a good reason not to accede to the GOSE point; a rephrased Policy opening saying:

“planning permission will be granted for developments which utilise renewable ...” would be better orientated to the effective control of development.

### Recommendation

8.86 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate altered wording as suggested in my paragraph 8.86 above, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

### POLICY C36 - POTENTIALLY POLLUTING DEVELOPMENT - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.144-7.145

#### Objections and Key Issues

##### *Paragraph 7.144 – Potentially Polluting Development*

RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2344)

- Noise/light/traffic/rubbish/ emissions must be controlled

##### *Policy C36*

RN216 Symons (815)

- Noise policies inadequate & should be amended in a single stand-alone modern policy to incorporate WHO Guidelines for Community Noise 2000. Should say that all applications and EIA will be examined rigorously

*Re: A7/073 – Amended Policy C36*

RD141 Canterbury & Coastal Primary Care Group (20531)

- Amendment inadequate; developments that have the potential to have an impact on the health of a community should be required to submit a health impact assessment to the LPA with planning application

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

8.87 The Council deals with the issue of noise pollution first in policy BE1 and its supporting text (spelling out relevant considerations in deciding applications for built development), and then here. The Council's unchallenged evidence is that, in determining planning applications, it uses a number of sources of advice and guidance, and it has quoted PPG23, PPG24, various British Standards, and approved codes of conduct published by the CIEH, the Noise Council, the HSE, the Institute of Acoustics and the WHO.

8.88 The objections of Mr Symons and the Canterbury & Coastal Primary Care Group have led the Council to revise the Policy and supporting text. The Council originally put forward Proposed Change PC7/013 in paragraph 7.145, adding as a factor the possible need to submit a Health Impact Assessment for development that may cause noise pollution. It subsequently put forward Further Amendment FA7/002, further refining the Proposed Change: this adds mention of Policy ENV20 of the adopted Structure Plan and PPG24 to the text, as factors that will be taken into account in reaching decisions in addition to Local Plan Policy BE1. Although Mr Symons put forward a detailed policy wording of his own, I find that the treatment of this important subject in the Plan is now comprehensively dealt with by the Council's preferred text, albeit not in one place in the Plan. That last factor is not important to the effective consideration of potentially polluting development.

Recommendation

8.89 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Further Amendment No. FA7/002, as set out in Core Documents CD1.14, CD1.19 and CD1.21, but that no other modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C37 - WASTE MANAGEMENT AND RECYCLING - AND PARAGRAPH 7.146

Objections and Key Issues

*Paragraph 7.146 – Waste management and Recycling*

- RN061 PACE (165)
- RN209 PACE (791)
- RN310 Wickhambreaux Parish Council (2340)

- Although primarily a KCC concern, the CCC should have more in their plan about recycling
- Surprise that paragraph 7.146 doesn't mention the planned SWERF waste incineration plant at Brett's landfill site in Broad Oak Road, which should not be permitted
- Plan weak on waste management; include much more on the need for waste minimisation; stop Ashford dumping waste in the district

*Policy C37*

- RN198 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (1507)
- RN228 Kent County Council (1633)

- Specific mention of waste management sites in the Canterbury District required: e.g. The expansion of the Shelford site should be prevented
- The Council should favour developing land despoiled by former mining activity, such as the East Kent Coalfield villages
- This policy is inappropriate and unnecessary as KCC is the appropriate determining Authority.

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.90 Despite waste management being a County function, the Council justifies its policy on the grounds that the relevant issues (a)-(k) identified in its text are those that it would be concerned about, when formally consulted by the County Council about any proposal. On balance, that seems to me a consideration meriting a specific policy, rather than a mere textual reference. The lead role of the County Council on the waste topic removes any need for this Plan to mention any of the site-specific matters that concern some objectors.

Recommendation

8.91 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

POLICY C38 - TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT - AND PARAGRAPHS 7.147-7.153

Objections and Key Issues

*Paragraph 7.152 – Telecommunications Development*

- RN025 Cutler (664)

## INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Government & NRPB do not protect us or help towards an open examination of new research. Research by NRPB on non-thermal effects isn't disclosed. Need more open discussion with future providers of masts

*Policy C38*

RN025                      Cutler (663)

- Believes mobile phone masts are feared by many; they are hardly mentioned in the Local Plan; unclear on the Council's policy and if it is anything more than abiding by Government guidance

### Reasoning and Conclusions

8.92 The objector voices fears and uncertainties that are shared by a number of people about the health effects of mobile phone base stations/masts. I find that the Council deals with the matter clearly and responsibly. The government's planning guidance on the subject of telecommunications - Planning Policy Guidance Note 8, states a clear government view that the planning system is not the place for determining health safeguards. However, it does say that health considerations and public concern can in principle be material considerations in determining applications for planning permission and prior approval, and that the local planning authority as decision-maker must determine what weight to attach to such considerations in any particular case (see the PPG's paragraphs 97 and 98). The Revised Deposit Draft's paragraph 7.152 shows the Council's desire to monitor and act on any new material that comes into the public realm about health effects, when considering telecommunications development. I do not consider it necessary to amend the Policy and text further in respect of health matters.

### Recommendation

8.93 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

### OMISSION SITE (LEISURE): LAND WEST OF ALBERTA HOLIDAY VILLAGE, FAVERSHAM ROAD, SEASALTER, WHITSTABLE

#### Objections and Key Issues

RN292                      Charles F. Jones & Son (2242, 2245)

- There should be a tourism policy providing appropriate criteria for applications seeking upgrading of existing static caravan sites and their extensions; main consideration to be overall environmental improvement, and no material conflict with other Plan policies
- Allocate land for the expansion of the site on to Fields "A" and "B", west of the existing Caravan Park, both within a Special Landscape Area

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

8.94 I have already considered the objectors' submission in respect of Policy C28 above. The objectors say they are seeking alteration to the Plan as a "global objection and not a site-specific objection", but given their illustration of the problems facing the Alberta Holiday Village site, and the outline of a case justifying its expansion, it is difficult not to see this avowed aim as a means of overcoming a real problem for the owners of that site. That problem amounts to an inability to accommodate on an existing site the 400 caravans that the relevant planning permission would theoretically allow. There is a concomitant desire to re-plan the Alberta site, allowing for modern space and amenity standards for holiday

makers, in contrast to the rather stark, close-set caravan layout now on site. Hence the desired expansion on to two adjoining fields.

- 8.95 The problem for such an aim is that the existing site and the adjoining fields happen to lie within an exceptionally sensitive area. It carries the designations of Site of Special Scientific Interest, a Special Protection Area, and a Wetland of International Importance identified under the Ramsar Convention, all protecting both habitat and wildlife. The Council makes clear its negative attitude towards the kind of expansion indicated, but very fairly states that only a properly supported planning application could settle the matter on the Alberta site.
- 8.96 There is no specific Local Plan policy about static caravan sites, though ED2b does concern touring sites. The tenor of the Council's evidence is that it does not like this type of development, because of the often-found adverse effects on the local environment and landscape. It does, however, acknowledge that static caravan sites are a significant part of the self-catering holiday sector in the District. I agree with the Council's reasoning that all relevant matters to do with new or expanded static caravan provision can very well be considered under Local Plan Policy TC5, even though this does not directly mention the words "static caravans"; TC5 sets out the criteria to consider in dealing with applications for new tourism development of all kinds, including self catering accommodation. Also, adopted Structure Plan Policy TO4 is highly relevant, and part of the development plan. TO4 is well-disposed to the proposed up-grading of static caravan sites, though with important caveats about inappropriate extension.

#### Recommendation

- 8.97 I recommend that no modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### OMISSION SITE (LEISURE): ST MICHAEL'S EMBANKMENT, ST MICHAEL'S ROAD, CANTERBURY

#### Objections and Key Issues

RN339 The Crab & Winkle Line Trust (2428)

- The Proposals Map should show the route of the Historic Line – for public access between Canterbury and Whitstable, including a pedestrian path and a safe cycling route – incorporating some 400 m of embankment near St Michael's Road

#### Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.98 The Council's evidence is that it has rejected the routing suggested because it would affect a number of houses and gardens immediately abutting the embankment land and involve expensive land acquisition. This consideration, and the existence of the quiet residential St Michael's Road as an alternative local route to accommodate walkers and cyclists, leads me to agree with the Council's views.

#### Recommendation

- 8.99 I recommend that no modification be made to the text of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

\*\*\*\*\*

OMISSION SITE (LEISURE): STATION ROAD WHITSTABLE

Objections and Key Issues

RN339                    The Crab & Winkle Line Trust (2429)

- The Proposals Map should show the route of the Historic Line – for public access between Canterbury and Whitstable, including a pedestrian path and a safe cycling route – complete up to the corner of Station Road and Westgate Terrace

Reasoning and Conclusions

8.100 The Council's Assessment of Site Proposals (CD1.16, pages 131-132) considers this request and comes to the view that "it is important to ensure that land is safeguarded for the construction of this cycle route in the future and, if possible, to be developer funded". The land that would accommodate this part of the route is allocated as a housing site in the emerging Local Plan, given planning permission in March 2002, and is now built and occupied, without a cycle route within the site. The draft Proposals Map accompanying the Revised Deposit Draft does not show the "cycle and pedestrian route" notation traversing the site up to the vicinity of Westgate Terrace; instead, it ceases to be marked at a point on the east side of Station Road, just north of the junction with Diamond Road, but within the housing allocation. I am not sure from the evidence just what the Council intends to do about the matter for Plan purposes, given what it says in CD1.16. Consequently, I must leave the matter to the Council's good judgement after it receives my report, and I make no formal recommendation.

\*\*\*\*\*