

CHAPTER 11: IMPLEMENTING & MONITORING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE KENT & MEDWAY STRUCTURE PLAN

IMP1 Meeting the costs of community and other infrastructure generated by new development
Comments on Explanatory Memorandum (no policy reference)

KMSP Deposit Consultation – Policy IMP1

ID Number	113	Organisation	Dover District Council	Name	Mr Mike Ebbs	Position	Forward Planning Manager										
Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Deposit	Chapter	D11	Policy Number	D-Policy IMP1	Paragraph Number	---	Map/Table Diagram	---	Supp/Obj	Object	Participate in EIP?	Yes	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-2310	Proposed Action	Proposed Change									Case Officer	DF				
Consultee Comments	Relates to the expression of the policy rather than the principle that development should help fund infrastructure, the need for which is caused by the development itself. The first sentence states that "The local planning authorities will require contributions from developments....." There are two objections to this. The first is that it is generally better to avoid the phrase "local planning authorities will" because they are not always the determining authority e.g. appeals. It is preferable to express the policy in terms of the circumstances in which planning permission should be granted. The second objection is that the term "require" should be substituted by "seek". It is always open for a developer to refuse to make a contribution, or to propose a reduced contribution. The deciding authority should also have the flexibility, to judge whether that is reasonable.																
Officer Comments	These points are noted. However the intent of the policy is to provide a framework for the approach of the local planning authorities in those circumstances where they have the discretion to make decisions directly or to make representations where final decisions rest elsewhere e.g. in the case of appeals. The clear intent of IMP1 is that community infrastructure costs generated by development should be met by it unless other means of provision/funding have been identified. An amendment to the first part of IMP1 is however proposed to clarify the process of negotiation involved.																
Proposed Change	Amend first sentence of Policy IMP1 to read: The local planning authorities will require appropriate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development.																
ID Number	118	Organisation	Swale Borough Council	Name	Mr Brian Lloyd	Position	Local Plans Manager										
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Deposit	Chapter	D11	Policy Number	D-Policy IMP1	Paragraph Number	---	Map/Table Diagram	---	Supp/Obj	Support	Participate in EIP?	Yes	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-2405	Proposed Action	No Change									Case Officer	JF				
Consultee Comments																	
Officer Comments	Support noted.																
Proposed Change	None																
ID Number	212	Organisation	CPRE Kent	Name	Dr Hilary Newport	Position	Director										
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Deposit	Chapter	D11	Policy Number	D-Policy IMP1	Paragraph Number	---	Map/Table Diagram	---	Supp/Obj	Object	Participate in EIP?	Yes	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-0175	Proposed Action	No Change									Case Officer	JF				
Consultee Comments	Concerns about adequate infrastructure being in place prior to development, with particular reference to the proposed Growth Areas.																
Officer Comments	The Councils share the objector's concerns and there are several policies in the Plan which address these matters. Locational policies for Dartford and Gravesham (NK1) and Ashford (CC1) specifically refer to comprehensive planning of these growth areas in conjunction with the provision of new infrastructure and community services and facilities. In addition, policies QL12 and QL13 address the need to protect existing and provide new community facilities and infrastructure respectively. Policy IMP1 aims to ensure that the costs of such new development are met.																
Proposed Change	None																

ID Number	214	Organisation	Kent Wildlife Trust		Name	Mr Richard Moyse		Position	Senior Conservation Officer	
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-0495	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	DF		

Consultee Comments Reference needs to be made to environmental mitigation, compensation and enhancement which may be associated with new development. Although a wide range of agencies have a part to play in securing the protection and enhancement of Kent's environment, it must be recognised that all development comes at a cost to the environment, and that much of the attractiveness and visual or recreational amenity associated with any development is based on the quality of the environment. It is therefore reasonable that the costs of any environmental measures that are required by planning, including any environmental enhancement, are met in full by the developer.

Officer Comments The need to secure the protection and enhancement of the County's environment is recognised and is a cornerstone of the Plan. The Plan should be read as a whole and Chapters 4 and 9 already contain a strong suite of environmental protection and natural resources policies which seek to ensure the protection and enhancement of the County's environmental assets. Amendments proposed to E1 , E2 and E8 will specifically address issues of mitigation and compensation in conjunction with necessary development.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	713	Organisation	Sevenoaks District Council		Name	Mr Ian Bailey		Position	Local Plans	
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-1648	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Support subject to the reassurance that S106 for improvements at a more local level are not jeopardised in favour of more strategic objectives (e.g. affordable housing/ access improvements etc.).

Officer Comments Each development is treated on a case by case basis, and any contributions required to serve that development will need to be prioritised accordingly, taking into account any relevant factors.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	720	Organisation	Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council		Name	Mr Brian Gates		Position	Chief Planner (Policy)	
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-0829	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments This overlaps with QL13. Is a separate policy required, if not why is this included in the monitoring section anyway?

Officer Comments Policies QL13 and IMP1 have different emphases although they are inextricably linked - Policy QL13 is concerned with ensuring that the appropriate type and range of new community services is provided, whereas Policy IMP1 is concerned with ensuring that development contributes to the provision of any necessary community and other infrastructure generated as a result of the development. Chapter 11 is also concerned with implementation as well as monitoring, which is why Policy IMP1 is in this chapter.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	752	Organisation	Government Office for the South East	Name	Mr Ralph Dickens	Position				
Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2112	Proposed Action	Proposed Change			Case Officer	DF			
Consultee Comments	The word "require" does not comply with Circular 1/97. Should state "seek to enter into".									
Officer Comments	The clear intent of IMP1 is that community infrastructure costs generated by development should be met by it unless other means of provision/funding have been identified. An amendment is however proposed to IMP1 to clarify the basis for the negotiation process.									
Proposed Change	Amend first sentence of Policy IMP1 to read: The local planning authorities will require appropriate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development.									

ID Number	1049	Organisation	Persimmon Homes (SE) c/o Anna Bloomfield	Name	Ms Anna Bloomfield	Position				
Date Received	06/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-3107	Proposed Action	Proposed Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	It is unrealistic and contrary to established practice to require a developer to agree contributions before the grant of planning permission. It is equivalent to holding a landowner or developer to ransom, and selling planning permission. The first sentence of the policy should be modified so as to explain and confirm that developers contributions should only be related to the impact of the proposed scheme. The second sentence of this policy must simply be deleted.									
Officer Comments	This policy reflects a clear intent that community and infrastructure costs generated by development should be covered by it unless other means of provision/funding have been identified. This is in line with established practice as is the negotiated agreement of such contributions in advance of the granting of planning permission. An amendment to IMP1 is proposed to improve the clarity of the policy in this regard.									
Proposed Change	Amend first sentence of Policy IMP1 to read: The local planning authorities will require appropriate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development.									

ID Number	1099	Organisation	Sevenoaks Town Council	Name	Position					
Date Received	06/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-3182	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	Support Policy IMP1 which provides for ongoing management and/or maintenance arrangements to be included in any Section 106 Agreement.									
Officer Comments	Support noted.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	1137	Organisation	Redrow Homes (Eastern) Ltd c/o Vincent & Gorbng	Name	Mr Richard Lewis	Position	Senior Planner			
Date Received	04/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1448	Proposed Action	Proposed Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	Policy should be amended to make it clear that a development is only expected to contribute towards the costs associated with meeting needs directly arising from the development. A development should not be expected to make up existing deficiencies. This amendment could be achieved by replacing 'necessary to serve development' with 'necessary to cater for needs arising directly from a development'.									
Officer Comments	The policy is directed at contributions towards costs of community and other infrastructure needed as a result of proposed development . However an amendment to IMP1 is proposed to improve the clarity of the policy in this regard.									
Proposed Change	Amend first sentence of Policy IMP1 to read: The local planning authorities will require appropriate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development.									

ID Number	1138	Organisation	Countryside Properties plc c/o Vincent and Gorbng	Name	Mr Richard Lewis	Position	Senior Planner			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1778	Proposed Action	Proposed Change				Case Officer	DF		
Consultee Comments	The policy should be amended to make it clear that a development is only expected to contribute towards the costs associated with meeting needs directly arising from the development. A development should not be expected to make up existing deficiencies. This amendment could be achieved by replacing 'necessary to serve development' with 'necessary to cater for needs arising directly from a development'.									
Officer Comments	The policy is directed at contributions towards costs of community and other infrastructure needed as a result of proposed development . However an amendment to IMP1 is proposed to improve the clarity of the policy in this regard.									
Proposed Change	Amend first sentence of Policy IMP1 to read: The local planning authorities will require appropriate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development.									

ID Number	1147	Organisation	Sport England South East	Name	Mr John Feetam	Position	Senior Planning Manager			
Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2268	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments										
Officer Comments	Support noted.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	1148	Organisation	Croudace Ltd c/o Charles Planning	Name	Mr Stuart Irvine	Position	Senior Project Manager			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-0112	Proposed Action	Proposed Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	This policy fails to provide appropriate recognition to the provision of Circular 1/97, regarding Planning Obligations. No reference is made to the need for contributions to be 'directly related' to the proposed development, or 'appropriate in scale and kind'. In this context, the policy does not adequately reflect Government guidance. Consequently, the wording of the policy should be revised to better reflect the criteria set out in Circular 1/97.									
Officer Comments	The policy is directed at contributions towards costs of community and other infrastructure needed as a result of proposed development . However an amendment to IMP1 is proposed to improve the clarity of the policy in this regard.									
Proposed Change	Amend first sentence of Policy IMP1 to read: The local planning authorities will require appropriate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development.									

ID Number	1235	Organisation	Frindsbury & Wainscott Community Association	Name	Mrs Anne Wade	Position				
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Support	Yes		
Comment No	D-1254	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	Between granting outline planning consent and signing S106 agreement, agreement should be available to public scrutiny. Developers are too powerful. There should be more transparency to judge whether agreements are being adhered to - quite a few recent examples to the contrary.									
Officer Comments	This is a procedural matter outside the control of the Structure Plan. Paragraph B19 of Circular 1/97 sets out the relevant government guidance concerning public involvement in planning obligations. It recommends that as a minimum, planning obligations and related correspondence should be listed as background papers to the committee report relating to the development proposal concerned.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	1410	Organisation	Bellway (Thames Gateway South)	Name	Mr M Smith	Position	Planning Manager			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1924	Proposed Action	Proposed Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	Contributions as part of new development under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are commonplace, but must be in accordance with the test set out in para 7 of Circular 1/97. The policy should make reference to this test in order that it is clear that such contributions relate to the new development, and are not provided in order to address deficiencies unrelated to that development. Policy QL13 conflicts with this policy, the implications of which are dealt with as a separate representation.									
Officer Comments	The policy is directed at contributions towards costs of community and other infrastructure needed as a result of proposed development .However an amendment to IMP1 is proposed to improve the clarity of the policy in this regard.									
Proposed Change	Amend first sentence of Policy IMP1 to read: The local planning authorities will require appropriate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development.									

ID Number	1897	Organisation	Dartford Borough Council		Name	Ms Sian Phillips		Position		
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2113	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	Policy IMP1 provides an appropriate policy approach and is supported in principle.									
Officer Comments	Support noted.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	2137	Organisation	BT plc c/o RPS		Name	Mr David Churchill		Position	Planner	
Date Received	06/11/2004	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-2391	Proposed Action	Proposed Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	Policy IMP1 seeks to impose measures on developers that are not justifiable and, as such, could lead to the imposition of excessive or unrelated financial burdens on developers. Although the broad principle of the policy is accepted in light of government guidance, wording contained in the supporting text to the policy is ill conceived where it is stated that 'The demand for new services cannot necessarily be met from the tightly constrained budgets of local authorities or other agencies'. This wording implies that if budgets within these agencies were not 'tightly constrained', it would be incumbent upon these authorities to provide the services in question. Reference made to Paragraph 36 of PPG1 and Circular 1/97 on Planning Obligations. Plan fails the requirement of this guidance. Suggest that the supporting text is rewritten to reflect guidance in circular 1/97 and to remove political statements that have no place in this document. In addition the following changes are proposed to the first paragraph of Policy IMP1; 'The local planning authorities may require contributions from developers to meet the costs of providing community, transport, and other infrastructure that is reasonably required to serve the development'.									
Officer Comments	The comments in para 11.14 are appropriate in a context where mainstream funding programmes are insufficient to meet the range of needs associated with new development . The policy is directed at contributions towards costs of community and other infrastructure needed as a result of proposed development . However an amendment to IMP1 is proposed to improve the clarity of the policy in this regard.									
Proposed Change	Amend first sentence of Policy IMP1 to read: The local planning authorities will require appropriate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development.									

ID Number	2138	Organisation	Aylesford Parish Council		Name	Mr Tim Thompson		Position	Clerk to the Council	
Date Received	06/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2998	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	Without size thresholds for triggering developer contributions, there is concern that infrastructure provision will not be secured.									
Officer Comments	Each development will be treated on its own merits and contributions towards any necessary facilities related to the development will be assessed accordingly. Current Government guidance in the form of Circular 1/97 does not set thresholds for development contributions but this guidance is currently under review. The individual and cumulative impact of smaller scale developments on the requirements for social and community facilities needs to be taken into account and in principle both IMP1 and QL13 apply across the full spectrum of development. Individual local authorities might choose to set indicative thresholds at which assessments of certain types of development contributions would be invoked.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	2183	Organisation	Mid Kent College c/o John Sharkey & Co	Name	Mr John Sharkey	Position				
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-0365	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	Generally support but the Policy should state that where the development is for a community, transport or other infrastructure project (or is funding such a project) no contributions would be required.									
Officer Comments	The possibility of necessary contributions from a community, transport or other infrastructure project being required cannot be ruled out.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	2211	Organisation	RWE Innogy Plc c/o Barton Willmore	Name	Ms Victoria Bullock	Position	Senior Planner			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-2797	Proposed Action	Proposed Change			Case Officer	DF			
Consultee Comments	Object. In accordance with paragraph 3.7 of PPG12 the provision of S106 Agreements is a development control matter and is best addressed in a Local Plan. The test as to whether planning obligations are needed is not whether they are necessary to 'serve the development' but whether, in accordance with paragraph 7 of Circular 1/97 they are necessary, relevant to planning, directly related to planning, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; reasonable in all other respects. This policy should be deleted.									
Officer Comments	Whilst S106 agreements are a development control matter the relationship between development provision and the need for facilities and infrastructure to which it gives rise are a matter of strategic policy concern and essential to the delivery of 'quality of place' and sustainably based communities to which the Structure Plan aspires. The policy is directed at contributions towards costs of community and other infrastructure needed as a result of proposed development. However an amendment to IMP1 is proposed to improve the clarity of the policy in this regard.									
Proposed Change	Amend first sentence of Policy IMP1 to read: The local planning authorities will require appropriate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development.									

ID Number	2213	Organisation	Pfizer Ltd c/o Halcrow	Name	Mr Chris Watts	Position	Technical Director			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1837	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	DF			
Consultee Comments	This policy makes no reference to the responsibilities of statutory or funding agencies, and the company feels that this is a key omission. If future new development is expected to essentially fund all the infrastructure needs arising out of that development from within, with no contributions being required from other statutory and public bodies, who are actually charged in law with providing those services and infrastructure? This is prompted by para 11.14 where this is made explicit as an intention, unless 'exceptional circumstances' can be demonstrated. It is considered that this policy should either be amended, or a new policy added, which deals with the responsibilities of other funding and service agencies, to ensure that their responsibilities are recognised and addressed.									
Officer Comments	A range of agencies are involved in the delivery of infrastructure and services to support development and this is recognised in para 11.9. Whilst it is the case that there are statutory duties upon infrastructure providers to provide for substantial elements of the strategic infrastructure required for this Plan, a very substantial contribution will need to come from private investment through the development process and therefore it is wholly appropriate that contributions are sought. Duties upon the statutory agencies do not negate this requirement.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	2228	Organisation	GlaxoSmithKline c/o GVA Grimley	Name	Mr Richard Newsome	Position				
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-0336	Proposed Action	Proposed Change				Case Officer	DF		
Consultee Comments	The wording of this policy is inappropriate as it implies that local authorities may require contributions from all developments. The policy should be amended as follows ' The local planning authorities will require contributions from developments, WHERE THESE MEET THE RELEVANT TESTS FOR PLANNING OBLIGATIONS SET OUT IN CIRCULAR 1/97, to meet the costs of providing . . '									
Officer Comments	The policy is directed at contributions towards costs of community and other infrastructure needed as a result of proposed development . However an amendment to IMP1 is proposed to improve the clarity of the policy in this regard.									
Proposed Change	Amend first sentence of Policy IMP1 to read: The local planning authorities will require appropriate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development.									

ID Number	2242	Organisation	Maidstone BC Liberal Democrat Group	Name	Cllr Mervyn Warner	Position	Chairman			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-0752	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	It is vital that this policy is not watered down but SPG on sustainable drainage and energy efficiency are needed and should be referred to in Para 11.8.									
Officer Comments	Support noted. There are no plans to produce Supplementary Planning Guidance on sustainable drainage and energy efficiency for the Structure Plan although support for these measures is provided through other policies of the Plan e.g. QL1 and NR9.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	2285	Organisation	Hoo St Werburgh Parish Council	Name	Mr M Singleton	Position	Vice Chair			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1507	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	The existing system does not ensure those contributions agreed do in fact get spent on what they were originally made for. Therefore we want this policy to ensure that the mechanisms are put in place to ensure that this does occur in the future.									
Officer Comments	This issue is a procedural matter beyond the scope of this Structure Plan policy. Government guidance on the approach to development contributions is currently under review.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	2295	Organisation	Countryside/Pelham/Persimmon/Taylor Woodrow/Ward c/o Barton Willmore	Name	Mr Paul McCreery	Position	Partner			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	- - -	- - -	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1871	Proposed Action	Proposed Change				Case Officer	DF		

Consultee Comments This policy goes beyond Government policy on infrastructure as set out in Circular 1/97. There is also duplication with policy QL13. Suggest policy is either deleted in its entirety or is modified to properly reflect Government policy and case law as to what might be legally sought by way of a planning obligation.

One way of revising the policy would be to delete the words "necessary to serve the development" from the first sentence and replace them with: ...AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE DIRECTLY RELATED IN SCALE AND KIND TO THE REQUIREMENTS GENERATED BY THE DEVELOPMENT.

Officer Comments The policy is directed at contributions towards costs of community and other infrastructure needed as a result of proposed development . However an amendment to IMP1 is proposed to improve the clarity of the policy in this regard.

Proposed Change Amend first sentence of Policy IMP1 to read: The local planning authorities will require appropriate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development.

ID Number	2306	Organisation	Fairview New Homes Ltd c/o RPS Plc	Name	Mr Simon Slatford	Position	Planning Director			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	- - -	- - -	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2814	Proposed Action	Proposed Change				Case Officer	DF		

Consultee Comments Object to wording - policy states that local planning authorities "will" require contributions from developments and refers to "necessary" provision of services. This wording is contrary to the guidance in Circular 1/97 which indicates that there "may" be a requirement for contributions towards off-site infrastructure provided that the development gives rise to a need that cannot be met by existing services and that any such requirements should be necessary and "reasonably" related to the scale of the development. Policy should therefore be amended to state that local authorities "may" require contributions from developments but only where it can be demonstrated by the local planning authority that the development would give rise to a demand that cannot be met by the existing facilities and that any contribution required is reasonably related to the scale of the development. In addition, this policy should only relate to "windfall" developments as the service providers have a statutory duty to meet the needs arising for planned growth where this is identified as allocated sites in development plans.

Officer Comments The policy is directed at contributions towards costs of community and other infrastructure needed as a result of proposed development . However an amendment to IMP1 is proposed to improve the clarity of the policy in this regard.

It is not accepted that contributions to community facilities and infrastructure should be confined to windfall sites. Whilst it is the case that there are statutory duties upon infrastructure providers to provide for substantial elements of the strategic infrastructure required for this Plan, a very substantial contribution will need to come from private investment through the development process and therefore it is wholly appropriate that contributions are sought. Duties upon the statutory agencies do not negate this requirement

Proposed Change Amend first sentence of Policy IMP1 to read: The local planning authorities will require appropriate contributions from developments to meet the costs of providing community, transport and other infrastructure necessary to provide for the needs arising from the development.

ID Number	2362	Organisation	Coxheath Parish Council		Name	Mrs E L Heywood	Position	Clerk		
Date Received	17/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-Policy IMP1	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2778	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	DF		

Consultee Comments LATE RESPONSE
This statement is important to parishes/communities and not just local planning authorities. An agreement should be made now between LPAs and parishes in terms of the strategy and implementation - parishes must benefit to ring fence contributions.

Officer Comments Agreed that involvement and consultation with parishes is very important but it is for the local planning authorities in exercise of their development control powers to take forward the requirements of this policy.

Proposed Change None

KMSP Deposit Consultation – Comments on Explanatory Memorandum

ID Number	214	Organisation	Kent Wildlife Trust	Name	Mr Richard Moyse	Position	Senior Conservation Officer										
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Deposit	Chapter	D11	Policy Number	D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number	---	Map/Table Diagram	p172-180 Table IMP2	Supp/Obj	Object	Participate in EIP?	Yes	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-0496	Proposed Action	No Change	Case Officer	JF												
Consultee Comments	It is important that monitoring measures and targets are set for key policy themes, although ideally there should be monitoring measures in place for each Structure Plan policy. Concerned that, although targets are set, these do not for the most part offer any encouragement for the enhancement of the county's environment. (Representation gives examples). In summary, any monitoring: (a) must distinguish between those changes attributable to planning, and those attributable to other causes; (b) must look towards the enhancement of the environment and not just its protection; and (c) must be sufficiently refined that they provide a real measure of progress towards the aims of the Structure Plan.																
Officer Comments	Targets have been selected to focus on the land use planning issues upon which the Structure Plan has significant influence and have been spread across the key themes, plus there are some wider contextual targets. Table IMP2 contains a suite of performance indicators and the headline and contextual targets to be attained, a number of which relate to the environment and natural resources. Paragraph 11.19 of the Plan notes that proposals for monitoring the Plan "will be subject to further detailing and refinement". In due course a more detailed technical paper will be produced to amplify the assessment of the targets. Paragraph 11.21 states that "regular reviews of progress towards achieving the headline and relevant contextual targets will be produced, supplemented with more detailed reports on particular themes where these are considered necessary".																
Proposed Change	None																

ID Number	333	Organisation	Dover District Chamber of Commerce	Name	Mr Ray Haines	Position	Chief Executive										
Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Deposit	Chapter	D11	Policy Number	D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number	---	Map/Table Diagram	---	Supp/Obj	Support	Participate in EIP?	Don't Know	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-1346	Proposed Action	No Change	Case Officer	JF												
Consultee Comments	Chapter (including Theme/Principle Tables) could be brought to front of Plan for easier reference.																
Officer Comments	The Themes and Principles form the cornerstone of Chapter 1. The Plan should be read as a whole.																
Proposed Change	None																

ID Number	668	Organisation	Kent Developers Group	Name	Mr David Dye	Position	Chairman										
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Deposit	Chapter	D11	Policy Number	D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number	---	Map/Table Diagram	---	Supp/Obj	Object	Participate in EIP?	Don't Know	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-3602	Proposed Action	No Change	Case Officer	JF												
Consultee Comments	Implementation of most of the policies are necessarily in the hands of LPA's & we are concerned about their ability to do so speedily & consistently though with regard to local circumstances, especially in areas where there are no special delivery vehicles.																
Officer Comments	The Plan recognises (para 11.9) that implementation of the Plan will depend on a range of agencies as well as the local planning authorities and that the resources required will be considerable and be drawn from a variety of sources. Representations to Government on the funding demands associated with the Growth Areas and the regeneration priority areas are being pursued and such needs are recognised in para 11.10.																
Proposed Change	None																

ID Number	692	Organisation	Ward Homes (Chatham) c/o David Lock Associates	Name	Mr Phil Copsey	Position				
Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-No Policy Ref	11.14	- - -	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1088	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Concerned that para 11.14 states that only in exceptional circumstances will new community facilities related to new development not be entirely funded by new development. This is in contrast with the more realistic approach elsewhere in the plan e.g.
- that government investment is required for the provision of new community facilities at Ashford para 3.35)
- that there may be costs associated with brownfield development which should be taken into account in determining the size of developer contributions for community infrastructure (para 11.15) and
- that local priorities will need to determine in the case of limited developer funds, how contributions are to be divided between community infrastructure, affordable housing, highways and public transport (11.15).

Officer Comments There is significant emphasis within the Deposit Plan on the accommodation of regional growth at Ashford and on the importance of this area to overall housing numbers and employment land provision within the County. In such circumstances, the use of the term "exceptional circumstances" is inappropriate. It should be replaced at para 11.14 and in the supporting text to IMP1 with an acknowledgement that in areas of regional-scale growth the ability of development to fund all community infrastructure may be limited.
The Plan recognises (para 11.9) that implementation of the Plan will depend on a range of agencies as well as the local planning authorities and that the resources required will be considerable and be drawn from a variety of sources. Representations to Government on the funding demands associated with the Growth Areas and the regeneration priority areas are being pursued and such needs are recognised in para 11.10.
Paragraph 11.14 acknowledges that demand for new services cannot always be met from tightly constrained budgets of local authorities and other agencies and that the costs should NORMALLY be borne by the development unless there are "exceptional circumstances" why this should not be the case and alternative funding is available.
Paragraph 11.15 draws attention to the Kent Planning Officers' Group publication: "Good Practice Guide on Development Contributions" (1999 and 2001) which contains detailed guidelines for negotiating development contributions to the cost of community facilities. This paragraph also acknowledges that the size of contributions and the way they are used must have regard to local priorities and take into account evidence of exceptional costs incurred in developing sites particularly where previously developed land is involved.

It is considered that the use of the term "exceptional circumstances" in paragraph 11.14 is acceptable – the onus is placed on the developer to provide evidence of any exceptional costs incurred in developing a site in order to make a case as to why costs to which development gives rise should not be borne by that development.

Proposed Change

None

ID Number	713	Organisation	Sevenoaks District Council	Name	Mr Ian Bailey	Position	Local Plans			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-No Policy Ref	- - -	- - -	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-1649	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments The new emphasis on monitoring the success of policies is supported. However, further information is required on the information required from the Districts. There is a real concern that present staffing levels are insufficient to undertake this work.

Officer Comments Concerns noted. Paragraph 11.19 of the Plan notes that proposals for monitoring the Plan "will be subject to further detailing and refinement". In due course a more detailed technical paper will be produced to amplify the assessment of the targets and there will be regular reviews of progress towards achieving the headline and relevant contextual targets. Close integration of monitoring requirements at a regional, strategic and local level is a desirable objective.

Proposed Change

None

ID Number	1038	Organisation	Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Name	Mr E G Barham	Position	Chairman, Kent Branch			
Date Received	01/09/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-No Policy Ref	- - -	p172-180 Table IMP2	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-0051	Proposed Action	Proposed Change				Case Officer	DF		

Consultee Comments Table IMP2 demonstrates the lack of commitment to addressing rural problems. There is no performance indicator or 'headline target' for the rural economy, diversification or revitalising rural communities.

Officer Comments Targets have been selected to focus on the land use planning issues upon which the Structure Plan has significant influence and have been spread across the key themes, plus there are some wider contextual targets. There are some performance indicators in Table IMP2 which would indicate progress in tackling rural problems, such as reducing economic disparities within Kent (p177) and protecting high quality agricultural land (p175), although it is difficult to derive a meaningful target to specifically measure addressing rural problems. However, there will be an opportunity to review such indicators. Paragraph 11.19 of the Plan notes that proposals for monitoring the Plan "will be subject to further detailing and refinement". In due course a more detailed technical paper will be produced to amplify the assessment of the targets and there will be regular reviews of progress towards achieving the headline and relevant contextual targets. It is therefore recommended that consideration be given to such a target relating to changes in rural economy, diversification or revitalising rural communities, when the review takes place.

Proposed Change Investigate the provision of a robust target in Table IMP2 to reflect progress in tackling rural issues including diversification of the rural economy and revitalising rural communities.

ID Number	1099	Organisation	Sevenoaks Town Council	Name		Position				
Date Received	06/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-No Policy Ref	11.16	- - -	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-3183	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Concerned that local planning authorities are given a major part in reviewing the Structure Plan policies and that staffing levels will be insufficient to undertake this work.

Officer Comments Concerns noted. There is increased emphasis at all levels of the planning system on regular and comprehensive monitoring. Paragraph 11.19 of the Plan notes that proposals for monitoring the Plan "will be subject to further detailing and refinement". In due course a more detailed technical paper will be produced to amplify the assessment of the targets and there will be regular reviews of progress towards achieving the headline and relevant contextual targets.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	1147	Organisation	Sport England South East	Name	Mr John Feetam	Position	Senior Planning Manager			
Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-No Policy Ref	11.13	- - -	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2262	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Support this which seeks to ensure that economic or housing development is supported with the necessary infrastructure including recreation facilities and open space. The final sentence is also supported referring to the need for local authorities to work with service providers to establish what services are needed.

Officer Comments Support noted.

Proposed Change None

Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-No Policy Ref	11.14	- - -	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2264	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Support the statement that the costs of service provision should normally be borne by the development.

Officer Comments Support noted.

Proposed Change None

Date Received 07/11/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D11	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number 11.14	Map/Table Diagram - - -	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP? Don't Know	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-2265	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Object to statement that exceptions may be permitted where alternative funding is available. Not clear what funding is in mind but this clause should be removed. Other sources of funding should only be used as additional funding and not to reduce the developer's obligation.

Officer Comments Paragraph 11.14 acknowledges that demand for new services cannot always be met from tightly constrained budgets of local authorities and other agencies and that the costs should NORMALLY be borne by the development unless there are "exceptional circumstances" why this should not be the case and alternative funding is available. Paragraph 11.15 draws attention to the Kent Planning Officers' Group publication: "Good Practice Guide on Development Contributions" (1999 and 2001) which contains detailed guidelines for negotiating development contributions to the cost of community facilities. This paragraph also acknowledges that the size of contributions and the way they are used must have regard to local priorities and take into account evidence of exceptional costs incurred in developing sites particularly where previously developed land is involved. It is considered that the use of the term "exceptional circumstances" in paragraph 11.14 is acceptable – the onus is placed on the developer to provide evidence of any exceptional costs incurred in developing a site in order to make a case as to why costs should not be borne by that development.

Proposed Change None

Date Received 07/11/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D11	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number 11.15	Map/Table Diagram - - -	Supp/Obj Support	Participate in EIP? Don't Know	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-2266	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Support the statement that ongoing management and maintenance should be considered.

Officer Comments Support noted.

Proposed Change Noted

ID Number	1177	Organisation	Inventures (NHS Estates)	Name	Mr Stephen Harness	Position	Senior Consultant
------------------	------	---------------------	--------------------------	-------------	--------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Date Received 07/11/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D11	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number - - -	Map/Table Diagram p172-180 Table IMP2	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP? Yes	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-0894	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments The targets included in this table should include targets for Key Worker Housing and Lifetime Homes Provision (see separate representations on Policy HP7 on this subject). These could be applied in a flexible manner, as for affordable housing targets, to be informed by local needs surveys. There therefore needs to be a portfolio of choice of dwellings to assist those people with special needs who are currently living in unsuitable accommodation. As a guideline at least 15% of all new market housing on all sites should be designed to lifetime homes standards or their equivalent. Details of the standards for lifetime homes should be published in SPG. We support the provision for key worker housing as part of affordable housing provision in line with PPG3 and Regional Guidance. The appropriate level of provision should be clearly identified in the Plan to be informed by local needs assessments, as a guide approximately 50% of affordable housing provision should be identified for key worker housing. Plans and SPG's can make an important contribution to improving this situation by enabling affordable housing for those on modest incomes and ensuring that where appropriate provision of Key Worker Housing is counted towards affordable housing requirements. In some cases, in recognition of site circumstances it may be appropriate to seek higher levels of provision for Key Worker Housing (for example where a site is close to a hospital). It is anticipated that for 2003-2008, up to 30,000 units will be needed to meet NHS workforce plans. Policy H4 (b.vi) of RPG9 (March 2001) specifically requests that local authorities work in partnership with local employers to attempt to ensure that key workers have a step on the housing ladder.

Officer Comments Targets have been selected to focus on the land use planning issues upon which the Structure Plan has significant influence and have been spread across the key themes, plus there are some wider contextual targets. Table IMP2 does contain a performance indicator and headline target relating to affordable housing on page 180. Detailed targets relating to Key Worker housing and Lifetime Homes provision should flow from local needs assessments and consideration given in Local Plans and Local Development Documents to the required range and mix of housing as provided for under Policy HP7 of the Structure Plan.

Proposed Change None

Date Received 07/11/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D11	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number ---	Map/Table Diagram p172-180 Table IMP2	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP? Yes	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-0997	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Concerned that targets in Table IMP2 will be used to set inflexible requirements in LDD's for new developments. There need to be a recognition that the specific circumstances of each site needs to be taken into account as well as the extent to which the development is achieving other aims of the Plan, for example, re-investment into healthcare. Therefore request that a reference is included to state that the targets should be established on a local basis or interpreted flexibly site by site. In the case of healthcare related sites there is an imperative to foster the modernisation of the NHS, and a need for Development Plans to recognise special circumstances applying to NHS related developments. As part of the programme of modernisation of NHS facilities there may be a need to redevelop sites for uses other than direct healthcare as part of a wider strategy to improve healthcare (another aim of Development Plans), which will always be the primary purpose of NHS related developments. The requirement to provide other social infrastructure on such sites may therefore affect the viability of such schemes to the detriment of the modernisation of healthcare provision. It would not therefore be appropriate for the plan to seek to define in every circumstance how NHS development income should be allocated, this is a more appropriate task for the Strategic Health Authority in conjunction with the NHS normal procedures for community consultation.

Officer Comments Targets have been selected to focus on the land use planning issues upon which the Structure Plan has significant influence and have been spread across the key themes, plus there are some wider contextual targets. Paragraph 11.19 of the Plan notes that proposals for monitoring the Plan "will be subject to further detailing and refinement". In due course a more detailed technical paper will be produced to amplify the assessment of the targets and there will be regular reviews of progress towards achieving the headline and relevant contextual targets. Local Plans and Local Development Documents will develop their own monitoring indicators and targets to reflect local issues. It is widely accepted that each planning application is treated on its own merits and assessed against relevant development plan policies and any other material considerations at that time. The need for other community facilities including elements of health care provision would be considered alongside objectives for affordable housing provision in the context of individual proposals or site specific planning guidance.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	1901	Organisation	Countryside Agency	Name	Ms Fiona Fraser-Boulton	Position			
Date Received 07/11/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D11	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number ---	Map/Table Diagram p169-171 Table IMP1	Supp/Obj Support	Participate in EIP? Don't Know	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-2035	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Support Table IMP1 which sets out these themes and principles against the plan policies which support them. To help ensure that the plan takes account of rural circumstances the Agency encourages the use of rural proofing.

Officer Comments Support and comments noted.

Proposed Change Noted

ID Number	2213	Organisation	Pfizer Ltd c/o Halcrow	Name	Mr Chris Watts	Position	Technical Director		
Date Received 10/11/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D11	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number ---	Map/Table Diagram ---	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP? Yes	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-1839	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Pfizer would welcome the opportunity to meet regularly with representatives of the County Council, to help them in this monitoring. This might be through a new Monitoring Panel or through the established Area Strategic Partnership. It may be useful for the company to meet with the County Council's Head of Planning on a six monthly basis to feed back how Structure Plan policies were affecting the company's long term plans and investments.

Officer Comments Comments noted. Comprehensive monitoring of the Plan's policies and proposals will need to draw upon a wide range of intelligence sources including the perspective offered by the business community in different parts of the county.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	2241	Organisation	.	Name	Mr David Symons	Position												
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Deposit	Chapter	D11	Policy Number	D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number	---	Map/Table Diagram	p172-180 Table IMP2	Supp/Obj	Object	Participate in EIP?	Yes	Withdrawn		Date
Comment No	D-0573	Proposed Action	No Change									Case Officer	JF					

Consultee Comments The KMSP should indicate what 'yardsticks' it proposes to use in order to monitor its policies.

Officer Comments Targets have been selected to focus on the land use planning issues upon which the Structure Plan has significant influence and have been spread across the key themes, plus there are some wider contextual targets. Table IMP2 contains a suite of performance indicators and the headline and contextual targets to be attained.

Paragraph 11.19 of the Plan notes that proposals for monitoring the Plan "will be subject to further detailing and refinement". In due course a more detailed technical paper will be produced to amplify the assessment of the targets. Paragraph 11.21 states that "regular reviews of progress towards achieving the headline and relevant contextual targets will be produced, supplemented with more detailed reports on particular themes where these are considered necessary".

Proposed Change None

ID Number	2272	Organisation	Highways Agency	Name	Mr H Moore	Position												
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Deposit	Chapter	D11	Policy Number	D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number	11.12	Map/Table Diagram	---	Supp/Obj	Support	Participate in EIP?	Don't Know	Withdrawn		Date
Comment No	D-1181	Proposed Action	No Change									Case Officer	JF					

Consultee Comments Paragraph recognises that a number of Agencies lead on the implementation of the various programmes that will generate the infrastructure needed to support the plan and that those programmes may change over time. This supports Highways Agency concerns about the linkages between the new development proposed in Chapter 3 and improvements to the trunk road network and the degree to which the former is dependent on the latter.

Officer Comments Support noted. The Councils would welcome any further advice from the Agency as to the relationship between proposed strategic development locations in Chapter 3 policies and the trunk road network.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	2285	Organisation	Hoo St Werburgh Parish Council	Name	Mr M Singleton	Position	Vice Chair			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-No Policy Ref	- - -	p172-180 Table IMP2	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1508	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	<p>Monitoring for NR4 - Why only 4 pollutants? No mention of methane and Pm2.5s which are more damaging pollutants (PM2.5s are finer grain than PM10a - they are absorbed by the lungs whereas PM10s sit on the lungs and can be expelled/removed).</p> <p>Monitoring for WM 1 to 7 - No mention of Medway's Zero Waste by 2020 (this is in the LA21 waste forum document which has been accepted by Medway Council).</p> <p>QL1, QL2, QL6, QL12 etc - No matter what the councils do places are not perceived as secure because of the lack of police presence.</p> <p>Also qualitative measures needed to prevent establishment of ghettos within developments in particular involving affordable housing (HP8) e.g. Peel Close/ Chattenden. Measures would need to monitor the dispersion of affordable housing within the development.</p>									
Officer Comments	<p>It would be too onerous to introduce targets for each individual policy in the Plan. Targets have been selected to focus on the land use planning issues upon which the Structure Plan has significant influence and have been spread across the key themes, plus there are some wider contextual targets.</p> <p>In response to specific points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is currently no national standard relating to levels of PM2.5, although it is recognised that they are damaging to lungs. - Whilst vigorously pursuing the waste management hierarchy and waste reduction and re-use the Structure Plan's policies do not adopt a zero waste strategy - The perceived lack of police presence is outside the remit or control of the Structure Plan. - The trend now is towards mixed uses of sites and the mix of uses on site is a detailed issue which should be dealt with at the master planning or planning application stage. <p>Paragraph 11.19 of the Plan notes that proposals for monitoring the Plan "will be subject to further detailing and refinement". In due course a more detailed technical paper will be produced to amplify the assessment of the targets. Paragraph 11.21 states that "regular reviews of progress towards achieving the headline and relevant contextual targets will be produced, supplemented with more detailed reports on particular themes where these are considered necessary".</p>									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	2286	Organisation	Lafarge Cement UK c/o David Lock Associates		Name	Mr R A Owen	Position	Senior Planner		
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-No Policy Ref	11.14	- - -		No		
Comment No	D-1909	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			

Consultee Comments Concerned that it is foreseen in para 11.14 (and likewise in para. 5.33) that only in 'exceptional circumstances' will such new community facilities not be funded by development. This is in contrast to the more realistic stance adopted elsewhere in the Deposit Plan where it is acknowledged that:
- government investment is required in the provision of new community facilities, (paras 3.10 and 7.12);
- that there may be costs associated with brownfield development which should be taken into account in determining the size of developer contributions for community infrastructure (para 11.15); and
- that local priorities will need to determine, in the case of limited developer funds, how contributions are to be divided between community infrastructure, affordable housing, highways and public transport. (also para 11.15)

There is significant emphasis within the Deposit Plan on the redevelopment of previously used land and on the importance of such sites within Kent Thameside to overall housing numbers and employment land provision within both the County and Thames Gateway. In such circumstances, we regard the use of the term 'exceptional circumstances' to be inappropriate.

Officer Comments Recommendations: Reference to 'exceptional circumstances' in para. 5.33 in the supporting text to QL13 should be replaced with an acknowledgement that costs of development on many previously used sites are likely to be significantly greater than in other circumstances and that therefore, the ability of such development to fund all community infrastructure may be limited.
The Plan recognises (para 11.9) that implementation of the Plan will depend on a range of agencies as well as the local planning authorities and that the resources required will be considerable and be drawn from a variety of sources. Representations to Government on the funding demands associated with the Growth Areas and the regeneration priority areas are being pursued and such needs are recognised in para 11.10.
Paragraph 11.14 acknowledges that demand for new services cannot always be met from tightly constrained budgets of local authorities and other agencies and that the costs should NORMALLY be borne by the development unless there are "exceptional circumstances" why this should not be the case and alternative funding is available. Para 11.10 refers to the need for additional funding in the Growth Areas and Regeneration Priority Areas if national and regional objectives for these areas are to be delivered.

Paragraph 11.15 draws attention to the Kent Planning Officers' Group publication: "Good Practice Guide on Development Contributions" (1999 and 2001) which contains detailed guidelines for negotiating development contributions to the cost of community facilities. This paragraph also acknowledges that the size of contributions and the way they are used must have regard to local priorities and take into account evidence of exceptional costs incurred in developing sites particularly where previously developed land is involved.

It is considered that the use of the term "exceptional circumstances" in paragraph 11.14 is acceptable – the onus is placed on the developer to provide evidence of any exceptional costs incurred in developing a site in order to make a case as to why costs should not be borne by that development.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	2295	Organisation	Countryside/Pelham/Persimmon/Taylor Woodrow/Ward c/o Barton Willmore		Name	Mr Paul McCreery	Position	Partner		
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-No Policy Ref	- - -	p172-180 Table IMP2	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1872	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			

Consultee Comments As regards Table IMP2 it is essential that proper arrangements are made to monitor the deliver of housing completions on an annual basis. It is also essential to take proper corrective action if completions lag behind the required rate as happened each year between 1991 and 2001.

Officer Comments Paragraph 11.19 of the Plan notes that proposals for monitoring the Plan "will be subject to further detailing and refinement". In due course a more detailed technical paper will be produced to amplify the assessment of the targets. Paragraph 11.21 states that "regular reviews of progress towards achieving the headline and relevant contextual targets will be produced, supplemented with more detailed reports on particular themes where these are considered necessary". The importance of close monitoring is acknowledged both in terms of managing the overall delivery of housing in accordance with the Plan's requirements and monitoring the supply of the sources of land upon which planned provision relies. Table IMP2 of the Plan (Measuring Progress and Monitoring Effectiveness) establishes key performance indicators to this end.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	2296	Organisation	RMC Estates & Development c/o Barton Willmore		Name	Mr Colin Finlayson	Position	Associate		
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-No Policy Ref	- - -	- - -	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1887	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	DF			

Consultee Comments The Structure Plan should contain a policy or policies to specify what action will be taken if, for example, the Structure Plan housing provision requirements are not achieved. The policy should also set out what data will be monitored, the frequency of monitoring and how it will be published. The whole process of monitoring needs to be speeded up. For example, at a time where housebuilding rates are at their lowest level since 1924, it is quite inadequate to publish data on housing completions up to 12 months after the data has been collected. More information needs to be collected faster and put in the public domain. There should be a commitment to the publication of an annual monitoring report to record progress on key Structure Plan policies.

Officer Comments Paragraph 11.19 of the Plan notes that proposals for monitoring the Plan "will be subject to further detailing and refinement". In due course a more detailed technical paper will be produced to amplify the assessment of the targets. Paragraph 11.21 states that "regular reviews of progress towards achieving the headline and relevant contextual targets will be produced, supplemented with more detailed reports on particular themes where these are considered necessary". The importance of close monitoring is acknowledged both in terms of managing the overall delivery of housing in accordance with the Plan's requirements and monitoring the supply of the sources of land upon which planned provision relies. Table IMP2 of the Plan (Measuring Progress and Monitoring Effectiveness) establishes key performance indicators to this end.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	2343	Organisation	Land Securities c/o David Lock Associates	Name	Mr J Urwin	Position	Director			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-No Policy Ref	11.14	- - -	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-2591	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	DF		

Consultee Comments Concerned that it is foreseen in para 11.14 (and in para 5.33) that only in 'exceptional circumstances' will such new community facilities not be entirely funded by development. This is in contrast to the more realistic stance adopted elsewhere in the Plan where it is acknowledged:

- that government investment is required in the provision of new community facilities (paras 3.10 and 7.12)
- that there may be costs associated with brownfield development which should be taken into account in determining the size of developer contributions (para 11.15)
- that local priorities will need to determine, in the case of limited developer funds, how contributions are to be divided between community infrastructure, affordable housing, highways and public transport (para 11.15).

There is significant emphasis within the Deposit Plan on the redevelopment of previously used land and on the importance of such sites within Kent Thameside to overall housing numbers and employment land provision within both the county and Thames Gateway. In such circumstances, it is regarded that the use of the term 'exceptional circumstances, is inappropriate.

Officer Comments Reference to 'exceptional circumstances' in paragraph 5.33 should be replaced with an acknowledgement that costs of development on many previously used sites are likely to be significantly greater than in other circumstances and that, therefore, the ability of such development to fund all community infrastructure may be limited.

The Plan recognises (para 11.9) that implementation of the Plan will depend on a range of agencies as well as the local planning authorities and that the resources required will be considerable and be drawn from a variety of sources. Representations to Government on the funding demands associated with the Growth Areas and the regeneration priority areas are being pursued and such needs are recognised in para 11.10.

Paragraph 11.14 acknowledges that demand for new services cannot always be met from tightly constrained budgets of local authorities and other agencies and that the costs should NORMALLY be borne by the development unless there are "exceptional circumstances" why this should not be the case and alternative funding is available. Para 11.10 refers to the need for additional funding in the Growth Areas and Regeneration Priority Areas if national and regional objectives for these areas are to be delivered.

Paragraph 11.15 draws attention to the Kent Planning Officers' Group publication: "Good Practice Guide on Development Contributions" (1999 and 2001) which contains detailed guidelines for negotiating development contributions to the cost of community facilities. This paragraph also acknowledges that the size of contributions and the way they are used must have regard to local priorities and take into account evidence of exceptional costs incurred in developing sites particularly where previously developed land is involved.

It is considered that the use of the term "exceptional circumstances" in paragraph 11.14 is acceptable – the onus is placed on the developer to provide evidence of any exceptional costs incurred in developing a site in order to make a case as to why costs should not be borne by that development.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	2362	Organisation	Coxheath Parish Council	Name	Mrs E L Heywood	Position	Clerk			
Date Received	17/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D11	D-No Policy Ref	- - -	p165 Box after para	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2777	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	DF		

Consultee Comments LATE RESPONSE
Where do parishes/communities integrate into this system? Local and Community Plans are important.

Officer Comments The purpose of diagram on page 165 is to illustrate the relationship between the Structure Plan and other planning policy documents. Links are shown to the Kent and Medway Community Strategies and to District Local Development Frameworks (which will replace Local Plans), while paragraph 11.6 acknowledges the linkages to Community Strategies. The importance of Parishes and community involvement in all these processes is not disputed and indeed should be strengthened in accordance with the aims of the current reforms of the planning system.

Proposed Change None