



Strategic Planning
Thanet District Council
Cecil Street
Margate
Kent
CT9 1YW

**Environment, Planning and
Enforcement**

Invicta House
County Hall
Maidstone
Kent
ME14 1XX

Phone: 03000 415718
Ask for: Chloe Palmer
Email:

BY EMAIL ONLY

17 January 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Re: Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Development Plan - Regulation 16
Consultation**

Thank you for consulting Kent County Council (KCC) on the Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Development Plan (the Neighbourhood Plan), in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

The County Council has reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan and for ease of reference, provides comments structured under the chapter headings and policies used within the consultation document.

5.0 Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment

It is noted there is no reference to ecology within the Neighbourhood Plan, other than acknowledging that the document will require a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA).

The Plan area is adjacent to the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar, the Thanet Coast Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The Neighbourhood Plan should consider how any development would impact on these designated sites and what information would need to be provided. The County Council recommends the inclusion of a policy within the Neighbourhood Plan to address this.

Protected/notable species (including bats, reptiles and hedgehogs) have been recorded within Thanet. Therefore, as outlined in paragraph 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), any Neighbourhood Plan should be looking to ensure that submitted planning applications are demonstrating that they are considering the ecological impact. This would ensure that the developments are designed to retain the ecological interest (or, if that is not possible, implement appropriate off site mitigation), ensure that ecological connectivity is maintained and that the area is enhanced for biodiversity.

6.0 The Broadstairs & St Peter's Area

Town History

The Neighbourhood Plan's town history summary, at present, only considers the historic town of Broadstairs, and only from the medieval period onwards, therefore neglecting an important, and potentially very useful, part of the area's past. The Neighbourhood Plan covers an area significantly larger than the historic town of Broadstairs, which should be explored in full in the Town History chapter.

Palaeolithic handaxes (c. 700,000 BC to 10,000 BC) have been found from three locations in the area and much of the brickearth in the area has been classified (following KCC research) as being of moderate potential for the recovery of further Palaeolithic finds. Only a small number of Mesolithic flints (c. 10,000 BC to 4,000 BC) have been found locally, but the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan is particularly rich for Neolithic and later finds. There have been several discoveries of Neolithic flint implements (c. 4,000 BC to 2,000 BC) from the area, including along the cliffs between Broadstairs and North Foreland Lighthouse, St Peter's and Dumpton Gap and Neolithic occupation sites have been found at Stone House School, Dumpton Gap Road, Thanet Reach Business Park and Westwood. There may even be a Neolithic flint mine close to Dane Court Grammar School. There are also numerous ring-ditches in the area, observable from aerial photography. These represent funerary monuments, and many are likely to be later Neolithic or Bronze Age (c. 2,000 BC to 700 BC) in date. There are a large number of Bronze Age sites from the area. These include occupation sites, enclosures, field systems, barrows and metal hoards making the Broadstairs area one of the richest in the county, and probably the country, for the period. As the part of the country closest to the continent, the area is also rich for Iron Age finds (c. 700 BC to AD 43). Settlements have been found at Lanthorne Road, South Dumpton Gap, Vale road and North Toreland Road. A possible defended enclosure has been observed near North Foreland Lighthouse and there are hundreds of records of iron age coins being found in the district. In addition there are more than twenty recorded Roman sites in the area (c. AD 43 to AD 410), including occupation sites, possible villas, cemeteries and rural sites. Finally, the area includes many Early Medieval sites (AD 410 to AD 1066) that pre-date St Peter's, including cemeteries containing rich burials and sunken-feature buildings.

The above summary demonstrates the rich archaeological heritage of the area. All periods of the past have left an imprint in the landscape of Broadstairs and significant discoveries continue to be made. It is not an overstatement to say that the archaeological heritage of Thanet is one of the richest in the entire country and the County Council would suggest that it can serve a wide range of uses for the Broadstairs community. It can add character to the area, whether existing or new build. It can be used for educational and tourism purposes, to contribute to health and well-being and to help social inclusion. These uses have been reviewed as part of the Dover Heritage Strategy¹. The Neighbourhood Plan team might wish to usefully consider the opportunities provided by the area's heritage and summarised in the Dover Heritage Strategy to see how they can be developed within the Broadstairs Neighbourhood Plan.

7.0 Vision and Objectives

The document acknowledges the importance of tourism to the local economy as its primary driver but seeks to limit the negative impacts of tourism. The County Council considers that the vision could be strengthened by indicating a desire to diversify the local economy away from its over reliance on the visitor economy.

¹ <https://www.dover.gov.uk/Planning/Planning-Policy-and-Regeneration/PDF/Dover-District-Heritage-Strategy-Main-Document.pdf>

8.0 Planning Policies

8.1 Place and Environment

Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems

The Broadstairs and St. Peter's Neighbourhood Development Plan does not include any consideration of drainage infrastructure or surface water management. Unfortunately, this locality has experienced local drainage and flood problems in the past as documented in the Thanet Stage 1 Surface Water Management Plan (May 2013)².

The more recent Flood Risk to Communities Thanet (June 2017)³ indicates that there is no specific risk to dwellings; however, if the area is to accommodate growth, it is important that any potential impact on drainage infrastructure is appropriately mitigated.

The County Council would encourage the consideration of a section within the Neighbourhood Plan with respect to infrastructure. This should include consideration of how infrastructure should be provided, and how sustainable drainage should be implemented within any new development.

Good practice supports drainage which is integrated within open space, at the surface and which provides multi-functional space. This is supported in the NPPF, which promotes drainage systems which are multi-functional; for example, biodiversity, landscape and amenity benefits can be provided through surface pond systems rather than below the ground grate attenuation.

Public Rights of Way

KCC has a duty to prepare a Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP)⁴ under Section 60 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and update the plan every ten years. The Plan aims to address the future needs of Kent's PRoW users through the delivery of a range of actions over the next decade.

The vision of the ROWIP is as follows:

"To provide a high quality, well-maintained Public Rights of Way network, that is well used and enjoyed. The use of the network will support the Kent economy, encourage active lifestyles and sustainable travel choices that support health and wellbeing, and contribute to making Kent a great place to live, work and visit".

KCC's PRoW and Access Service is committed to delivering the positive outcomes identified in the ROWIP and has looked for innovative ways to improve the PRoW network in the face of financial challenges.

The PRoW network is free to all users regardless of age, race or gender and provides physical and mental health and wellbeing benefits to all. The ROWIP will aim to encourage use of the network through the promotion of these important benefits.

The ROWIP assesses the extent to which the local PRoW network meets the present and likely future needs of the public:

² https://www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/50031/Thanet-Stage-1-SWMP-Report.pdf

³ https://www.kent.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/71669/Flood-risk-to-communities-in-Thanet.pdf

⁴ https://consultations.kent.gov.uk/gf2.ti//873698/44445893.1/PDF/-/ROWIP_20182028.pdf

- contributing towards more sustainable development;
- delivering active travel; and
- providing opportunities for exercise, leisure, open air recreation and enjoyment of all areas Kent has to offer.

The ROWIP will look to address the accessibility issues that those with disabilities or with mobility problems face when using the PRoW network.

The County Council strongly urges the Town Council to ensure that reference to the ROWIP is included within the Neighbourhood Plan. This will enable the successful joint partnership working to continue to make improvements to the Broadstairs and St Peter's PRoW network. Joint delivery of the ROWIP will ensure considerable benefits and its omission could result in significant loss of access to additional funding and opportunities.

Following the introduction of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, the County Council has been working in partnership with Natural England to establish the Kent stretches of the England Coast Path. This is a new National Trail walking route that will eventually circumnavigate the entire English coastline, securing access rights for the public to explore the coast. In addition to the creation of a continuous walking route around the whole of the English Coast, the project secures public rights to explore adjacent beaches and headlines – known as the coastal margin.

When the trail is complete, the path will be approximately 2,800 miles long, making it one of the longest promoted coastal walking routes in the world. Due to the scale of the project, the coast path is being developed in 'Stretches' around the country. On the 19 July 2016, the first stretches of the Coast Path in Kent, between Ramsgate and Camber, were opened to the public. This created 106km (66 miles) joined up, quality coast path, connecting coastal communities across the District and bringing tourism opportunities to the region. The section of Coast Path from Ramsgate through Broadstairs and St Peter's to Margate is due to open in the next few years.

With reference to paragraph 98 of the NPPF, planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.

The Town Council should be aware that coastal access rights do not prevent land from being developed or redeveloped in the future, though consideration should be given to the potential impacts on the Coast Path. If necessary, Natural England may need to submit a variation report to the Secretary of State recommending a change to the trail alignment, to ensure the route is not obstructed by development. When development proposals are being considered, the planning authority should look to safeguard provision for the England Coast Path on the seaward side of development where possible.

The Neighbourhood Plan should seek to provide opportunities to provide better facilities for users wherever possible. The County Council recommends the following considerations;

1. To protect or enhance the quality of any PRoW to ensure opportunities for active travel, leisure and recreation and access to the wider countryside. This includes access for walking, cycling, horse riding and the availability of open space;
2. That the character and value of any quiet roads connected to or adjacent to developments, which may potentially provide access to the wider PRoW network, are not changed to a state that they become dangerous or unattractive for non-motorised traffic; and

3. Ensuring that developments positively encourage sustainable transport choices.

8.1.2 The 'Green Wedge'

As the text notes, the 'Green Wedge' approach will be important to help the area retain its distinctiveness and character. To help protect the green wedges, it will be important to enable people to value them, not just as barriers to development. This is more likely to happen if people understand the history of these areas and a process called landscape characterisation can contribute to this. The landscape that is visible today is the result of many centuries of evolution and the pattern of roads, tracks, field boundaries and hedgerows that gives the modern landscape its character is firmly rooted in the past. Although the Kent Landscape Assessment does include a broad consideration of the history of the landscape, to fully comprehend how it has developed and to identify those aspects which make it unique, more detailed assessment is needed. The Kent Historic Landscape Characterisation (2001) is a tool for understanding this historic context and should be used at a strategic level to inform decisions taken regarding landscape character. Ideally this county level study should be deepened to be more relevant at the district and local level as has recently happened in the Hoo Peninsula and in Tunbridge Wells Borough. The County Council would be happy to discuss this further and can be contacted via heritageconservation@kent.gov.uk.

8.1.5 Seafront Character Zones

The County Council supports the definition of the Seafront Character Zones (SCZ) in order to conserve the character of the area's sea frontage. However, the County Council would point out that there are numerous heritage assets along the coast that need to be identified and protected during any works intended to enhance the quality of the Zones. Some of these assets are the remains of First and Second World War defences and ancillary infrastructure. These are often not beautiful but are nonetheless key survivals from Thanet's past and with appropriate interpretation can help tell the story of the area in a way that still resonates with people today. The Kent Historic Environment Record lists more than fifty defence sites that will fall in SCZs, although the defences of Thanet have never been studied in detail, so it is not known how many of these survive today. A heritage survey of the SCZs would help identify survivals of this and other eras and thereby help in their management and use by the community.

8.1.6 Protecting Important Species

Open spaces have an important role to play in conserving and promoting the heritage of Broadstairs and St Peter's. Some of the open spaces are heritage assets, representing urban spaces that have been designed as public amenities or that reflect the wealth and aesthetic tastes of private individuals. Other open spaces may not be assets in their own right, but may contain heritage assets, for example in the form of historic structures or buried archaeological sites. Others can be important in that they allow heritage assets to be displayed, for example where a listed building is located next to an open space. As such, any alterations to open spaces need to be considered for the impact that they may have on the historic environment of the area.

Whether considering large and well-known, or smaller and possibly even new sites, it will be essential that they are fully understood before major changes can take place. Over the last few years, KCC has been working with volunteers from the Kent Gardens Trust to review the gardens of other districts in order to better understand the history and development of the gardens and their surviving remains. These reviews are accompanied by Statements of Significance for each garden that allows the Local Planning Authority to use them effectively in the development management process. The information also makes it easy for the Local

Planning Authority to include the gardens on a list of local heritage assets. If the Town Council wishes to understand its green spaces better, then this could be an effective way to achieve this and the County Council would be pleased to discuss this matter further.

8.1.7 Community Facilities

Policy BSP6: Sustaining Community Facilities

Policy BSP6 offers the opportunity to grow the creative economy and support freelancers and homeworkers in accessible, shared work spaces. Small to medium sized enterprises (SMEs) located in shared work spaces have a 60% increased probability of sustainable growth. Redundant community facilities and leisure and tourism assets should, as a priority, be considered as employment space for freelancers and the creative economy. This might be creative making spaces, co-working/affordable/easy in-out spaces for higher spec digital and tech sub sectors and other freelancers. Priority could be given to workspace plans that facilitate co-location with community and/or provision of publicly accessible cultural activity.

8.2 Design

The County Council would welcome the development of community assets, green spaces and communal spaces for recreation, as these are likely to have a positive effect on mental health and wellbeing of residents. In addition, communal spaces for recreation and public transport/active travel would likely have a positive impact on physical activity levels which would have a positive effect on both physical and mental health and wellbeing.

Incorporating vegetation into the design of the built environment can provide ecosystem service benefits and reduce additional costs for residents through providing cooling, air conditioning and shade in the summer and shelter during the winter. Sustainable design and construction methods and the incorporation of renewable and decentralised power generation should be considered to ensure that the development remains resilient into the future, does not contribute to climate change and local air pollution, facilitates affordable utility bills and delivers resilient local energy supplies.

Promoting sustainability should include the installation of electric vehicle charging points within new developments to ensure that future growth in Thanet is to be both resilient and sustainable.

8.2.2 Areas of High Townscape Value

Policy BSP7: Areas of High Townscape Value

The County Council supports this policy, as it will help conserve areas of historic character.

8.2.4 Local Heritage Assets

The text states that the Town Council will create its own list of local heritage assets. The County Council supports the need to identify heritage assets which, although not designated, nonetheless play an important role in local character, and so should be protected during the planning process. However, the County Council is concerned that the Town Council would appear to be developing an approach in isolation from other areas of the District. This is highly unusual and has not been seen elsewhere in Kent. KCC recommends a district-wide approach to local heritage assets with the Local Planning Authority committing to developing a district-wide list of local heritage assets. This has already happened in several districts in the county. Developing such a list at a very local, Neighbourhood Plan level, risks the local

heritage assets of Thanet being identified and conserved according to a wide range of different systems and criteria, thereby making the process less efficient and effective.

Irrespective of how this develops, it should be noted that the list of local assets needs to be added to the Kent Historic Environment Record (HER) (maintained by KCC Heritage Conservation) if the information is to be available for development management decision-making. The Kent HER should also be a starting point for information gathering as the database may contain information on heritage assets that the Town Council is unaware of, particularly archaeological and military or industrial assets. At present the HER lists more than 530 archaeological sites and buildings in the study area, many of which might qualify as local heritage assets. The County Council would therefore ask that heritageconservation@kent.gov.uk is contacted as a matter of urgency to discuss the matter.

8.3 Importance of the Economy

8.3.1 Our High Street and Shopping Areas

Policy BSP10: Shopping Areas

Policy BSP10 can provide space for the creative economy and cultural activity, creating more animated public spaces, positive contributions to the street scene and night time economy and increased revenue for local businesses (e.g. cafes, stationers, food stores). To achieve this, the County Council would recommend the consideration of Use Class B1 at ground floor level for creative studios and co-working spaces that support the freelance economy and support Use Class C3 above ground floor, as live/work. This option should be considered in the context of BSP13 Live-Work Space and particularly requirement c), which should be amended to encourage live-work development in a High Street setting.

8.3.2 Employment Development

Paragraph 8.3.2 describes the higher than average self-employment/freelance workforce and prevalence of home working. Thanet has witnessed significant growth in the Creative Industries sector (Thanet Survey 2016⁵) and particularly in the digital subsector. Kent's creative and digital workforce is up to 93% freelance. Broadstairs is well placed to benefit from this growth by using this opportunity to deliver the right infrastructure to underpin sector growth.

BSP11: Retention of Employment Space

Policy BSP11 is strongly supported by the County Council and it is recommended that requirement a) *'The applicant can demonstrate that the site/premises is no longer capable of meeting employment needs'*, is thoroughly considered, particularly within the creative industries sector, which has a proclivity and experienced capacity to repurpose redundant buildings and heritage assets. The County Council can advise on market testing, that requires a non-standard approach to reach the right investors and developers.

Policy BSP12: High-Speed Internet Access

The inclusion of Policy BSP12 is welcomed. The County Council would ask that this Policy is considered further, in a similar way to the approach of Ashford Borough Council in its Local Plan 2030 (Policy EMP6), pending adoption. The policy states:

⁵ <https://umbraco.thanet.gov.uk/media/3656760/Thanet-Economic-Growth-Strategy.pdf>

Policy EMP6 - Promotion of Fibre to the Premises (FTTP)

All residential and employment developments within the Ashford urban area, including the site allocations promoted in this Plan which adjoin Ashford, will enable FTTP. In the rural area, all residential developments over 10 dwellings and reasonably sized employment proposals shall enable FTTP.

For schemes under these thresholds the Council's expectation is that provision for FTTP will be achieved, where practical.

Where it can be demonstrated that fibre to the premise is not practical due to special circumstances, then non Next Generation Access technologies that can provide speeds in excess of 24Mbps should be delivered wherever practical.

8.3.3. Tourism

The County Council would recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan considers the Dover Heritage Strategy (p68) to see some of the ways that the area's heritage can contribute to increasing the amount and quality of the tourism offer of Broadstairs and St Peter's⁶.

Policy BSP14: Sustaining Leisure and Tourism Assets

The County Council would like to reiterate previous comments made in relation to Policy BSP6 Community Facilities.

9.0 Community Projects

9.2 Litter and Waste

The Neighbourhood Plan area includes a number of safeguarded waste management facilities. These include:

- JC of Broadstairs, Unit 1, The Old Council Yard, Dane valley Road CT10 3JL
- Half Skips, 10 Lenham Close, CT10 1SG
- Brazil Brothers, The Lodge, Sacketts Hill, Dane Road CT10 2QS
- Southern Water infrastructure facility, Crescent Road, CT10 3QU

The Neighbourhood Plan does not propose any new non-waste development that would threaten the retention and continued lawful operation of these safeguarded waste management facilities. However, there should be an understanding that they are located within the Plan area and are safeguarded.

These sites are part of Kent's waste management capacity infrastructure and are safeguarded by Policy CSW16: "Safeguarding of Existing Waste Management Facilities" of the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-31 (KMWLP). Policy CSW16 safeguards the waste management facilities from loss due to non-waste related development. Similarly, any non-waste management development proposed within 250m of safeguarded waste management facilities are required to consult the County Council as the Waste Planning Authority to consider whether the development could compromise the continued lawful operation of the waste management facility in question. If the non-waste development is determined as incompatible with the presumption to safeguard the waste management facility, then the exemption criteria of Policy DM8 "Safeguarding Minerals management,

⁶ <https://www.dover.gov.uk/Planning/Planning-Policy-and-Regeneration/PDF/Dover-District-Heritage-Strategy-Main-Document.pdf>

Transportation Production & Waste management Facilities” of the KMWLP (currently subject to an early Partial Review) should be considered by way of an Infrastructure Assessment submitted with the proposal and considered by the determining authority in consultation with the County Council.

9.4 Transport and Traffic Management

Whilst the Neighbourhood Plan is not specifically intended to replicate issues that have already been identified/addressed as part of the emerging Thanet District Local Plan and its Transport Strategy, there are a few local matters that the Town Council may wish to consider for inclusion/review in order to demonstrate a consistent approach to transport and traffic management.

The transport section largely focusses on encouraging local residents to drive to town centre car parks and park at a reduced rate rather than encouraging sustainable travel options. Lobbying Thanet District Council to reduce town centre car parking fees, despite car parks being well occupied during the summer season, could exacerbate existing traffic pressure in and around the town during seasonal peaks. If parking is considered a particular problem within the town, there could be merit in engaging local businesses and residents to see if there is any interest in offering use of surplus car parking areas at times of peak parking demand to visitors. There are organisations that facilitate hire of private parking spaces over the internet which can generate a valuable source of additional parking choice and a source of income for the commercial/residential stakeholders.

The longer term aspiration for a summer season shuttle service between the main beaches and the railway service is positive and could potentially be extended to a seasonal park and ride service using school car parks (subject to relevant agreement with the necessary school stakeholders). In addition to this, consideration could be given to encouraging the implementation of a public cycle hire scheme (with some electric cycles) and provision of more cycle parking around the town where space allows. It may be prudent to consider mobility scooter parking in key town areas such as existing car parks or pocket park areas.

There is no mention of the routes into Broadstairs and St. Peter’s being improved around the Westwood area (many of these fall within Broadstairs). Whilst these routes are addressed within the Thanet Transport Strategy, it may be beneficial to include a reference to emerging interventions that fall inside the Neighbourhood Plan area, such as the Millennium Way extension and upgrade of the Tesco internal road, which are key to enhancing access into and out of Broadstairs and St. Peter’s, given existing traffic pressure on the A256 Westwood Road corridor. In addition, it may be beneficial to reference potential improvements to the A256/A255 roundabout to reduce excessive queuing in peak times and manage cumulative growth from non-strategic/windfall development sites that might be delivered in the town in the future.

A review of signage/wayfinding for cycle and walking routes, and publications for visitors/residents about the benefits of walking/cycling within the District, would be a beneficial addition to the plan. The Town Council could also look to set competitions or events to encourage local businesses to encourage staff to travel sustainably.

9.5 Other Town Council Projects

Broadstairs Folk Week is a highlight of the Broadstairs and Kent cultural calendar, generating economic benefit, a positive reputation and making a significant contribution to national and international folk music and culture. Therefore, the County Council suggests that the Broadstairs Folk Week is added as a project within this chapter of the Neighbourhood Plan.

KCC would welcome continued engagement as the Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Development Plan progresses.

If you require any further information or clarification on any matters raised above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Stephanie Holt-Castle

Interim Director of Environment, Planning and Enforcement



Historic England

Strategic Planning
Thanet District Council
PO Box 9
Cecil Street
Margate
Kent CT9 1YW

local.plans@thanet.gov.uk
by email only

Our ref: 2019.01.18
Your ref: Broadstairs
and St Peter's
NP
Submission
RLS
Comments
Telephone 01483 252028

18th January 2019

To whom it may concern:

Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version Consultation

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the submission version of the Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Plan. Historic England is the government's adviser on planning for the historic environment, including the conservation of heritage assets and champion good design in historic places. As such we have limited our comment on the plan to those areas that fall within our remit. As such, silence on other matters should not be taken as agreement. We hope our comments are of assistance to the examiner.

Over all we consider this to be a well-prepared plan with thoughtful elements of planning for the historic environment, taking advantage of several areas of opportunity for the community to identify and, through policy, secure positive management of those features that are valued for the historic, architectural, artistic or archaeological interest. This positive approach includes both the designated heritage assets (particularly conservation areas) and non-designated heritage assets, including those identified through the neighbourhood planning process. This conforms with the guidance set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance that:

where relevant, Neighbourhood Plans should provide enough information about local heritage to guide decisions and put broader strategic heritage policies from the Local Plan into action at a neighbourhood scale; and

where relevant, neighbourhood plans need to include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions.



Historic England, Eastgate Court, 195-205 High Street, Guildford GU1 3EH
Telephone 01483 25 2020 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



We do not have any in-principle objections to any of the plan policies proposed and, as such, our comments are restricted to areas where we feel that policy wording can or should be amended to provide clarity of meaning, better secure the objectives of the plan makers or provide conformity with the policies and process set out in the NPPF.

BSP1: The Green Wedge. We support this policy where it helps to sustain valued landscape character and the identity of historically distinct settlements.

BSP2: Important Views and Vistas. We are interested in the potential of this policy to provide understanding and protection of the important element of character or appearance of the conservation areas or the setting of heritage assets individually, or in groups (for example, where they create a landscape within a vista). However, the map presented is rather difficult to interpret, due to its scale. The special features of the subject matter, viewing place or understanding of how and when the view is appreciated and by whom are also not available to help inform decisions about what may or may not constitute harm in each view. The reference to work undertaken in 2016 suggests this information may be available and we wonder whether a report setting these details out could be appended to the plan and referenced in the policy to ensure decision makers have access to information to implement this policy.

BSP8: Local Heritage Assets. We support the policy intention. We recognise the current wording goes beyond what is appropriate within the policy set out in the NPPF, which allows that in circumstances where necessary public benefit delivered by a proposal would outweigh the harm resulting from loss of all or part of a heritage assets significance that harm may be justifiable. However, we feel that the community's effort to protect local heritage assets deserves support and we would like to suggest an alternative wording to ensure the policy remains a part of the plan as follows:

Policy BSP8: Local Heritage Assets

Planning permission will not be granted for development resulting in the loss of existing buildings or structures on the local list of heritage assets (Appendix 4), unless it can be demonstrated that:

- a. the proposal is informed by an appropriate understanding of the heritage asset's significance;**
- b. public benefit that outweighs the benefit of conserving the asset cannot otherwise be delivered in a less harmful way; and**
- c. measures have been included in the proposal to avoid, minimise or mitigate harm to the asset that would result including exploring opportunities to better reveal its significance through the development.**

Alterations, extensions or other development which would adversely affect the appearance or setting of such buildings or structures will require clear and



convincing justification. Proposals that would contribute to the conservation of a heritage asset and better reveal its significance will be encouraged.

BSP9: Design in Broadstairs and St Peter's. We feel this policy lacks direction to achieve the objective, jumping to the means before establishing the direction of travel. We would like to suggest a slightly amended version that provides greater clarity for decision makers:

Policy BSP9: Design in Broadstairs & St. Peter's

Development proposals that conserve and enhance the local character and sense of identity of the plan area will be supported. Proposals should set out how the development has fulfilled the requirements of design guidelines set out in Appendix 5. Where relevant this should be set out in the design and access statement to accompany the application.

BSP14: Sustaining Leisure and Tourism. Some Tourism facilities may be dependent on remaining in a particular location because of their association with a particular feature such as a heritage asset. The Dickens House Museum is an example, where the facility is reliant for its purpose on the historic association of the building, which could not be authentically replicated in another location. Given that attractions like the Dickens House Museum, Bleak House, Broadstairs Bandstand and Crampton Tower Museum, and some of the cultural and tourism events they support, are dependent for, at least, some of their value on the historic or architectural interest of the building or site, we feel that the irreplaceable value of heritage assets that are used for tourism uses relating to their significance requires protection within the policy and would like to suggest an additional bullet point for inclusion within it:

“d) the change of use will not result in an unjustifiable loss of the contribution of a heritage asset's significance to attractiveness of the neighbourhood plan area as a destination for leisure and tourism.”

We also feel that bullet point c) lacks clarity and would ask the examiner to consider whether its meaning is sufficiently clear for decision making.

We hope these comments are of assistance to the examiner, but would be pleased to answer any queries relating to them.

Yours faithfully

Robert Lloyd-Sweet

Historic Places Adviser (South East England)
Historic England
Guildford
Tel. 01483 252028
E-mail:



Date: 18 January 2019
Our ref: 265702
Your ref: Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Plan Consultation
(Regulation 16)



BY EMAIL ONLY

Customer Services
Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Adrian Verrall

Planning consultation: Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 16)

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 23 November 2018 which was received by Natural England on the same date.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

**Regulation 16 consultation
Summary of Natural England Response – No Objection**

Natural England focuses its responses to Neighbourhood Plans where there is the greatest impact on our areas of interest (nature conservation, landscape, soils, access to the environment) or opportunity for gains.

Natural England commented on the Broadstairs and St.Peter's Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 consultation on 18th September 2018. It is pleasing to see that our comments have been taken on board. Natural England have no further comments to make at this time.

We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Amy Croombs on 07554 115 631. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

Yours sincerely

Amy Croombs
Sussex and Kent Area Team

From: **Peter Lorenzo**
Date: Sun, 2 Dec 2018 at 17:33
Subject: Broadstairs and St Peter's Neighbourhood Plan
To: <local.plans@thanet.gov.uk>

The Broadstairs Society fully supports the Neighbourhood Plan.

Peter Lorenzo
Planning Secretary
The Broadstairs Society

----- Forwarded message -----

From: John Pugh

Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2018 at 16:07

Subject: Re: Broadstairs & St Peters Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 16)

To: <local.plans@thanet.gov.uk>

Cc: Matthew Arnold

, David Morton

Phillip Morgan

, Kim Brooks

Dear Sirs

Thank you for consulting Stagecoach on the Broadstairs & St Peters Neighbourhood Plan:

As far as transport issues are concerned, the plan appears to be rather aspirational, with little or no information on how the Town Council's objectives would be achieved.

Stagecoach welcomes the desire to "support the existing bus routes and promote the use of public transport" (Page 39). However, this is then contradicted by suggestions to reduce the car parking charges in TDC car parks, raising awareness (promoting?) to visitors and residents, the free parking in Vere Road car park on Saturdays, and offering discounted parking to residents using district-owned car parks. These proposals only serve to encourage, not reduce dependency on car use, and in the medium to long term would lead to increased traffic levels and congestion.

Little is said about enforcement of existing parking restrictions. The lack of effective enforcement of parking restrictions results in obstruction to our buses, leading to unreliability, and does nothing to encourage public transport use. We regularly experience problems in Broadstairs Town Centre (High Street/Albion Street) and in Church Street/Hopeville Avenue in St Peter's. The plan does not adequately address these issues. We would object to any proposal that would result in higher levels of car use.

Yours faithfully

John Pugh – Roadside Infrastructure Manager
Stagecoach South East

The Bus Station | St George's Lane | Canterbury | Kent | CT1 2SY

www.stagecoachbus.com

Follow us on Twitter: [@StagecoachSE](https://twitter.com/StagecoachSE)

East Kent Road Car Co Ltd. (Registered in England & Wales No. 144585)

Strategic Planning
Thanet District Council
PO Box 9
Cecil Street
Margate
Kent
CT9 1YW

By email only to: local.plans@thanet.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam,

This letter provides Gladman Developments Ltd (Gladman) representations in response to the submission version of the Broadstairs & St Peters Neighbourhood Plan (BSPNP) under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Gladman requests to be added to the Council's consultation database and to be kept informed on the progress of the emerging neighbourhood plan. This letter seeks to highlight the issues with the plan as currently presented and its relationship with national and local planning policy.

Legal Requirements

Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the BSPNP must meet are as follows:

- (a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order.*
- (d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.*
- (e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).*
- (f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.*

Revised National Planning Policy Framework

On the 24th July 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government published the revised National Planning Policy Framework. The first revision since 2012, it implements 85 reforms announced previously through the Housing White Paper.

Paragraph 214 of the revised Framework makes clear that the policies of the previous Framework will apply for the purpose of examining plans where they are submitted on or before 24th January 2019. Given the date of this consultation, the comments below reflect the relationship between Neighbourhood Plans and the National Planning Policy Framework adopted in 2012.

National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role in which they play in delivering sustainable development to meet development needs.

At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread through both plan-making and decision-taking. For plan-making this means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is applicable to neighbourhood plans.

The recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) updates make clear that neighbourhood plans should conform to national policy requirements and take account the latest and most up-to-date evidence of housing needs in order to assist the Council in delivering sustainable development, a neighbourhood plan basic condition.

The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have implications for how communities engage with neighbourhood planning. Paragraph 16 of the Framework makes clear that Qualifying Bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should develop plans that support strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing development and plan positively to support local development.

Paragraph 17 further makes clear that neighbourhood plans should set out a clear and positive vision for the future of the area and policies contained in those plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth.

Paragraph 184 of the Framework makes clear that local planning authorities will need to clearly set out their strategic policies to ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. The Neighbourhood Plan should ensure that it is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area and plan positively to support the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities.

Planning Practice Guidance

It is clear from the requirements of the Framework that neighbourhood plans should be prepared in conformity with the strategic requirements for the wider area as confirmed in an adopted development plan. The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

On 11th February 2016, the Secretary of State (SoS) published a series of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG. In summary, these update a number of component parts of the evidence base that are required to support an emerging neighbourhood plan.

On 19th May 2016, the Secretary of State published a further set of updates to the neighbourhood planning PPG. These updates provide further clarity on what measures a qualifying body should take to review the contents of a neighbourhood plan where the evidence base for the plan policy becomes less robust. As such it is considered that where a qualifying body intends to undertake a review of the neighbourhood plan, it should include a policy relating to this intention which includes a detailed explanation outlining the qualifying bodies anticipated timescales in this regard.

Further, the PPG makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not contain policies restricting housing development in settlements or preventing other settlements from being expanded. It is with that in mind that Gladman has reservations regarding the BSPNP's ability to meet basic condition.

Relationship to Local Plan

To meet the requirements of the Framework and the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, neighbourhood plans should be prepared to conform to the strategic policy requirements set out in the adopted Development Plan.

It is important to note that Thanet District Council are progressing with a new, Framework compliant Local Plan. The Council submitted the draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on 30th October 2018, for independent examination. The draft plan sets out a housing requirement of 17,140 dwellings over the 20-year plan period to 2031.

Gladman consider it essential that the BSPNP allows for flexibility and adaptability, so it can positively respond to changes in circumstance which may arise over the duration of the plan period. This degree of flexibility is required to ensure that the BSPNP is capable of being effective over the duration of its plan period and not ultimately superseded by s38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which states that:

'if to any extent, a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approached, or published (as the case may be).'

Policy BSP1: The 'Green Wedge'

In line with our comments made to the Regulation 14 consultation on the draft version of the NP, Gladman would like to take this opportunity to remind the Council that it is not within a Neighbourhood Plans remit to determine planning applications. We therefore recommend that where the policy makes reference to planning applications being 'permitted', the policy wording is amended to read 'supported'.

Policy BSP2: Important Views and Vistas

Gladman are disappointed to note that our previous comments have not been addressed in Policy BSP2. Policy BSP2 and supporting Map 4, identify a number of important views and vista where development proposals should respect and not detract from the identified important view or vista.

We again submit that new development can often be located in areas without eroding the views considered to be important to the local community and can be appropriately designed to take into consideration the wider landscape features of a surrounding area to provide new vistas and views.

In addition, as set out in case law, to be valued, a view would need to have some form of physical attribute. This policy must allow a decision maker to come to a view as to whether particular locations contains physical attributes that would 'take it out of the ordinary' rather than selecting views which may not have any landscape significance and are based solely on community support.

Opinions on landscape are highly subjective, therefore, without much more robust evidence to demonstrate why these views and landscape areas are considered special, the policy in its current form will likely lead to inconsistencies in the decision-making process.

Policy BSP9: Design in Broadstairs & St. Peter's

Policy BSP9 states that all planning applications in the Neighbourhood Plan Area, will only be granted planning permission if they take into account the design guideline set out at Appendix 5 of the draft plan.

Whilst Gladman recognise the importance of high quality design, planning policies and the documents sitting behind them should not be overly prescriptive and need flexibility in order for schemes to respond to sites specifics and the character of the local area. There will not be a 'one size fits all' solution in relation to design and sites should be considered on a site by site basis with consideration given to various design principles.

Gladman therefore suggest that more flexibility is provided in the policy wording to ensure that a high quality and inclusive design is not compromised by aesthetic requirements alone. We consider that to do so could act to impact on

the viability of proposed residential developments. We suggest that regard should be had to paragraph 60 of the previous NPPF which states that: "*Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles*".

Conclusions

Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the BSPNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the wider strategic policies for the wider area.

Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic conditions (a) and (d). The plan does not conform with national policy and guidance and in its current form does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or one of the Gladman team.

Yours Faithfully,

Megan Pashley

Gladman Developments Ltd.