

Adoption of the Cliftonville Development Plan Document

Sustainability Statement

February 2010

If you would like a copy of this document in a different format such as Braille, audio or large print, or in another language please call 01843 577165

Adoption of the Cliftonville Development Plan Document (DPD)

Thanet District Council adopted the Cliftonville Development Plan Document (DPD) on 25th February 2010, following its examination by an independent inspector. The Cliftonville DPD was found sound, subject to certain changes which have been incorporated.

The purpose of this statement is to explain how sustainability considerations were integrated into the DPD, how options and consultation responses have been taken into account, the reasons for choosing the DPD in preference to other reasonable alternatives and monitoring the sustainability effects and effects of policy implementation.

Sustainability Considerations

Sustainability has been a key consideration throughout the production of the Cliftonville DPD.

The Cliftonville DPD plan area addresses an area declared by Thanet District Council in 2005, as Cliftonville West Renewal Area. The Plan area falls within two electoral wards, Cliftonville West, which makes up most of the area, and Margate Central that forms the North West Corner of the area.

Despite being popular in the early 20th Century, in part because of the sandy beaches that form the northern boundary of the area, the area has seen rapid decline in the latter part of the 20th and early 21st Century with properties becoming run down. The area is also noted to have high numbers of bedsits and flats, littered streets and narrow roads lined with parked cars.

A complete and detailed description of the area is contained within the Sustainability Appraisal Report.

Key Issues for Cliftonville

During the process of preparing the Sustainability Report, a set of Sustainability Issues were identified.

These Sustainability Issues identify both constraints and opportunities for achieving sustainable development (social, environmental and financial) within the area. These issues (which contributed to the formulation of Sustainability Objectives) are useful in ensuring that the Cliftonville DPD targeted key areas of concern. The issues identified as part of the Cliftonville SA are in addition to those identified for the wider Thanet District. The key Sustainability Issues identified for Cliftonville are:

- High unemployment;
- Low household income;
- High levels of deprivation;
- Poor quality of housing stock;
- Low levels of health;
- High levels and concern over crime; and,

- Waste management and street cleanliness.

Sustainability Objectives

Using the information from the characterisation of the plan area and the identification of key Sustainability Issues, SA Objectives were derived. The SA objectives for Cliftonville complement those developed for the Core Strategy which is applicable to Thanet District as a whole. Below are the nine SA Objectives identified for Cliftonville. Details of the Core Strategy SA Objectives are also provided within the Sustainability Appraisal Report.

Cliftonville DPD SA Objectives

- C1 To support initiatives and development to bring unemployment rates in Cliftonville in line with levels in the wider Thanet District
- C2 To curtail development of small, low quality flats and bedsits
- C3 To support the development of a range of types and tenure of properties and the regeneration of derelict and vacant properties
- C4 To provide access to education facilities focused on training vulnerable and welfare dependant workers with skills necessary to ensure stable employment
- C5 To increase public safety and reduce crime and fear of crime in the Cliftonville West Renewal Area
- C6 To reduce the transient nature of residents and improve community structure
- C7 To improve location and safety of local parking facilities
- C8 To ensure waste management and collection strategies are appropriate to the Cliftonville urban environment
- C9 To educate residents about waste management and recycling

The Development of the Cliftonville Plan Options

During the production of the SA Scoping Report, Thanet District Council developed an Issues and Option Report. This report details the issues within the area as identified by the District Council and a number of policy options to address them. The identified key issues were;

- **Issue 1** The over-riding need for action in Cliftonville West;
- **Issue 2** The adopted Cliftonville Policy on small flats;
- **Issue 3** Retention of family housing;
- **Issue 4** Size of flats;
- **Issue 5** Design, open space and new development;
- **Issue 6** Tourism;

- **Issue 7** Traffic management; and,
- **Issue 8** Refuse Storage.

Within the Issues and Option Report, a number of policy options to address the identified issues were considered. A period of public consultation supported this process. The sustainability performance of each of these options was assessed against both the Cliftonville SA Objectives and the Core Strategy SA Objectives, the outcome of which is presented in the Sustainability Appraisal Report.

By considering the SA and recommendations received through public consultation Thanet District Council then reviewed the plan options. Following this review, Thanet District Council released a Preferred Options Paper. The preferred options were assessed against the SA Objectives. This was done by making an assessment as to whether the option is aligned or misaligned to the SA Objectives.

This assessment was undertaken for the short term (0-4years), medium (5-9years) and long (10+years) term and includes a description of the proposed effect. The assessment is presented in detail within the Sustainability Appraisal Report.

The following is a summary of how each option was considered:

The Overriding Need for Action in Cliftonville.

This option is effectively a do nothing or a do something option. Option 1.2 to 'do nothing' performed poorly against the Cliftonville sustainability objectives as it failed to address the key sustainability objectives. The predicted effect of Option 1.1 against the sustainability objectives is uncertain. The extent to which policies will be successful cannot be predicted at this time, but the assumption is that the policies will address the sustainability objectives contributing positively to the social, economic and environmental issues. For this reason it is considered that the preferred option should be to develop a spatial policy for Cliftonville West. (However, it was later decided that the criteria were more a set of objectives, rather than a policy, and were included as objectives in the final DPD).

The Adopted Cliftonville Policy

The SA supports the need for a policy that resists elevated levels of one bedroom and small flats which has been fuelling sustainability problems in the area. Deleting the existing policy and not replacing it would not address the problem and would exacerbate the situation so this option (Option 2.2) was dismissed. Option 2.3 proposed carrying on with the policy with the insertion of exceptions, as there may be circumstances where it is appropriate to allow for smaller units of accommodation to be developed. Whilst adding an exception to the policy provides more flexibility, concerns over clarity and legal challenges associated with the exception was judged as a limiting factor in respect of its beneficial impact. Therefore it was considered that continuing with the existing policy (option 2.1) is most applicable and appropriate at this time.

Retention of Family Housing

The two issues are to develop a policy to retain family housing or a 'do nothing' option.

Having identified the need to address the availability of family housing, it is considered that option 3.2 to 'do nothing' should be rejected. The presence of families would be expected to contribute to stabilizing the community structure, contributing positively towards reducing the transient nature of

the resident population, improving social cohesion and reducing incidences of crime and anti social behaviour.

In undertaking the Sustainability Appraisal no clear distinction was made between the 3 options. The size of flats have no bearing on sustainability objectives and in any event is being deferred to a SPG on flat conversions guidance applicable to the whole district. The SPG was considered a more appropriate vehicle for this. The choosing of option 2.1 as the preferred option already impacts on the ability of developers to build small one bedroom flats but this option would give further guidance. (This issue is now being dealt with under the management proposals as part of proposed conservation area designations, rather than as planning policy in this DPD).

Design, open Space and New Development

The SA supports the principle of protecting open space to become compatible with the wider ambitions of the area and prevent the cycle of deprivation. The abundance of small dwellings has caused a high population density. As the population has a greater proportion of vulnerable and socially dependent people, the pressure placed on infrastructure has had a negative impact on service provision. Reducing the density in this area will contribute positively to reversing the social and economic trends. Therefore options 5.1, to address open space issues through policy and 5.2 to reduce density through policy are the preferred options. The other options of developing a security checklist or a combination of the above. The security option was considered unnecessary as there is already a crime and disorder strategy in place. (It was later decided that these issues were already covered by saved local plan policies and in the Conversion to Flats Guidelines therefore inclusion in this DPD would be duplication).

Tourism

The three options are to safeguard currently used and potentially suited to use as quality hotel accommodation that will enhance and support local tourism (option 6.1). To allocate sites or buildings in the area suitable for tourist accommodation (option 6.2). To develop a criteria based policy to support proposals to upgrade existing tourist accommodation, or the provision of new tourist facilities (option 6.3). And to have no specific policy regarding hotel accommodation in the Cliftonville West Renewal Area is developed and let market forces determine the future use of property (option 6.4). It was considered that option 6.4 was associated with high levels of uncertainty and was therefore not supported. The remainder of the options all exhibited benefits in SA terms. The SA highlights that any tourism promoting policy will have an impact on the transient nature of the area. In developing and improving the existing tourism industry, the seasonality of employment in the area will increase and potentially magnify the inward and outward movement of people. But due to the high level of unemployment in the area the impact will be limited. As a synergistic benefit the growth of the tourism industry will spark economic investment and improved facilities for local people.

Traffic Management

There are a number of options for traffic management in the area. To require cycle storage within all new development (option 7.1), to require provision of additional car parking spaces per additional residential unit created by extensions to properties (7.2), to refuse applications for development providing parking in front garden areas (and where necessary remove permitted development rights) (7.3), to allow development without the need for additional on site parking (7.4), and all or only some of the traffic management options (7.5). Despite Cliftonville having a low level of car ownership the nature of the area with its terraced houses and limited off road provisions leads to

congested areas. It was considered that options & 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 all contributed to easing the parking problems in the area. Option 7.1 particularly met all the sustainability appraisal objectives.

Summary of the Key Impacts of the Preferred Options

Beneficial

The SA has confirmed that Cliftonville DPD policy options deliver significant benefits, mostly targeting the social deprivation that is abundant in the area. In particular, the plan addresses housing issues and will have a positive impact on the available mix of accommodation (types and scale) in the future. Furthermore, by restricting the domestic storage of waste and implementing policy aimed at design, higher quality public open spaces will be secured for the future and there will be a positive impact on the quality of the street scene.

In general, deprivation is a result of cumulative issues and problems. In response, Thanet District Council has addressed the identified issues through a series of policies that will tackle deprivation in synergetic manner delivering cumulative benefits in terms of employment, social structure and 'sense of place'.

Adverse

The plan policies have few adverse impacts. This has been achieved through adapting and modifying options through the SA process and through consultation. It has been noted however, that in boosting the tourist industry, seasonal employment trends may contribute to an increased seasonal population with incumbent demands. Whilst this is possible it is felt the wider contributing benefits of a rejuvenated tourism industry will significantly out way any impact on the transient nature of the population.

Mitigation

Mitigation provides opportunities to not only lessen adverse effects, but also to promote or enhance beneficial effects. This has been the approach adopted for the mitigation measures outlined within the Sustainability Appraisal Report which illustrates a number of proposals as follows:

- Changes to options and recommendation for new options to further promote sustainability;
- Examination of linking the Cliftonville DPD with other plan policies to strengthen positive plan effects and the overall beneficial impact of the Cliftonville DPD; and,
- Developing a remit within which the plan options are to be delivered i.e. criteria to guide the delivery of the Cliftonville DPD during its implementation.

What Difference has the SA Process Made?

The SA has tested the different options for the delivery of the Cliftonville DPD in respect of their likely significant environmental, social and economic effects. The most suitable options have been carried forward to become preferred options and in doing so, the SA process has made suggestions for enhancement and mitigation to further enhance the development of the Cliftonville DPD. These

mitigation and enhancement measures took the form of highlighting key actions necessary to minimise significant impacts suggesting potential amendments to policies and forging links with other plans, policies and strategies.

In addition to sustainability appraisal there is now a requirement to carry out Appropriate Assessment of land use plans and programmes. This process is often also known as Habitats Regulations Assessment. Recently the Court of European Justice ruled that the United Kingdom had failed to adequately transpose all the requirements of 'Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild fauna and Flora (The Habitats Directive)' into UK law. In response, it has been determined Appropriate Assessments (AA) should be made to all relevant land use plans in order that Local Planning Authorities accord with the requirements of this Directive.

The Council carried out a screening assessment for potential effects and one issue was highlighted. It was considered Policy CV4 (provision of tourist accommodation) could result in a greater number of visitors to the areas currently protected under European nature conservation designations, or that some potential sites for new tourist accommodation may, if developed, cause disturbance to wildlife during the construction period. A clause was therefore added to the policy to the effect that there should be no negative impact on biodiversity or the designated sites

Consultation, responses and alternatives

A Statement of Consultation was submitted to the Secretary of State and detailed how the options on the consultation responses were taken into account and the reasons for choosing the dpd in light of other reasonable alternatives. (These were applicable prior to the examination and may have been amended in the adopted plan as a result of the Inspectors required changes).

An extract from the Statement of Consultation is appended to this document.

Monitoring

This Sustainability Appraisal Report contains a description of the measures for monitoring the effects of the DPD which will permit an assessment of the accuracy of the SA against its predicted effects. In the future, it is critical that the significant adverse effects of the Cliftonville DPD are monitored. This will provide an appropriate level of empirical evidence through which planning responses may be made and beneficial effects are monitored to maximise the benefits of the plan.

The Adopted DPD contains indicators and targets, and how they will be monitored, for each of the policies in the DPD where appropriate.

Cliftonville Development Plan Document

Extracts from Statement of Consultation

1 Introduction

1.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act introduced the Local Development Framework (LDF) format of planning policy. The Thanet District LDF, together with the Regional Spatial Strategy (South East Plan) will become the statutory Development Plan for the District. The Cliftonville Development Plan document (DPD) will form part of the LDF.

1.2 The purpose of the Cliftonville DPD is to implement tighter planning controls in the Cliftonville West Renewal Area to prevent the continuation of small, poor quality, high density developments which are a significant contributory factor to the social and deprivation issues the area is currently experiencing. (Applications such as live.com or google earth are a useful way to see how developments have taken place to the rear of properties, contributing to the intensification of buildings in the area).

1.3 One of the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act is for each local authority to produce a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which sets out how and when the community will be involved in the development of planning policy documents. Thanets Statement of Community Involvement was adopted in February 2007. The Cliftonville DPD has met the requirements of the SCI during the formal stages of the planning policy process:

Regulation 25 (under 2004 Regulations) – questionnaires, forums, mailshot, newspaper adverts, documents and comments form available on web or hard copies

Regulation 26 (under 2004 Regulations) – questionnaires, mailshot, newspaper adverts, documents and comments form available on web or hard copies

Regulation 27 (under 2008 Regulations) – model response form, mailshot, newspaper adverts, drop-in session, documents and form available on web or hard copies

Continuing informal community involvement has taken place in between the formal stages.

Consultation with Members and formal Council procedures

1.4 Initially a 'Local Development Steering Group' was established and was an informal group comprising five Members and a representative from the Local Strategic Partnership. This group evolved to form a formal group known as the 'Local Development Framework Working Party', comprising five cross-party Members.

1.5 The Working Party have been kept up to date with the general progress of the DPD, and each stage of the planning process has been discussed at the working party and agreed, prior to reporting to Cabinet or Council.

1.6 The Cliftonville Document has been reported to the following Council meetings :

Item Reported	Council Meeting	Purpose of Report
Preferred Issues and Options	Cabinet – 20 th March 2008	Agreement for Public Consultation
Petition Received on Preferred Options consultation	Council – 24 th July 2008	Formal receipt of petition by Council
Petition Received on Preferred Options consultation	Cabinet – 6 th November 2008	Referral of petition from Council to Cabinet
Petition Responses	Cabinet – 12 th February 2009	Progress on responses to the petition
Petition Responses	Council – 26 th February 2009	Report back to council within Procedure Rules for a petition
Publication Document	Cabinet – 7 th May 2009	Agreement for Public Consultation and subsequent Submission
Publication Document	Council – 21 st May 2009	Agreement for Public Consultation and subsequent Submission

Regulation 30(d) Statement

2 Pre-Submission Consultation

2.1 In 2005 a Renewal Area was declared for Cliftonville West which included a significant amount of public consultation. A policy restricting further development of one-bedroom flats in the Cliftonville West Renewal Area was adopted by the Council, as a Council policy, in December 2006. Extensive consultation was carried out during the process of adopting this policy during September-November 2006. The consultation carried out under Regulation 25 was based on other issues identified from this consultation.

2.2 The database for this DPD was derived from consultees for the consultations carried out for the Renewal Area designations and the one-bedroom flat policy. A full list can be found in Appendix 3.

3 Consultation Pursuant To Regulation 25(1) (Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004)

3.1 An Issues and Options paper formed the basis for this consultation from 15th August – 12th October 2007.

3.2 A total of 218 groups and individuals were contacted comprising:

- Local groups and organisations (as set out in the SCI, including Age Concern, residents groups/forums, health/education groups)
- Hard to Reach groups identified in the SCI as appropriate (contact with the Youth Council, Gypsies and Travellers, Surestart , Help the Aged/Age Concern)
- Respondents to the Cliftonville Policy consultation carried out in 2006
- Estate Agents/Developers/Landlords
- Those who had requested to be kept informed
- Statutory Consultees/DPD bodies as appropriate

3.3 How this consultation was carried out:

- Letter and questionnaire sent out on 15th August 2007 inviting responses and attendance at one of two forums, with the consultation period running from 15th August until 12th October 2007.
- Questionnaires available at Council Offices
- Questionnaires available at all local libraries
- Questionnaires distributed to the St Pauls Community Centre, and Thanet Community Development Trust, both located in Cliftonville West
- Electronic questionnaire on website
- Press release appeared in Thanet Times, 4th September 2007
- Two forums were held – one in the afternoon and one in the evening, to maximise the opportunity for people to be able to attend:

4th September 2007, 7.00pm: 7

10th September 2007, 3.00pm 15 Attendees

Attendees

The forums took the following format:

- Arrival and Coffee
- Welcome
- Introduction and Presentation
- Ice-Breaker
- Discussion session (structured discussion on issues and options for Cliftonville West)
- Plenary session (Feedback and comments from participants)
- Closing remarks/close

How the main issues have been addressed in the Preferred Options Document

3.5 The Issues and Options included discussion about the minimum standard size of two bedroomed flats in the Cliftonville West Area. There was a strong message that the existing standard of 50 m square, as set out in the Conversion to Flats Supplementary Planning Guidance, was not adequate. However, a range of alternative sizes were suggested, and a suggestion was made that a standard should be set for the amount of usable space, rather than the total floor area. Some people commented that they could not visualise the sizes to be able to make a reasoned judgement. It was considered, therefore, that this issue would need more research and be supported by more detailed public consultation in order to arrive at a reasoned and meaningful standard that could be applied. The Preferred Option was therefore considered to be for a comprehensive review of the Supplementary Planning Guidance to be carried out.

3.6 Comments were made about perceived overcrowding in Cliftonville West. To address this, an option was suggested to establish a maximum density for new dwellings.

3.7 One issue identified at the forums was a lack of family housing – the concentration of flats in the area being more suited to single people or couples. A lack of garden space for children to play in was also raised. The Preferred Options included policy suggestions for preventing houses that are currently suitable as family housing from being converted into flats, and restricting extensions to properties if it would result in the loss of garden space.

3.8 The subject of tourism was raised at one of the forums, and also during a discussion with officers from other council departments. Cliftonville might once again become a popular place for visitors, considering some of the regeneration initiatives taking place in Margate. There was concern that some existing hotels, or buildings suitable for hotel use, may be converted to housing, leaving little or no scope for tourist accommodation in the future. An option was therefore suggested for the retention of buildings for hotel use and supporting proposals for tourist accommodation.

3.9 Parking was an issue people felt strongly about, as expressed both at the forums and via the questionnaires. One of the options suggested was to encourage cycling by providing a secure, communal cycle storage facility. However, during the consultation it was considered that this would become a security risk, therefore the Preferred Options suggest a policy requesting that cycle storage facilities be provided in new developments.

3.10 Provision for refuse storage was raised during the consultation, and also by a Councillor. A lack of storage facilities, or convenient storage facilities, often results in rubbish bags being left in front gardens or on pavements creating an untidy environment. Consideration was given to this issue as to how it could be resolved and identified a problem, common to many properties in the area, that providing such facilities in mid-terrace properties is simply not feasible. A Preferred Option was therefore drafted to require appropriately designed refuse storage facilities to be incorporated in all conversions or new developments, and that this could be situated at the front of a property if there is no alternative.

Other Consultations as part of the Issues and Options process

3.11 Internal consultation was carried out by way of a 'brainstorming' meeting on 8th October 2007 which included council officers from the tourism, renewal area, housing, private sector housing, development control and highways departments. The issues discussed related to the potential issues being considered for the Preferred Options, ie the one-bedroom flat policy, room size, extensions to hotels, parking and design. Issues that materialised from the meeting included:

- Various sources identified relating to standards for room sizes for future research
- Consider a policy retaining quality hotels
- Converting front garden areas for car parking detrimental – also reduces on street parking by two spaces

4 Representations on Proposals for a Development Plan Document (Pre-Submission Public Participation) Regulation 26 (Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004)

4.1 The consultation on the Preferred Options Document was carried out between the 18th April and 30th May 2008. Letters were sent to the same consultees on the database used for the previous consultation, totalling 242 groups and individuals. The number of consultees was higher for this consultation as it incorporated those new consultees who became involved following the Issues and Options consultation.

4.2 At a meeting of the Local Development Steering Group (comprising officers, councillors and representatives from the LSP) on 5th February 2008, it was decided that forums/workshops would not be appropriate this time as the area was suffering from 'consultation overload', due to recent consultations having been carried out by other departments.

4.3 It was considered appropriate at this stage to send a copy of the Preferred Options document and the comments form to Statutory consultees (Specific Consultation Bodies).

4.4 A letter was sent to the 242 groups and individuals advising them of the consultation, and enclosing the Proposal Matters.

4.5 Copies of the Preferred Options Document, comments forms and the Sustainability Appraisal Report were made available at the Thanet Gateway/Library, Cliftonville Library, St Pauls Community Centre, Cliftonville and online. The Proposal Matters were published in the Thanet Extra on April 18th 2008, and a press release advertising the consultation was published in the Thanet Gazette on April 18th 2008.

4.6 103 comments were received from 20 representors.

4.7 A Petition was also received, submitted by five Cliftonville Residents Associations, and signed by 641 signatories. The petitioners had commented on each of the issues and preferred options set out in the consultation document. The comments were broadly supportive of the initiatives set out in the document, along with suggested amendments and additions to be included in the Publication document.

Main Issues

4.8 The main issues from this consultation have been summarised in Appendix 2. The comments were generally supportive and several additions were suggested, although the majority of these would not be appropriate to include in this Development Plan Document as they relate to issues outside the realms of the planning system, or would not stand up to the tests of soundness. There

were also some comments relating to the evidence base. A car parking survey, and a survey of hotels in Cliftonville have been carried out as a result of those comments.

4.9 Comments were made by the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) and Kent County Council that an Area Action Plan may be more appropriate than a Development Plan Document. Officers met with GOSE on the 17th July 2008 to discuss the issue – GOSE suggested that some issues addressed in the Preferred Options document may not be appropriate for a DPD, and should be addressed elsewhere. This is detailed in this document where an explanation is given to the progress of each Preferred Option. The justification as to why this document should be a DPD rather than an Area Action Plan or Supplementary Planning Document is set out below:

These paragraphs explain why an Area Action Plan would not be considered an appropriate policy document format for this DPD. An Area Action Plan aims to focus on a specific location or an area subject to conservation or significant change (eg major regeneration), and to facilitate specific projects or proposals to enable that change.

Other initiatives, facilitated by various Council departments, are already underway to try and improve the situation in Cliftonville. These include the declaration of Cliftonville West as a Renewal Area (an initiative to work with landlords and residents to improve the physical state and appearance of buildings and bring empty properties back into use to try and tackle poor housing conditions coupled with social and environment needs), the Safer Stronger Communities Fund (aiming to making the area safer, cleaner and greener and building a greater sense of community pride) and the adoption of a planning policy restricting the development of one-bedroom flats in this area.

The declaration of the Renewal Area and the one-bedroom flat policy underwent significant public consultation which identified other issues (including parking problems, high number of rented properties, bad tenants, need for greater police presence, bin storage and noise, rubbish, alcohol and drug taking) causing concern to residents, businesses and associations in the area. Following these consultations, a request was made by Council Members for prompt action to be taken to address some of these other issues. We also continued to receive comments and concerns from residents in the area. It was therefore considered necessary for a DPD to be produced for the Cliftonville West area to formalise the one-bedroom flat policy and to introduce new planning policies that could begin to be implemented immediately after their formal adoption by the Council.

PPS12 defines an Area Action Plan as a document to be used for areas where significant change or conservation is needed. An Area Action Plan should deliver planned growth areas, stimulate regeneration, resolve conflicting objectives in areas subject to development pressures and focus the delivery of area based regeneration initiatives. However the most significant issue for Cliftonville at this point in time is that current development trends urgently need to be diminished.

The large number of suitable properties and the relatively low property prices in the Cliftonville West area have given rise to the situation where a very high number of properties have been converted into poor quality small flats, often without private gardens/amenity space or sufficient parking, properties being occupied by transient, often vulnerable people, often placed there by other authorities, and little greenery or landscaping. These trends need to be reversed urgently. The Councils vision is for a more balanced community with a better mix of housing, encouraging families and property owners to live in the area, and taking measures to ensure that any new developments or conversions are of a high quality design and addressing the issue of parking where possible.

In the immediate future there are no specific proposals or projects for the Cliftonville West area that could be facilitated and delivered by an Area Action Plan. The issues that have been included in this document are directly related to the significant number of planning applications being submitted in this area. In order to achieve the Council's planning objectives for the area as soon as possible, it is necessary to implement a series of Development Control policies, therefore the DPD approach was considered the most appropriate for this document. This DPD therefore is a 'development management' document, its primary function being a development control tool to have more influence on the planning applications being submitted in the area.

The Cliftonville West Renewal Area has recently been extended and now incorporates other parts of Margate. If more definitive proposals for the extended Renewal Area are established, it may then be considered appropriate to work with other Council departments to develop an Area Action Plan to cover the whole of the extended area.

The Preferred Options – Outcomes

4.10 The following sets out each of the Preferred Options included in the Preferred Options consultation and a commentary as to their inclusion, or not, in the Publication Document.

Option 1.1 – Develop and over-arching policy across a wide spectrum of issues with the aim of addressing the identified 'key' problems in Cliftonville West

4.11 This policy was drafted, but considered to be more a set of aims rather than policy criteria. It was therefore decided that the issues should remain as aims setting out what the DPD would like to achieve, rather than a planning policy.

Option 2.1 – (One-bed flat policy) – The policy adopted in 2006 should continue to be implemented

4.12 The policy has been operational and successful, is understood by developers and has been considered by planning inspectors at appeal. The wording has been changed to reflect its status as a planning policy, rather than an adopted council policy, but otherwise remains unchanged as a policy in the DPD.

Option 3.1 – (Retention of Family Housing) – To develop a policy to retain existing family housing in the area

4.13 This Preferred Option was carried forward to the Publication DPD. In addition, a policy has been introduced requiring the provision of family housing in new developments.

Option 4.1 (size of flats) – Continue using existing standards of 50m sq until resources are available to carry out a full and robust review of the guidelines

4.14 The issue of the size of flats has been highlighted as a major area of concern by residents, both in previous public consultations, and in informal meetings with officers, regarding the Publication Document. Residents are concerned that space is an important consideration and goes to the root of the problem in Cliftonville, and that this needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency.

4.15 In the absence of national guidance or policy on minimum space standards for housing, some local authorities have set their own. The Council has its own standards covering the whole district,

in the Conversion to Flats Guidelines which were adopted in 1988, but are now considered dated and in need of revision.

4.16 There are no national internal space standards for the private sector, and successive governments have been reluctant to intervene in the market. Recent research has been carried out on behalf of the Greater London Authority (GLA), and by Mid-Sussex District Council, exploring the possibility of introducing minimum space standards. Their findings highlighted that the introduction of new space standards can be a contentious issue, as developers argue that the market should decide what is an adequate size for a dwelling as a property that is too small would not sell. It is also argued that the demand for new homes (particularly in the South East) means that residential units need to be smaller in order to be accommodated within existing land assets. Indeed government policy supports the creation of smaller homes to meet growing demand from smaller households being created and to ensure that maximum use is made of brownfield land in urban areas. However in today's economic climate people are divided between those who can afford to buy their own homes, and those who cannot, and some have no option than to buy or rent small, cheap properties.

4.17 Officers have given careful consideration to the issue of room space standards in this DPD, and concluded that it would be inappropriate to set a new standard for Cliftonville in this DPD for the following reasons:

- A new minimum room space standard would need to go through the Examination process if included as planning policy. This would require a robust evidence base to demonstrate that this is a significant problem, unique to Cliftonville and which could be resolved by imposing a higher space standard. This could prove difficult evidence to provide since a high quality small flat may provide perfectly acceptable living accommodation – this may be an issue of the quality of developments rather than size.
 - Additionally, many of the issues experienced in Cliftonville are due to poor management (contributed to by absentee landlords) rather than small room sizes.
 - A larger space standard for a two-bedroom flat may result in more people living in a two-bedroom flat, thus still experiencing cramped living conditions
 - Would need to be able demonstrate how a new standard has been determined and why that figure has been set
 - May be too restrictive and inflexible as a planning policy and would not allow account to be taken of specific sites or circumstances
-
- An increased minimum standard may still result in insufficient space if designed inefficiently, or due to the amount of space that is actually usable as a total floorspace would not account for sloping roofs, pillars etc. Could also end up penalising good design for smaller flats that are designed well and give the impression of being spacious.
 - Other local authorities who have set space standards have done so as Supplementary Planning Document/Guidance rather than planning policy. The Councils existing Conversion to Flats Guidelines were adopted in 1988 and a review of these guidelines (as a Supplementary Planning Document) is included in the current Local Development Scheme, due to commence in April 2011. This review would include consideration of new room space standards.
 - There is little or no national guidance on the appropriateness of space standards or on their formulation
 - If at Examination the Inspector considered the requirement unreasonable, the policy may be found unsound with instruction for its removal, and cause the whole DPD to be found unsound

- Would add substantial delay to production of DPD due to the research and additional consultation that would be required, and could conflict with timetable and resources for Core Strategy which is a corporate priority

Conservation Areas and Room Space Standards

4.18 Conservation-led change has a vital role to play in the social and economic regeneration of our towns and cities: historic areas can provide a focus around which communities can regenerate.

4.19 Discussions are currently in progress with English Heritage and residents regarding the potential designation of some parts of Cliftonville as a Conservation Area. The first part of this process will include a character appraisal of the area, and the development of management proposals for proposed conservation areas. The management proposals should take the form of a mid- to long-term strategy, setting objectives for addressing the issues and recommendations for action arising from the appraisal and identifying any further or more detailed work needed for their implementation. There is scope here, therefore, for the issue of internal space standards to be addressed in association with conservation area designation, the advantage being that whilst there will be public consultation to determine a reasonable and realistic requirement, the inclusion of internal space standards will not be restricted by the planning policy process. Discussions are well advanced with English Heritage together with the Renewal Board to determine whether or not a conservation area could be designated.

Options 5.1 and 5.2 (Design, Open Space and New Development)

Option 5.1 – Develop a policy limiting residential extension unless there would be no material loss of garden or open space from the existing property, and that a suitable level of accessible amenity space can be provided for the units

4.20 After further consideration of this policy option, it was decided that the issues of provision of gardens and amenity spaces are already covered in existing saved local plan policies and the Conversion to Flats Guidelines, therefore to include the issue in this DPD would be duplication. The issues would however be addressed in the proposed review of the Conversion to Flat Guidelines.

Option 5.2 – Develop a policy stating an indicative maximum density of new dwellings for the area

4.21 This option was considered not to be practical for the Cliftonville Area as the area is already densely populated, and would make relative densities between new build and conversions unrealistic and any relating policy difficult to implement. . However the policy requiring all new build to be family homes indirectly addresses the density issue.

Options 6.1 and 6.3 (Tourism)

Option 6.1 – To safeguard buildings currently used/potentially suited to use as quality hotel accommodation that will enhance and support the local tourism economy

4.22 This option has been the subject of much discussion and careful consideration. Whilst it may be appropriate to safeguard hotels as once a hotel has been converted to other uses, it will never be a hotel again, it is unreasonable to 'force' hoteliers to either keep hotels and a struggling business, or sell as a business that nobody would want to buy.

4.23 Further consideration suggested it may be unfeasible to apply a hotel retention policy just to Cliftonville. However, its inclusion in the Core Strategy as a district-wide option may be more appropriate.

4.24 The following arguments were presented at a meeting of the Local Development Framework Steering Group:

For

- If we can produce evidence that a criteria based policy is applicable district wide, then incorporating it into the DPD would introduce it sooner (albeit for only Cliftonville)
- Will help reduce potential for additional flats as hotel buildings typically lend themselves to such

Against

- Unless we have areally robust evidence base/data, policy could backfire resulting in dereliction, or the importation of more vulnerable people to occupy under-used hotel/guest-house rooms that might otherwise be converted/developed into good quality accommodation or alternative use.
- The Cliftonville DPD could be found unsound without a credible evidence base and the whole document could potentially fail.
- If we develop a hotel retention policy for Thanet, the Cliftonville policy will need to be consistent with it (could have a compliance issue as the Core Strategy policy should be developed first and the Cliftonville policy should comply with it – not the other way round)
- Policy option has not had significant support – two comments were received suggesting it should be part of a district wide policy
- District wide policy would more likely be defensible (criticism of pre introduction in Cliftonville DPD might be to question its validity without comprehensive review of demand and total stock in the wider area)

Councillors debated these points in some detail at the meeting, but requested that the policy be included in the Cliftonville DPD unless further evidence suggested otherwise.

4.25 A meeting was held with representatives from some of the Cliftonville Residents Associations and they were asked for their views on the inclusion of a policy to retain hotels. Whilst they appreciated the aim resist their conversion to more flats, they considered the remaining hotels to be of poor quality an unlikely to be worth retaining. Meetings have also been held with a number of hoteliers in Cliftonville.

4.26 It was therefore concluded that there was not sufficient evidence to support a policy retaining hotels in the Cliftonville DPD, and to do so would not be justified.

Option 6.3 – a criteria based policy to support proposals to upgrade existing tourist accommodation, or for the provision of new tourist accommodation.

4.27 This policy option was carried forward into the Publication Document. Whilst policy T1 of the adopted local plan supports new tourist accommodation in general, it was considered necessary to expand on this policy to apply to Cliftonville as it has become largely residential but with the potential for a growth in tourism as various regeneration projects evolve.

Options 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 (Traffic Management)

Option 7.1 – Policy requiring the provision of cycle storage within all new developments

4.28 This option had been included as a policy in the Publication Document until a meeting with Kent Highways and Development Control was held on 19th January 2009 where the issue was discussed at length. The current Kent Vehicle Parking Standards currently require the provision of one cycle parking storage facility per bedspace or residential unit. To include a policy in the Cliftonville DPD would duplicate this requirement so was therefore considered unnecessary.

Option 7.2 – Policy requiring the provision of additional car parking spaces per additional residential unit created by extensions to properties.

4.29 It had been considered that the Cliftonville Publication Document should expand upon this preferred option and include a general policy to request the provision of adequate off street parking in an acceptable manner, or to require the developer to provide evidence that there is adequate on-street parking available and that the proposed development would not result in conditions detrimental to highway or pedestrian safety.

4.30 A parking survey was carried out following comments from and discussions with residents within Cliftonville who had expressed concern that some roads in the area were becoming congested and that it was difficult for residents to find parking spaces in convenient locations.

4.31 The aim of the survey was to provide evidence to support the development of the Cliftonville Development Plan Document and also to potentially provide evidence for the council in determining planning applications in the area. The survey provided a “snapshot” of the parking situation in the Cliftonville West Ward.

4.32 The survey found that the availability of parking spaces varies significantly between different roads within the study area. The amount of parking available in the area as a whole is sufficient to meet the needs of residents, shoppers and visitors. However, this picture does not tell the full story as many of the available parking spaces are along the northern edge of the study area in Eastern Esplanade and also at the northern end of many streets.

4.33 Given that some roads are very heavily parked in certain sections, the ability of residents to park outside or even close to their own properties can be problematic in many parts of the area. The major issue therefore becomes one of access, convenience and perceived safety rather than an ability to park in the area as a whole.

4.34 While this situation is not ideal, it is one that exists in many other parts of the district where off street parking is limited and/or where large properties have been converted to smaller units.

4.35 Extensive discussions took place with Kent Highways Services and Development Control exploring the possibilities of a number of policy options. Kent Highways Services advised that there is no current problem with highways safety, therefore the problem is an amenity issue with residents often unable to park near their homes. It was concluded that a policy to reduce the amount of on-street parking would be based on anticipated parking problems, dependent on levels of development and car ownership, and would not therefore be sound.

4.36 The current method for calculating car parking makes an allowance for the existing use of a property. Therefore if an existing hotel with ten bedrooms were proposed for conversion to five 2-bed flats there would be no requirement for any on site parking. Kent Highways have agreed that this is inappropriate in Cliftonville. Policy CV5 has therefore been agreed to address this issue.

How issues from the consultation have been addressed in the Publication Document

4.37 The following points have been included in the Publication document as a direct result of comments made during the preferred options consultation:

- Include 'to encourage biodiversity' in the Vision
- Include 'Northdown Road will be a bustling, diverse area with a thriving high street attracting independent retailers. Local people and tourists will enjoy their shopping experience in Northdown Road. New enterprises will support existing businesses and leisure facilities along the sea front, reflecting and enhancing the natural beauty of the coastline' to the Vision
- Include text in the Publication Document relating to the size of flats and emphasising the importance of spacious living accommodation
- Include provision of green spaces in Vision and key issues for Cliftonville
- Include text referring to other regeneration initiatives in Margate and extensions to the renewal area.
- Include text setting out expected timescale of the DPD
- Expand on conformity/links with other plans and strategies and chain of conformity
- Include section on implementation and monitoring
- Include map of the district indicating the Renewal Area
- Include a statement to the effect that the DPD does not replace any policies from the adopted Local Plan, but has evolved from policy H10
- Clarify one bedroom flat policy (ie status)
- Include a summary of the main findings of the Sustainability Appraisal

Regulation 30(e) Statement

5 Publication of a Development Plan Document and Representations – Regulation 27 (Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008)

5.1 The Representations period on the Publication document ran from 19th June – 7th August 2009. A letter, the 'Statement of Representations Procedure, and 'Statement of Publication' was sent to the general consultees on the database (Appendix 3), totalling 264 groups and individuals. A letter, the document and comments form, a non-technical summary of the Sustainability Appraisal, the Statement of Consultation and a list of documents forming the Evidence Base were sent to 26 Specific Consultation bodies. A letter was sent to the South East England Partnership Board requesting conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy. Copies of these letters, and all other

letters and press adverts from previous stages in the process, can be found in a separate Appendix (4) to this document.

5.2 Copies of the Publication Document, comments forms, the Sustainability Appraisal Report, the Habitats Regulations Assessment, the Statements of Representations Procedure/Publication, the Statement of Consultation and list of documents forming the Evidence Base were made available at the Thanet Gateway/Library, Cliftonville Library, St Pauls Community Centre, Cliftonville and online.

5.3 Copies of the document and comments forms were also given to a representative from the Cliftonville Futures Group for distribution amongst the Residents Associations, and the Cliftonville Partnership for distribution to local traders.

5.4 Adverts stating where and when the document was available for comment were published in the Thanet Extra and Thanet Gazette on 19th June and in the Gazette on the 26th June. A press release was published in the Times on 26th June. An official notice comprising the Statement of Representations Procedure and Statement of Publication was published in the Thanet Extra on the 19th June. Posters stating the availability of the document for comment were displayed at the Thanet Gateway and St Pauls Community Centre.

5.5 The Manager of St Pauls Community Centre and some of the representatives from the Residents Associations contacted the Council stating that people were having trouble understanding the comments form (the model comments form supplied by the Planning Inspectorate) and were unsure how to comment. It was agreed that a coffee morning would be held at the St Pauls Community Centre on 27th July, between 11.30-2.00. The coffee morning was advertised in the Thanet Extra on 24th July. Three officers from the Council attended, as did four members of the Cliftonville Futures Group, and were available to talk to people and provide assistance in completing the forms. Approximately 10 residents attended. The Cliftonville Futures Group representatives had been talking to people to gain their views, and were compiling a response on behalf of a number of Cliftonville residents. They requested more time to talk to colleagues and canvas neighbours, so it was agreed that the representations period be extended until 7th August 2009 (the original closing date for the consultation had been the 31st July. The new closing date was displayed on the Councils website).

38 comments were received from 25 respondents. The comments included 13 supporting comments, 2 objections and 23 observations. No respondents have requested to attend the Examination in Public in person.

One respondent is the Cliftonville Futures Group. The Group comprises representatives from the various Residents Associations in Cliftonville and acts on their behalf. Their representation was endorsed by 136 residents. A response was also submitted by the Gordon Road Area Street Scheme on behalf of 13 members.

The main issues raised included:

- Support for the Vision but further initiatives beyond the scope of the DPD will be necessary to achieve it
- Policy CV1 should exempt specialised accommodation for older people
- Policy CV1 could be expanded to include making better use of existing housing stock/empty properties
- Minimum room size (as set out in the Conversion to Flats Guidelines) is not sufficient – should be set at 80 square metres

- Thanet District Council lacks the powers to solve problems of social and economic deprivation
- Policy CV4 – enforcement of occupancy controls must be effective and have the confidence of the public in their effectiveness
- Policy CV4 – support but retaining good quality hotel accommodation should also be addressed
- County/Local policies section needs updating as the South East plan is now adopted
- Policy CV5 – support objectives of policy but consider re-wording necessary to clarify the policy

Lists of General and Specific Consultees

Cliftonville Development Plan Document – General Consultation Bodies

Category <i>Organisation</i>	Developers and landowners		
	<i>Title</i>	<i>First Name</i>	<i>Surname</i>
BSF Planning	Mr.	D.	Jarman
Gleeson Homes	Mr.	Matt	Richardson
Lee Evans Planning	Miss	Karen	Banks
McCarthy & Stone			
Cluttons	Mr.	Jonathan	Tenant
Roger Tym & Partners			
Ashton Moore			
Cattell Skinner			
Clague Architects			
Manyweathers	Mr	S	Manyweathers
DHA Planning	Ms	Klaire	Lander
The Barton Willmore	Ms.	Judith	Ashton
Planning Partnership			
Home Builders Federation (Southern	Mr	Pete	Errington
Hume Planning Consultancy	Mr	Alister	Hume
Lee Evans de Moubray			
M. Goddard Planning Consultancy			
Messrs. Peacock & Smith			
Rosefarm Estates	Mr.	Barry	Neill
Jennifer Owen Associates	Mrs.	J. A.	Owen
Philip Dadds			
S. F. Morgan			
St. Crispins Homes			
Orbit Housing Group	Ms	Maggie	McCann
D. C. Manyweathers & Co			
Terence O'Rourke plc	Mr.	M.	Miller
Enplan	Mr.	M.	Carpenter
BSF Planning Consultants			
Thanet Community	Mr.	Simon	Addley
Housing Association			
Oxford Hotels and Inns			
The Planning & Development	Mr.	Trevor	Herron
DPP Partnership	Miss	M.	Nagy
Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd	Mr.	Graham	Norton
George Webb Finn	Mr.	D.	Bass
The Barton Willmore Planning Partnership	Mr.	Guy	Flintoft
Pyramid Consulting	Mr.	B.	Preston
Terence Painter Properties	Mr.	T.	Painter
Mr	R	Storey	

Category <i>Organisation</i>	Estate Agents		
	<i>Title</i>	<i>First Name</i>	<i>Surname</i>
Spicer McColl			
Oakwood Homes			
Estate Agents			
Regency Properties			
Miles & Barr Estate Agents			
Milton Ashbury Ltd			
Ward & Partners			
Clarke & Crittenden			
Cooke & Co Estate Agents			
Thomas Jackson			
Lovetts Property Services			
Parkland Estates Ltd			

Your Move
 Charterhouse
 Cooke & Co
 Oakwood Homes
 Estate Agents Ltd

Sir/Madam

Category

Organisation

Thanet District Council
 Thanet District Council

Internal TDC

Title

First Name

Surname

Cllr. Mrs	Iris	Johnston
Cllr	Steve	Ward
Cllr	David	Green
Cllr.	Martin	Wise
Cllr.	Roger	Latchford OBE
Cllr.	Douglas	Clark
Cllr. Ms	Linda	Aldred
Cllr.	Sandy	Ezekiel
Cllr	John	Watkins
Cllr.	Clive	Hart

Category

Organisation

Mr
 Mr
 Belmonte Bowmanor
 Mr
 Mr
 Mr
 Mr
 Mr
 Mr

Landlords

Title

First Name

Surname

John	Gaughan	
G	Menga	
Mr	N	Pope
	Ian	Biggs
	Jospeh	McDermott
	A	Zlotnick
	IA	Smith
	Steve	Gannon
Mr & Mrs		Coleman
Mr	L	White
Mr	G	Thind

Category

Organisation

Dalby Square Residents Association

Dalby Square Project
 Gordon Road Area Street Scheme
 SureStart Millmead
 Margate Old Town Action Group
 Sustainability Actions
 Thanet Community Development Trust
 Surrey Road Area Action Group
 TCDC
 Margate Town Partnership
 Turner Court Residents Association
 Margate Town Partnership

Local Community Groups

Title

First Name

Surname

Mrs	J	Raines
Mrs.	Anne	Smith
Mr.	E.	Ibarola
Mrs.	V.	Mann
Ms.	J.	Cranstone
Mr	Tony	Ward
Ms.	Frances	Rehal
Ms.	Jill	Edwards
Mrs	Vera	Elliott
Mr.	Keith	Morris
Mr.	R.	Morland
Mrs	L	Sutton
Ms.	Sharne	McCarthy
Mr.	R.	Coker
Ms.	Tina	Pullinger
Mrs	D	Moldrich
Mr	Thomas	King
Mr	Peter	Whale
Mr	Barry	Coppock
Ms	Pamela	Pople
Butler	Beverley	Butler
Ms	Emma	Batt
Mr & Mrs	D	Scroder
Ms	Dolly	Jenkinson
Ms	Karen	Naylor
Mrs	Mo	Wallis
Mr	Peter	Hatton
Mrs	E	Walton
P	Ellisden	
Ms	T	Tinsley
Mr	Tony	Snow
Mr	Greg	Wood

Westgate and Westbrook Residents
 TCDC
 Thanet Senior Citizens Forum
 Cliftonville Partnerships
 Fusion
 Thanet Extra Newsletter
 Surrey Road Area Action Group
 Dalby Square Area Action Group
 Cliftonville Futures Group/SRAAG
 Grotto Hill Residents Association
 DAAG
 St Pauls Community Trust
 Reverend
 In Touch - Thanet Home Improvement
 Margate Civic society
 Kent Police
 SRAAG

Godwin Road Residents Association
St Pauls community Trust
Gordon Road Area Street Scheme

Ms Jayne
Ms E
Mrs Betty

Kennett
Phillips
Ward

Category

Local Hoteliers

Organisation

Title

First Name

Surname

Nigel House Hotel

The Manager

Pavilion View Hotel

The Manager

Glenwood Hotel

The Manager

Florence Court Hotel

Mr

Steve

Dang

Athlone Guest House

The Manager

Walpole Bay Hotel

Mrs

Patricia

Bishop

The Greswolde Hotel

The Manager

The Bay Guesthouse

Mr

Steven

McKenna

Malvern Guesthouse

Ms

Helen

Bullock

Palm Court Hotel

Ms

Julie

Faladey

Smiths Court Hotel

Ms

Sophy

Forwood

Innsbrook House

Mr

Ian

Raines

Category

Other agencies

Organisation

Title

First Name

Surname

Help the Aged

Miss

Stockwell

East Kent Coastal Primary Care Trust

Ms.

Mary

Jones

EK Coastal PCT

Ms.

Sally

Denley

Help the Aged

Ms

Diane

Aslett

Club Caprice

Mr

Mark

Tournay

Canterbury christ church University

Ms

Penelope

Stevens

Eastern and Coastal Primary Care Trust

Ms

Meradin

Peachey

Thanet Youth Council

Mr.

John

Simmonds

Thanet Local Strategic Partnership

Mr.

Paul

Trumble

Thanet & East Kent Chamber of Commerce

Ms.

L.

Wells

Margate Civic Society

Mr.

C.

Hart

English Heritage

Mr.

Steve

Williams

Kent Youth & Community

Mr.

R.

Bonner

QEQM PALS/Voluntary

Ms.

M.

Young

Canterbury Gypsy Support Group

East Kent Council for Voluntary Services

Ms.

Maureen

Possee

Voluntary Sector Representative

RevD

Arthur

Houston

East Kent Coastal Primary Care Trust

Ms.

Hannah

Price

Kent Refugee Support Group

Ms.

R.

Cull

Playaways Childcare Centre

Ms.

M.

Baldwin

Thanet Volunteer Bureau

Ms.

J.

Boulton

New Life Christian Fellowship

Ms.

P.

Wells

Thanet Action Team

Friends Families & Travellers

Sure Start Margate

Ms.

G.

Stygal

Thanet Care & Repair

Ms.

A.

McDonald

Government Office for the South East

Ms

Joanna

Andrews

Kent Highways

Mr

R

Smith

The Georgian Group

Home-Start Thanet

Ms.

S.

Lewis

Southern Water

Mr

David

Sims

East Kent Social Services

Ms

K

Graham

DPDs Consulting Group

Ms

Diane

Bowyer

SEEDA

Mr

I

Mawyer

Age Concern Margate

Mrs.

Sandra

Matthews

Thanet Counselling Service

Ms.

J.

Fenn

Category

Residents

Organisation

Title

First Name

Surname

Mr

S

Villette

Mrs

JY

Dyett

Ms

Victoria

Sweetingham

Mr

King

Mr

Mike

Read

Ms

Honor

Todd

Mr

Edward

Lever

Nadeza

Ziberga

Mr	Raymond	Bailey
Ms	Kirstyeyn	McCornisky
Mrs	J	Manners
Mr	Jim	French
Mr & Mrs		Addis
Ms	J	Watling
Mr	T	McElligott
Mr	S	McKenna
Mr	J	Benson
Mr	L	Wells
Ms	Pamela	Besant
Mr & Mrs	M	Hubbard
Mr & Mrs	D	Moore
Ms	Gill	Lilley
Mr	G	Drage
Mrs	Mariette	Castellino
Mr		Gibbs
Mr & Mrs		Fever
Mr	D	Kay
Mr	N	Smith
Mr	R	Carroll
Mr	D	Cotton
Mrs	Sue	Houghton
Mr	A	Jemmett
Mr	JB	Fry
Mr	TA	Afuape
Ms	Joanne	Savage
Mr	J	Hill
Mr	Terry	Shale
Mr & Mrs		Braedley
Mr	K	Oliver
Mr	K	Mamden
Mrs	E	Hall
Mr	S	McKenna
L	Foster	
Mr	Olive	
Mr	M	Wisk
Mr	N	Deverell
Ms	Joanne	Savage
Mrs	D	Higgs
Mr & Mrs		McAloney-Foster
Mr		Busher
Mr	Stewrt	Webber
Mr	MBG	Pratt
Ms	H	Green
Mrs	PW	Suckling
Mr	Garry	Gowans
Mrs	Margaret	Main
Mr	Andrew	Stock
Mrs	E	McKenzie
Mr & Mrs		Day
Ms	Sharon	Brown
Ms	Jenny	Cobb
Ms	M	Dearman
Mr & Mrs		O'Callaghan

Mr & Mrs	Vic and Sue	Talbot
Mr & Mrs		Carss
Mr	C	Edwards
Mr	Z	Parveen
Mr	EG	Lynch
Mr & Mrs	David and Helen	Watkins
Mr & Ms	Peter & Ann	Fullbrook
K		Dallen
Ms	Leja	Gatvasova
Mr	RW	Bryant
Mr		Cripps
S		Johnson
Mrs	M	Holdsworth
Mr	K	Chadband
Mr	D	Rhodes
Mr and Mrs	Gordon and Valerie	Gloor
Mr	PR	Miles
Mr	JW	Lynas
Miss	L	Howard
C		Waller
Mrs	L	Phillips
Ms	M	Bonne-Golay
Mr	J	Milford
Mr	Len	Shergold
Mr	C	Dempsey
Mr	John	Bean
Mr & Mrs	Deborah and Brian	Smith-Stewart
Mrs	B	Deacon
Mrs	MJ	Baker
Mr	Ian	Smiler

Category

Organisation

Kent County Council
 Strategic Health Authority
 Kent Adult Education
 Canterbury Christ Church University
 Kent County Constabulary
 Highways Agency
 East Kent Coastal Teaching Primary
 EK Hospitals Trust
 EK Community NHS Trust

Service Provider

<i>Title</i>	<i>First Name</i>	<i>Surname</i>
Mr.	Martin	King
Mr.	Mike	Daly
Ms.	S.	Huston
Dr.	Sally-Ann	Burnett
Mr.	J	Duncan
Mr.	Howard	Moore
Ms.	Caroline	Davis
Mr.	Rupert	Williamson
Ms.	F.	Linder

Cliftonville Development Plan Document – Specific Consultation Bodies

Organisation	Contact Name
Canterbury City Council	Mr. Ian Brown
South East Coast Strategic Health Authority	Mrs Ann Sutton
Broadstairs & St. Peter's Town Council	Mr Roy Dexter
Kent County Council	Mr. Dick Feasey
Countryside Agency	Ms. Fiona Fraser-Boulton
Dover District Council	Mr Adrian Fox
Environment Agency	Ms Jennifer Wilson
Southern Water	Ms Susan Solbra
Natural England - Kent Team	Ms. Ingrid Chudleigh
Manston Parish Council	Mrs. Twyman
Highways Agency	Mr Mark Arnold
Cliffsend Parish Council	Mr. Roy Wade
English Heritage	Mr. Steve Williams
Acol Parish Council	Ms. Sheila Bransfield
Monkton Parish Council	Mr. N. Cole
Chislet Parish Council	Mr G Eaton
Birchington Parish Council	Mr. John Garland
Worth Parish Council	Mrs Janet Hughes
Stourmouth Parish Council	Jay Huxtable
Ash Parish Council	Mrs Christine Haggart
Minster Parish Council	Mr D Neville
SEEDA	Pam Alexander
St Nicholas at Wade and Sarre Parish Council	Maud Kinsella
Department for Transport - Rail Group	Mr Tony Brownbill
Government Office for the South East	Ms Phillipa Sandbrook
South East England Partnership Board	Mr Dominic Veasey