

CHAPTER ONE

1. OBJECTIONS TO THE INTRODUCTION AND OTHER OBJECTIONS OF A GENERAL NATURE

UNLOCKING THE POTENTIAL

Objections and Key Issues

RN010 Mrs A Wilks (344, 346, 349, 350, 352, 354, 355)

RN120 English Nature (462)

RN255 GOSE (2663)

- Reflect value of nature conservation sites in the introductory text
- Para 4: Reject competition to see who can build the most; would not mean decline, as this would be a desirable place to live and work. The present working spaces would prosper
- Aim should be to improve the quality of life and the environment. This does not mean build, build, build, but making the most of what we have
- Should be moratorium on all development, except conversions of existing properties, with all Council resources going into improving the environment and quality of living
- Re: Economic Growth: Need to stop spiral of development. More employment places = more houses, roads and schools. Reject as key objective
- Nearly all open urban spaces gone; an impossible aim for all new development to be on brownfield land: shutting the stable door once the horse has bolted
- Transport: Development ideas will generate more traffic. Need moratorium to sort out traffic problems: reject this as a key objective
- Reject all key objectives except culture and heritage and regeneration which need not be confined to zones, but be more widely spread

Re: Ai/001

RD135 KCC Education & Libraries (20546)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20586)

- Say City Council will work in partnership with the County Council & other service providers to ensure that these core aims are delivered
- Add text: which contributes to the economic, cultural and social well-being of the district & secures the redevelopment and re-use of derelict disused & brownfield land wherever it occurs before resorting to any other land

Re: Ai/003

RD134 English Heritage (20504)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20587)

- Add: including areas of derelict land within the E Kent Coalfield after historical assets
- Para could be strengthened by drawing out the regeneration value of utilising the area's heritage rather than appearing as more limited renaissance of culture for culture's sake, would complement para. 4.20

RE: Ai/004

RD132 Whitstable Beach Campaign (20445)

RD133 Reeves & Neylan (20491)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20588)

- Proposal unduly restrictive. Need balance between natural environment & economy. Current restrictive Policy led to average wage levels in district £40 per week below Kent Average
- Add "and to seek out derelict, damaged, despoiled &/or brownfield land wherever it occurs before resorting to use of greenfield land for development"
- Amend to add developed & undeveloped coast, foreshore and beaches

Re: Ai/006

RD004 Blean Parish Council (20210)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

RD020 Mrs A Wilks (20040)

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20589)

- Delete entire amendment. Reducing journeys times will reduce services at small stations, discouraging train use and encouraging car use. Likely to increase fares
- Add to end "in so far as the same is consistent with the Council's objective or reopening of Chislet Halt as a station for Hersden in order to serve the new & expanded community & employment clusters at Hersden & surrounding area."
- Add that Council will endeavour to ensure that the Parkway Station is built to achieve the full benefits of the high speed rail link

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 1.1 The Council has put forward PCi/001 to amend Ai/003 further by deleting the word "cultural" from the last line of the paragraph. A further Proposed Change – PCi/002 expands the new paragraph created by Ai/004 to bring the categories of developed coast, foreshore and beaches into the list of features mentioned in the last sentence.
- 1.2 The Introduction is and should remain short, without extraneous verbal clutter, and no more than generally informative. The text expresses the outlook of the Council; objections that take a different view about the pace or direction of change envisaged by the Council have failed to change that body's mind, and I see no need to disagree with the Council to the extent of amending its basic planning philosophy. Some textual change has arisen between the Deposit and Revised Deposit Drafts because of objections, but I am generally satisfied by the tenor of the Council's responses to representations (CDs 1.3 and 1.22).
- 1.3 The text of the fourth paragraph in the section named "Unlocking the Potential" will need amendment, in view of the inadequacies I have found elsewhere over the allocated sites to meet the strategic housing requirement. Likewise, the section on the Chapters of the Plan could amend the description of Chapter 2 – Providing Decent Housing, to say something like: "...aim to locate the maximum amount possible on previously developed land...".
- 1.4 The section on the Role and Purpose of the Canterbury District Local Plan would be improved, in terms of public enlightenment, by adding some short account of how the Council sees itself bringing its first Local Development Framework into being, and the implications of the new process in terms of the probable life of this emerging Local Plan.

Recommendation

- 1.5 I recommend that the Local Plan be modified to incorporate Proposed Changes Nos. Ai/001 and Ai/002 as set out in Appendices F1 and F2, and the altered wording I suggest in my paragraphs 1.3-1.4 above, but that no other modification be made to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan in respect of these objections.

THE ROLE AND PURPOSE OF THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN/CHAPTERS OF THE PLAN

Objections and Key Issues

RN120 English Nature (463)

- Mention the Sustainability Appraisal in the text on page

RE: Ai/007

RD137 MHP Partnership represented by Davies Arnold Cooper (20590)

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN

- Council should be clear in its Policy allocations & objectives relating to Regeneration Zones, & dereliction left by minerals working activities in East Kent coalfield rather than deferring positive decisions through monitoring

Reasoning and Conclusions

- 1.6 The Council has met English Nature's objection in the Revised Deposit Draft. The comment by the MHP Partnership is just one of a large number made at both Plan stages to advance the objectors' proposals for Hersden, a matter that I consider later in this report.

Recommendation

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