

This is Phase 5 of the consented development. The original allocation (SHLAA 031 - listed in Appendix B under its previous reference of S141) was for 1020 units, however this is shown as zero in Appendix B to avoid double counting as the site is fully consented.

The phasing for the remaining surveys has been confirmed by the agent (February 2019) as follows:

17/0726 Land North of Haine Road Broadstairs and West of Nash Road Margate Phase 3C – 97 units.

2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32
		20	30	30	17								

The phasing of the other phases are set out below:

14/0320 Land North of Haine Road Broadstairs and West of Nash Road Margate Phase 4 – 204 units.

2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32
		50	50	50	54								2

15/0250 Land North of Haine Road Broadstairs and West of Nash Road Margate Phase 5 – 469 units

2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32
			50	50	75	75	75	75	69				

Issue 7 – Land at Manston Court Road/Haine Road - Policy SP18

Q1. How was the site boundary defined and what is it based on? Are there any ownership constraints likely to affect the deliverability of the site?

The allocation comprises two sites - SHLAA 013 and 014, also known as Westwood Village. The eastern part of the site was submitted in response to the Preferred Options Consultation in 2015 and allocated in the Preferred Options Revisions Consultation in 2017. The western part was submitted in response to the Call for Sites in 2018 and allocated in the Publication Draft Local Plan in 2018. In their response to the Publication Draft Local Plan, the Option holders suggest that site HO3 (Land on west side of Old Haine Road, Ramsgate) which is currently allocated as a non-strategic site be included as part of this strategic allocation at the request of their client.

The eastern part of the site, incorporating part of HO3, is currently subject to a planning application -

OL/TH/18/0261 - Land On South Side Of Manston Court Road And West Side Of Haine Road RAMSGATE Kent :

Outline application for a mixed development of up to 900 dwellings together with a mix of use

classes A1 (retail) A2 (Financial and professional services) A3 (restaurants and cafe) A4 (drinking establishments) A5 (hot food takeaways) B1 (business) C1 (Hotel) D1 (non-residential institution) D2 (assembly and leisure) and a two form entry primary school, together with ancillary and associated development including new and enhanced pedestrian / cycle routes and open spaces, car parking and vehicular access with all matters reserved except for access

There are no ownership constraints likely to affect the deliverability of the site.

Q2. What is the justification for allocating the site for up to 1,200 dwellings? What is this based on and is it achievable?

SHLAA 013 was allocated in the Preferred Options Revisions at a capacity of 700 dwellings in response to the increased OAN to 17,140. Following the decision by Council in January 2018 to remove the proposed mixed use allocation at the former airport site, the 2,500 dwellings proposed for that site had to be located elsewhere and a Call for Sites was carried out. SHLAA 014 was submitted as additional land to the existing allocation to accommodate between 667 - 751 dwellings.

The allocation of the two sites at a total capacity of 1,200 dwellings allows for the provision of open space, highways and other infrastructure required.

Q3. What is the justification for specifying a maximum density of 30 dwellings per hectare? Is this policy requirement justified? Why is a lower density justified on this site, compared to other strategic allocations?

This requirement was a reflection of earlier development proposals for this site. The maximum density should be 35 dwellings per hectare as per the other strategic allocations - the Council proposes the following modification to Policy SP18:

Land is allocated for a mixed use development, comprising up to 1200 new dwellings at a maximum density of ~~30~~ 35 dwellings per hectare net, and leisure uses.

Q4. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required of the masterplan and how this will integrate with development at the 'adjoining sites'? Is the policy effective?

The purpose of the Masterplanning process is to ensure that when planning applications are submitted, they can be considered in the context of the total requirements of the site allocation policy, and that any approved development is well-related to adjacent communities.

The purpose of the Development Brief is similar, but relates to the detailed design of the site, rather than the broad principles.

They could be incorporated in a single document, of form part of a Design & Access Statement. This will help decision-makers and local communities to understand how the site works and how it relates to neighbouring sites.

Although the northern part of the site has been granted planning permission as part of a wider allocation, it is still necessary for the development of the southern part of the site to be appropriate and well related to the northern part of the site.

For clarity, the Council proposes the following modification to Policy SP12 - General Housing Policy for the Inspectors' consideration:

'Proposals for residential development on sites allocated in this plan must be submitted with a masterplan (to demonstrate how the requirements of site specific and other local plan policies can be fully met on site) and a development brief (including more details such as design, layout and access). Proposals must.....'

An illustrative masterplan was submitted as part of the planning application, demonstrating the relationships between phase 1 (the subject of the application) and phase 2.

Q5. How has the mix of uses and minimum area of open space been established? Are they necessary, appropriate and justified?

Open Space requirements were calculated using Table 7 of the Preferred Options Plan 2015, based on the Open Space audit carried out in 2005. (This has since been revised as have the Open Space standards in the local plan). Other uses have been informed by the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and by advice from other statutory bodies, such as KCC in relation to education provision

Q6. Is it sufficiently clear to developers, decision-makers and local communities when and how the proposed school will be delivered?

The provision of the school was included in the outline planning application.

Q7. Have the costs associated with the open space and secondary school been taken into account in considering the viability of the site? Is the site developable within the plan period?

The Viability Study Report (CD1.3) and the Update Report (CD1.11), undertaken by the Dixon Searle Partnership, takes a standard approach to Local Plan viability assessment, and is in accordance with Government guidance. The detailed methodology is set out in Chapter 2 of the Report.

The study assesses a number of different Scheme Development Scenarios/typologies and locations of development, and applies a number of standard costs to different elements of infrastructure. The study also includes a number of specific policy costs, where these apply (for example, National Technical Standards and the SAMM tariffs). Additional information is contained in the Appendices to the Report (identified as CD1.4 - CD1.10).

It should be noted that DSP also carry out reviews of viability statements submitted by developers in relation to planning applications, so have a good understanding of the local market.

Q8. What is the justification for requiring contributions to an internal spine road laid out in accordance with the requirements of the draft Transport Strategy? Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required? Is the policy justified and effective?

This site lies at a critical location on the proposed Inner Circuit. The Inner Circuit proposal stems directly from the impacts of new development on the existing urban route network. It is vital that it provides a

suitable standard of route that connects Westwood to the wider route improvements. The draft Transport Strategy sets out the nature of improvements required to deliver effective improvements and this is reflected in the draft Local Plan (Policy SP47).

Q9. How has the effect of the proposed development on the local road network been taken into account? How will the site be accessed, and is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what the necessary highway improvements consist of?

The impact of the development on the local road network was taken into account in the preparation of the draft Transport Strategy (CD6.1), and the accompanying modelling evidence from Amey (Core Documents CD6.3 - CD6.8). The necessary highway improvements are identified in Policy SP18, SP47 and the draft Transport Strategy.

Q10. How will proposals for the site be expected to provide connections with existing public rights of way and cycle networks to promote the use more sustainable modes of transport?

The draft Transport Strategy sets out the broad objectives for walking and cycling and bus provision in the context of the development proposed in the draft Local Plan. These are also included in the Sustainable Development Strategy that was submitted with the planning application.

Q11. How does the scale of proposed development relate to the size, role, function and character of the area?

This allocation contributes towards the evolution of Westwood as a sustainable mixed use business and residential community, consolidating its role and function as Thanets primary retail centre.

Q12. What is the justification for requiring ecological surveys of breeding and wintering birds? What effect will the proposed development have on breeding and wintering birds? How has this been considered as part of the allocation process?

Following comments from Natural England at the Pre-Submission stage, the Council considers it appropriate to remove this requirement.

Q13. What is the current status regarding the submitted planning application for the site?

There was resolution to grant permission for what is known as "Phase 1" of the site (ie: the eastern half of the site) by the Council's Planning Committee on Tuesday 26th February 2019, under planning application ref. OL/TH/18/0261.

Q14. What consideration has been given to the standard of living accommodation for potential future occupants, having particular regard to the proximity of the site to Manston Airport?

At the time of the consultation of the Proposed Options Revisions the Council had received evidence from an airport viability study that 'airport operations at Manston are very unlikely to be financially viable in the longer term...' therefore the proximity of the site to Manston Airport was not an issue.

If the current Development Consent Order for the airport is granted, there will be a review of the Local

Plan which will need to address issues including noise, air quality and public safety based on the quantity and nature of flights being proposed.

It may be necessary for some noise attenuation/mitigation to be included, however it is impossible to make any such policy provision at this stage with the current uncertainty surrounding the airport site. This could be addressed in the process of determining subsequent applications for Reserved Matters.

Q15. Appendix B to the Plan estimates that 50 dwellings will be delivered on the site in 2019/20. What is this based on and is it a realistic expectation?

The trajectory has changed since the publication of the Submission plan and is set out in the appendix to the Council's statement on Matter 8. This is based on the information received from the developer as part of the HIA phasing survey and confirmed by the developer by email following the developer meeting in January 2019.

2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32
		90	110	120	130	140	130	120	110	50	100	100	

Issue 8 – Land North and South of Shottendane Road – Policy HO2

Q1. How was the site boundary defined and what is it based on? Are there any ownership constraints likely to affect the deliverability of the site?

The southern part of site (SHLAA 022) was included by the Council at the Preferred Options Revisions stage to provide 250 dwellings in agreement with the landowner as its allocation played a key part in delivering the road network improvements identified in the Transport Strategy for the district. Following the decision by Council in January 2018 to remove the proposed mixed use allocation at the former airport site, the 2,500 dwellings proposed for that site had to be located elsewhere and a Call for Sites was carried out. The northern part of the site (SHLAA 023) was submitted to provide 300 dwellings in response to the Call for Sites. It was considered appropriate to allocate the northern part of the site to accommodate some of the displaced housing from the airport. It was also considered appropriate for the two sites to be brought together to form a strategic site to ensure comprehensive development between the sites and contributions towards the inner circuit.

Q2. What is the justification for allocating the site for up to 300 dwellings at land north of Shottendane Road and up to 250 dwellings on land south of Shottendane Road? What is this based on and is it achievable?

The allocation of the two sites for 300 and 250 dwellings respectively takes into account the sites areas and allows for the provision of open space, highways and other infrastructure required.

Q3. What is the justification for specifying a maximum density of 35 dwellings per hectare? Is this policy requirement justified?

Please refer to Matter 5, Issue 1, Q3

Q4. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required of the masterplan and development brief? Why will both these documents be required and how will they relate to one another? Is the policy effective?

The purpose of the Masterplanning process is to ensure that when planning applications are submitted, they can be considered in the context of the total requirements of the site allocation policy, and that any approved development is well-related to adjacent communities.

The purpose of the Development Brief is similar, but relates to the detailed design of the site, rather than the broad principles.

They could be incorporated in a single document, of form part of a Design & Access Statement. This will help decision-makers and local communities to understand how the site works and how it relates to neighbouring sites.

For clarity, the Council proposes the following modification to Policy SP12 - General Housing Policy for the Inspectors' consideration:

'Proposals for residential development on sites allocated in this plan must be submitted with a masterplan (to demonstrate how the requirements of site specific and other local plan policies can be fully met on site) and a development brief (including more details such as design, layout and access). Proposals must.....'

Q5. How has the effect of the proposed development on the local road network been taken into account? How will the site be accessed, and is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what the necessary highway improvements consist of? What are the costs of these improvements and have they been taken into account when assessing the viability of the allocation?

The impact of the development on the local road network was taken into account in the preparation of the draft Transport Strategy (CD6.1), and the accompanying modelling evidence from Amey (Core Documents CD6.3 - CD6.8). The necessary highway improvements are identified in Policy SP16, SP47 and the draft Transport Strategy.

Q6. The masterplan for the northern site is expected to include a link road through the site to link Hartsdown Road and Shottendane Road. What is the justification for this? Has the cost of providing this infrastructure been included in the viability assessment of the site?

This is a critical link in the Inner Circuit Strategic Route, that helps to secure improvements to the Coffin House corner junction, and provides a vital connection to Westwood.

The Viability Study Report (CD1.3) and the Update Report (CD1.11), undertaken by the Dixon Searle Partnership, takes a standard approach to Local Plan viability assessment, and is in accordance with Government guidance. The detailed methodology is set out in Chapter 2 of the Report. At this stage, the proposed link road infrastructure is not considered to place a disproportionate impact on development viability, as such internal roads and junctions onto the existing highway network would typically be required to deliver a housing site of this quantum. As with other strategic allocations located within the Inner Circuit, the internal roads will simply serve

a dual purpose of assisting in distributing traffic in the locality as well as provide direct access to the site.

The study assesses a number of different Scheme Development Scenarios/typologies and locations of development, and applies a number of standard costs to different elements of infrastructure.

Q7. What is the justification for requiring 6.23 hectares of open space to be provided? Is it clear from the policy how the open space will be expected to be spread across the two sites? Is the policy justified and effective?

Open Space requirements were calculated using Table 7 of the Preferred Options Plan 2015, based on the Open Space audit carried out in 2005. (This has since been revised as have the Open Space standards in the local plan). Other uses have been informed by the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and by advice from other statutory bodies. The policy states that the open space may be spread across the two sites, rather than an expectation for it to be, to make it clear that the provision of open space is flexible between the sites.

Q8. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities how off-site mitigation for the loss of ground nesting bird habitats will be identified and delivered? Is this policy effective?

Following comments from Natural England at the Pre-Submission stage, the Council suggests this requirement should be removed from Policy HO2 as a proposed modification for the Inspectors' consideration:

Master planning will:

- Provide for the integration of development and landscaping to enable a soft edge between the site and the open countryside
- Provide pedestrian and cycle access between the two sites
- Provide a minimum of 6.23 ha of open space – this may be spread over both sites but must be easily accessible by both sites
- ~~Provide off site mitigation for the loss of ground nesting bird habitats~~

Q9. Developments are required to incorporate and provide for improvements identified in the Thanet Transport Strategy. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what specific improvements have been identified for the allocation and are these justified? Is the delivery of the site dependent on these improvements being delivered?

This site lies at a critical location on the proposed Inner Circuit. The Inner Circuit proposal stems directly from the impacts of new development on the existing urban route network. The draft Transport Strategy sets out the nature of improvements required to deliver effective improvements and this is reflected in the draft Local Plan (Policy SP47).

Q10. What is the justification for requiring improvements to Margate Cricket Club pitch and facilities? Has the cost of providing these improvements been included in the viability assessment of the site?

The need for improvements to Margate Cricket Club pitch and facilities was identified in the recent Playing Pitch Strategy (2018). This is not considered to be critical to the viability of the site.

Q11. How has the effect of the proposed development on nearby heritage assets been taken into account? What impact will the allocation have on designated heritage assets? Is the policy justified?

A Heritage Impact Assessment has been required in the Policy for impacts on St Johns Cemetery and sites/memorials within it.

The following is also suggested as a proposed modification to the policy for the Inspectors' consideration:

Master planning for the northern site will include:

- a link road through the site to link Hartsdown Road and Shottendane Road.
- Improvements to Margate Cricket Club pitch and facilities
- Development proposals that respect the setting of the listed building at Shottendane Farm

Q12. What effect will the proposed development have on existing drainage infrastructure? Will additional infrastructure be required to accommodate the proposal, and if so, how will this be provided?

Additional local sewage infrastructure will be required to serve the proposed development. Southern Water suggest the addition of the following clause to the Policy:

Ensure occupation of development is phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in collaboration with the service provider

The Council propose this as a Modification for the Inspectors' consideration

Q13. Appendix B to the Plan estimates that 30 dwellings will be delivered on the site in 2021/22. What is this based on and is it a realistic expectation?

The trajectory is based on the information received from the developer for the developer meeting in January 2019. This is set out in the appendix to the Council's statement on Matter 8.

Phasing 2018/19	Phasing 2019/20	Phasing 2020/21	Phasing 2021/22	Phasing 2022/23	Phasing 2023/24	Phasing 2024/25	Phasing 2025/26	Phasing 2026/27	Phasing 2027/28	Phasing 2028/29	Phasing 2029/30	Phasing 2030/31
		30	90	90	90	90	90	70				