

## Arlington Planning Brief Survey Results

**Q1. Please state how strongly you either agree or disagree with the Arlington Planning Brief overall.**

Strongly agree.....	51.9%
Agree .....	38.5%
Neither agree nor disagree .....	5.8%
Disagree.....	1.9%
Strongly disagree.....	0.0%

**Q2. Please state how strongly you either agree or disagree with each of the following proposals:**

**a) New retail/commercial development with parking, on current car park.**

Strongly agree.....	42.3%
Agree .....	40.4%
Neither agree nor disagree .....	9.6%
Disagree.....	1.9%
Strongly disagree.....	3.8%

**b) Exterior improvement of Arlington House.**

Strongly agree.....	88.5%
Agree .....	5.8%
Neither agree nor disagree .....	1.9%
Disagree.....	0.0%
Strongly disagree.....	1.9%

**c) New shops and cafes facing the seafront.**

Strongly agree.....	65.4%
Agree .....	25.0%
Neither agree nor disagree .....	1.9%
Disagree.....	5.8%
Strongly disagree.....	0.0%

**d) Pedestrian and cycle links creating easier access to Dreamland, Margate seafront and Main Sands, Turner Contemporary, Margate Old Town and the High Street.**

Strongly agree.....	69.2%
Agree .....	17.3%
Neither agree nor disagree .....	5.8%
Disagree.....	3.8%
Strongly disagree.....	1.9%

**e) A new attraction, possibly a sea life centre, on the beach.**

Strongly agree.....	59.6%
Agree .....	11.5%
Neither agree nor disagree .....	7.7%
Disagree.....	9.6%
Strongly disagree.....	13.5%

**f) New open space created on the seafront.**

Strongly agree.....	51.9%
Agree .....	23.1%
Neither agree nor disagree .....	11.5%
Disagree.....	9.6%
Strongly disagree.....	1.9%

**g) A new road link along the railway line between All Saints Avenue and Eaton Road.**

Strongly agree.....	63.5%
Agree .....	23.1%
Neither agree nor disagree .....	13.5%
Disagree.....	0.0%
Strongly disagree.....	0.0%

## **Public Response**

### **Comments on returned Survey Forms**

- Provide a new visitor centre
- Pedestrianise the seafront
- Provide safe public meeting places
- There is a need for attractions for varying weather conditions
- Remember cycle link proposals from railway station to Viking Coastal Trail
- There is a need for a variety of shops and cafes
- There is a need for a balance between shops and parking
- Do not create security problems
- No pubs
- More detail on retail
- Provide a free children's playground
- Provide free parking
- Provide more promenade seating
- Make the seafront family friendly
- Have a skateboard park
- Introduce a childrens' interactive museum
- Provide communal bottle banks etc to avoid rubbish problems
- Improve links to Hartsdown Park
- Provide bus stops and cycle parking
- Extend the loop bus service to the railway station

*Response: The brief now has stronger references to the need for safety and security. The proposed Viking Coastal Trail extension is referred to. The desire to improve public transport links is included, also reference to the need for a child and family friendly open space is included. Recycling facilities are referred to in relation to sustainability. The brief does not include detailed proposals for particular land uses, as these will emerge through the detailed planning process and will be the subject of further consultation.*

### **Letters in Response to the Consultation**

#### **Comment:**

- Concern that TDC is the freeholder and that this should be made clear. The lessee has a lease of 199 years from 1965. TDC should act as a freeholder and impose covenants.

*Response: Brief amended to refer to Council freehold.*

#### **Comment:**

- Anything the Council can do to change the exterior of the Arlington development will be better than the present boarded up mess.
- There is a need for seafront attractions, a seafront "train" and a skateboard park, there is room.
- One letter does not consider there is a demand for a sea life centre and recommends the development of a water park, skating rink, bowling alley and childrens play area alongside the scenic railway, relating to the Dreamland site rather than Arlington.

*Response: There is the potential for a seafront attraction identified, specific uses can be considered at a later stage.*

#### **Comment:**

- If a large new building has to be built could it be sympathetic to Margate's history, e.g. reflecting the character of the Scenic Railway.

*Response: Reference added into the brief as an opportunity.*

Comment:

- Lower flats views of the bay must not be lost or compromised as a result of redevelopment.
- Present tenants suffer as a result of noise from adjacent uses which stay open until 3am, concern is expressed that the proposed open space may become a gathering place for noisy youths.
- Concern is expressed that the new road would generate increased traffic close to two sides of Arlington House.

*Response: The need for a new development to take account of the environment of existing residents has been added to the opportunities section of the brief.*

Comment:

- Professional Advice should be taken in relation to sustainability opportunities within any redevelopment proposals.

*Response: The need for sustainability to be considered is referred to in the brief.*

Comment:

- Concern at the potential for retail to be dispersed, resulting in the possible loss of College Square and less visits to the town due to the proximity of the site to the railway station.

*Response: The site is considered the sequentially most suitable site for a large retail store, it is considered that the regeneration benefits for Margate outweigh the disadvantages, but that any proposals must improve connectivity with the town centre.*

Comment:

- What is the impact of the loss of the car park?

*Response: Studies have shown Margate to have surplus parking without taking into account informal use of Arlington House. Any retail development would be expected to provide town centre parking that is not exclusive to the retail store/s.*

Comment:

- Concern that the proposed roundabout open space will not be useable for much of the year, due to the adverse weather conditions.

*Response: Detailed development proposals need to consider the influence of the wind on the site, this is now referred to in the brief.*

Comment:

- Concern is expressed at the lack of maintenance by the present owners which may continue into the future.

*Response: Liaison on these issues continues outside of the planning process.*