

**KEY DIAGRAM
APPENDICES
GENERAL COMMENTS**

KMSP Deposit Consultation – Key Diagram

ID Number	118	Organisation	Swale Borough Council			Name	Mr Brian Lloyd		Position	Local Plans Manager
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00 Key	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Technical/Info	Yes		
Comment No	D-2630	Proposed Action	Proposed Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	The Kent Downs SLA should be amended to show the proposed extensions northward to be promoted in the draft Swale Local Plan.									
Officer Comments	Agree.									
Proposed Change	Key Diagram . Review Kent Downs SLA area in line with the proposed northward extension in the Deposit Swale Local Plan.									
ID Number	215	Organisation	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)			Name	Ms Alison Giacomelli		Position	Conservation Officer
Date Received	11/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00 Key	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-2986	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	Key Diagram should identify key wildlife sites - at the least European Designations (i.e.. Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation and Ramsar Sites).									
Officer Comments	The strategic nature of the Structure Plan is emphasised by the fact that key diagrams should not be produced on an Ordnance Survey-based map. The addition of key wildlife sites would not add any value to the Key Diagram in this case as the scale of the plan would not enable the location of these sites to be pinpointed accurately. It is more appropriate for such designations to be shown on local plans, where locations can be seen accurately on an Ordnance Survey map base. Page 46 of the Plan already contains an indicative map showing sites of international and national importance for wildlife.									
Proposed Change	None									
ID Number	1167	Organisation	Lend Lease c/o Drivers Jonas			Name	Mr Michael Davies		Position	
Date Received	04/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00 Key	D-No Policy Ref	---	p15 Table SS1	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1388	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	DF			
Consultee Comments	In principle, supports the overall strategy outlined in Chapter 2 which seeks to concentrate development and investment in the Major and Principal Urban Areas, including Kent Thameside. The St. Clement's Valley site will play a key role in enabling this regeneration. Table SS1 defines the Kent Thameside Major Urban Area (MUA) as comprising Dartford/ Stone/ Greenhithe/ Swanscombe/ Gravesend/ Northfleet. The Key Diagram appears to exclude St Clement's Valley, as well as Bluewater and Eastern Quarry from the Kent Thameside MUA. These sites are a key part of the Kent Thameside strategy. In recognition of this role, the MUA boundary shown on the Key Diagram should be corrected to include St Clement's Valley, and all the land north of the A2 between Dartford and Gravesend.									
Officer Comments	The strategic development locations on the Key Diagram are shown diagrammatically outside of the present extent of the Major Urban Area so as to indicate their relationship and hence the resulting changes to the urban areas. The Kent Thameside major urban area will , following implementation of the strategic development locations proposed will extend more widely with its southern limit defined by the A2. Detailed boundaries defining the confines of the urban area will be determined through local plan/local development document preparation									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	2223	Organisation	Hallam Land Management Ltd	Name	Ms Ruth McKeown	Position	Area Manager			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00 Key	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1943	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	In showing the Metropolitan Green Belt on the Key Diagram, not only should the built up area boundaries of Principal Urban Areas be inset but in addition, land which has specifically been taken out of the Green Belt and safeguarded for future housing development should also be clearly recognised as such. This is specifically relevant in relation to land at Tonbridge and in particular to land off Lower Haysden Lane.									
Officer Comments	The strategic nature of the Structure Plan is emphasised by the fact that key diagrams should not be produced on an Ordnance Survey-based map. The addition of detailed built up area boundaries of Principal Urban Areas and land specifically taken out of the Green Belt would not add any value to the Key Diagram in this case as the scale of the plan would not enable the location of these sites to be pinpointed accurately. It is more appropriate for such designations to be shown on local plans, where locations can be seen accurately on an Ordnance Survey map base.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	2227	Organisation	Berkeley Group Plc	Name	Mr Jon Lambert	Position	Development Planner			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00 Key	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Support	Yes		
Comment No	D-0326	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	However alterations may be needed in line with the changes to RPG9 for the Ashford Growth Area.									
Officer Comments	Should the outcome of the RPG9 Inquiry on the Ashford Growth Area necessitate changes to the Key Diagram, this will be considered at the appropriate time through the formal Modifications stage to the Plan (after the Panel has reported on the Examination in Public).									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	2231	Organisation	Carillion Richardson (Thanet) Ltd c/o Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners	Name	Ms Marie Nagy	Position	Associate			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00 Key	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-0538	Proposed Action	Proposed Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	The key diagram should be amended to include land at Westwood as being within the Thanet Priority Area for Regeneration and Major Urban Area.									
Officer Comments	Agreed . The definition of the Thanet Towns major urban area and the definition of the PAER should reflect Westwood as an integral part of the urban area.									
Proposed Change	Include land at Westwood within the Major Urban Area and Priority Areas for Economic Regeneration designations on the Key Diagram.									

ID Number	2251	Organisation				Name	Mr G Norton			Position
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D00 Key	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number ---	Map/Table Diagram ---	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP? No	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-0791	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	Lenham has been excluded from the Key Diagram as identified Rural District Centre. Lenham is on a par with other settlements identified as Rural District Centre such as Headcorn both in size and its level of services.									
Officer Comments	Lenham is not defined in the Structure Plan as a Rural Service Centre (Table SS2 and Policy SS2). It is therefore not shown on the Key Diagram. Rural Service Centres have been defined on the basis of their size and also the range of day to day services and facilities that they support. The Plan acknowledges that "Proposals to support the local rural economy or address local housing needs at other, smaller rural settlements, capable of supporting a sustainable pattern of development, will be identified through Local Development Documents" (para 2.16, page 16), and Policy SS2 allows for this situation.									
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 Deposit	Chapter D00 Key	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number ---	Map/Table Diagram ---	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP? No	Withdrawn	Date		
Comment No	D-1926	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF				
Consultee Comments	Ebbsfleet - a key transport interchange that will benefit from its own international station, from the only new domestic station on CTRL and, potentially as a terminus for Crossrail - is identified in RPG9a as a "key focus for growth in the south east". The Deposit Plan in Policy NK1, identifies Ebbsfleet as, inter alia, a new major business centre. Ebbsfleet will be a unique focus within Kent Thameside - indeed, within the Thames Gateway and the County - one that, during the lifetime of the Plan, will emerge, along with Bluewater and Eastern Quarry, to form a unique, polycentric, "Central Area" to Kent Thameside, complementing the existing town centres at Dartford and Gravesend. The Key Diagram identifies Ebbsfleet as one of 13 "Thames Gateway Strategic development locations." This significantly underplays the significance of the location. Recommendation: Ebbsfleet should be identified with its own unique designation (as Bluewater has been) as a Major Business Centre.											
Officer Comments	Singling out Ebbsfleet with its own unique designation as a major business centre would place an unfair emphasis on this area when there are other equally significant, regionally-designated locations.											
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 Deposit	Chapter D00 Key	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number ---	Map/Table Diagram ---	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP? Yes	Withdrawn	Date		
Comment No	D-1888	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF				
Consultee Comments	The location of the Rugby Cement Works, Halling, Medway, should be identified by an asterisk (*) in the designation: "other strategic development locations NK1-3, EK 1-3, CC1-3, WK2,3".											
Officer Comments	This site is not recognised in the Structure Plan as a strategic development location. Whilst redevelopment at this location may have considerable local significance it is not considered to be of a scale which would warrant a direct reference in Policy NK2 and thus on the Key Diagram.											
Proposed Change	None											

ID Number	2364	Organisation	J M Preston & MHP Partnership c/o Walker Stuart		Name	Mr Paul Bradley-Lloyd	Position			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP? Yes	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-2546	Proposed Action		No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Objects to Key Diagram in its present form. Add the name 'Hersden' to the Priority Area (SS1) north east of Canterbury and add 'Policy EK1' to the Priority Areas key. Reason: to tie in with the amendments suggested in the other objections to policies in the Plan.

Officer Comments Hersden is not specifically identified in the Structure Plan under Policies SS1 and EK1 and it is therefore unnecessary to include the name on the Key Diagram.

Proposed Change None

KMSP Deposit Consultation - Appendices

ID Number	2281	Organisation	Tesco Stores Ltd c/o G L Hearn		Name	Ms C Parker		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	DApp2	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1409	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	The Glossary of Terms definition of "out of centre" should be amended to read: "locations THAT ARE CLEARLY separate from a town or district centre but not necessarily outside the existing built up areas."									
Officer Comments	Suggested amendment follows that in the recently published draft PPS6, Annex A, Table 1. However, the draft PPS currently has little weight and it would therefore be premature to make the amendment at this stage.									
Proposed Change	None									

KMSP Deposit Consultation – General Comments

ID Number	110	Organisation	Ashford Borough Council		Name	Mr Richard Alderton		Position	Strategic Planning Manager	
Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2190	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	Not normally role of Structure Plan to include detailed criteria-based policies, but some included (QL5 & FP3). Detailed policies should be set out through LDF process.									
Officer Comments	The Structure Plan has been prepared to take account of the fact that there will be a sub-regional policy vacuum until the new system of Regional Spatial Strategy and Local Development Frameworks are firmly in place. This is recognised by the fact that the Structure Plan can be saved for a period of three years, or longer if appropriate, once it has been adopted. The Councils therefore need to ensure that a sound and comprehensive sub-regional policy base is in place from which the new planning system can continue.									
Proposed Change	None									
ID Number	113	Organisation	Dover District Council		Name	Mr Mike Ebbs		Position	Forward Planning Manager	
Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-2273	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	Would have preferred that Plan avoided detailed policies & instead concentrated on truly strategic matters.									
Officer Comments	The Structure Plan has been prepared to take account of the fact that there will be a sub-regional policy vacuum until the new system of Regional Spatial Strategy and Local Development Frameworks are firmly in place. This is recognised by the fact that the Structure Plan can be saved for a period of three years, or longer if appropriate, once it has been adopted. The Councils therefore need to ensure that a sound and comprehensive sub-regional policy base is in place from which the new planning system can continue.									
Proposed Change	None									
ID Number	118	Organisation	Swale Borough Council		Name	Mr Brian Lloyd		Position	Local Plans Manager	
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Support	Yes		
Comment No	D-2390	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	Support strategy relating to Swale set out in chapters 1 to 3.									
Officer Comments	Support Noted.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	214	Organisation	Kent Wildlife Trust		Name	Mr Richard Moyse		Position	Senior Conservation Officer	
Date Received	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date	
10/11/2003	Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Support	Yes			
Comment No	D-0366	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	Welcome Structure Plan review, the long view (20 year time horizon) it takes, and the commitment to 'change for the better'.									
Officer Comments	Support Noted.									
Proposed Change	None									
Date Received	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date	
10/11/2003	Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Yes			
Comment No	D-0370	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	If environmental enhancement (as required by Policy SP1) is to be achieved there must be an understanding of the most important factors affecting the natural environment. Plan fails to do this. In particular it: (a) fails to recognise damaging fragmentation to wildlife habitats by built development, especially transport infrastructure - damaging in itself but also makes wildlife more vulnerable to climate change; (b) fails to recognise impact of climate change on biodiversity and natural environment; (c) fails to consistently apply joint principles of strongest possible environmental protection and targeted environmental enhancement to each and all of the Structure Plan policies.									
Officer Comments	<p>a) Para 4.26 of the Plan recognises that habitats often occur as fragments and the need to prevent further fragmentation by safeguarding existing habitats and improving linkages between them. In addition Para 4.27 acknowledges that future development should seek to maintain existing habitats and reverse fragmentation by identifying areas where the biodiversity potential is the greatest. Policy E8(j) will implement this by ensuring that site evaluation is undertaken to establish the nature conservation value of proposed development sites.</p> <p>b) Policy SP1 addresses the need to respond to the implications of long term climate change. This policy defines the key elements needed to be addressed in development control and development plan making.</p> <p>c) This Deposit Plan carries forward the suite of strong environmental policies from the adopted Plan. The plan is intended to be read as a whole so it is not necessary to include environmental protection and enhancement in every single plan policy. In addition, the Deposit Plan has been through a Sustainability Appraisal process which has considered the social, economic, resource and environmental needs of the County and analysed the cross cutting and potentially conflicting issues.</p>									
Proposed Change	None									
Date Received	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date	
10/11/2003	Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Yes			
Comment No	D-0371	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	Detailed policies are inconsistent. Environmental protection and enhancement that is at core of Policy SP1 is referred to elsewhere in more restrained terms. Development is variously required to: (a) be located so as to minimise impact on the environment; (b) be allowed where there are no adverse environmental impacts; (c) balance social, transport, economic and environmental effects; (d) supported unless there are exceptional and overriding environmental impacts; (e) be assessed against impact on surrounding environment.									
Officer Comments	It is intended that the Plan should be read as a whole. It is inevitable that there will be different policy approaches for differing circumstances or issues and that it is not possible to standardise all the plan policies for this very reason. Each individual proposal is treated on its own merits according to the relevant development plan policies and any other material considerations in force at that time.									
Proposed Change	None									

Date Received 10/11/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D00	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number ---	Map/Table Diagram ---	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP? Yes	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-0372	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments A number of policies apply no particular environmental constraints or tests, while policies TP24, 25 and 26 each set a different environmental test for airport development. (More than 20 policies include a variety of tests or constraints which weaken, or in some cases conflict with, underlying principles set out at start of Plan. This approach, as well as appearing rather shambolic, actually undermines the excellent principles established at the beginning of the Plan, and in Policies E1-E14, by suggesting that certain developments need to meet lower environmental standards than others. Only once is there a specific reference to development being permitted if it brings environmental benefits, and that is in a policy relating to caravan and camping sites. While we would not expect all policies to address the environment in exactly the same way (e.g. where government dictates a certain approach, or where there is particular emphasis on internationally important wildlife areas) the basic environmental tests against which all developments are assessed should be the same. This may be remedied two ways:

- (1) remove all reference to any qualifications or tests from all policies other than E1-E14, and to clearly state that all developments must conform to these 14 policies and to Policy SP1; or
 - (2) derive a generic statement relating to environmental protection and enhancement, and to append this to all relevant policies.
- We have strong preference for (2) - longer policies but greater impact on applicants and greater reassurance for public.

Officer Comments It is intended that the Plan should be read as a whole. It is inevitable that there will be different policy approaches for differing circumstances, issues or locations, and that it is not possible to standardise all the plan policies for this very reason. The environmental policies in the Plan provide strong protection and each individual proposal should be treated on its own merits according to the relevant development plan policies and any other material considerations in force at that time.

Proposed Change None

Date Received 10/11/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D00	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number ---	Map/Table Diagram ---	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP? Yes	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-0373	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Plan provides explicit or implicit support for a number of infrastructural schemes without analysing potential environmental impact or how impact may conflict with policies for environmental protection and enhancement, e.g. FP3, TP4, TP20, TP22, TP24, TP25, WM5, M5, M6, M7, M8, M9, M10, M11. In all these cases the policies should be subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment in order that their environmental impacts are properly understood.

Officer Comments A Sustainability Appraisal has accompanied all stages of the Structure Plan's preparation in accordance with Government guidance. This has led to a Plan that has: considered the social, economic, resource and environmental needs of the County; been informed by the detailed analysis of cross cutting and potentially conflicting issues; and adopted strong sustainability principles. The Plan is intended to be read as a whole and, as specific proposals come forward, they will be tested against any relevant development plan policies and other guidance as appropriate. Individual proposals may also be subject to Environmental Impact Assessment if they meet relevant criteria.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	245	Organisation	The London Green Belt Council	Name	Mr LG Holt	Position	Hon. Secretary
------------------	------------	---------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------

Date Received 16/09/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D00	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number ---	Map/Table Diagram ---	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP? No	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-0007	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Even though Green Belt forms a minor part of KCC's total area and has policies designed to protect it in the Deposit Plan, nevertheless general comments on the Plan's contents, and Chapters, can clearly be related to Green Belt and its protection as to the County's land area at large. The critical path lies in the order of achieving the stated objectives, as between Chapters 4, 5, 8, 9 and 10, and the expansion foreshadowed in the other chapters, and will be very significant. There could be potential trouble in Chapter 9 to think that its objectives should set the pace and be a stated requisite for the other expansionist chapters if, for one reason or another, arguments become deployed to develop Green Belt, perhaps because other areas are still too difficult to develop in accordance with the Plan. The Plan should set out more precisely what chapter 4, 5, 8, 9 and 10 objectives need to be achieved before the much more obvious (and relatively easier) expansions proceed i.e. a matter of keeping chapters in step. The Monitoring Chapter may suffice to achieve this but 'resources' has the flavour of 'pious hope' which, in 11.11 in particular, seems to acknowledge that it may also be forlorn, since the next heading is 'meeting the costs of new development' and the problem is certainly recognised in 11.15: "the rapid pace of development envisaged..." But how far is 'rapid' likely to outpace e.g. chapters 8, 9 and 10 never mind the more general chapters 4 and 5.

Officer Comments It is not the case that chapters of the Plan must be read in step, rather that the Plan is intended to be read as a whole. As individual proposals come forward, they will be assessed on the relevant development plan policies and any other material considerations prevailing at that time. However, the Plan is quite firm in its commitment to maintaining the Green Belt in para 2.28 which specifically states that "no significant changes to the Green Belt are proposed in this Plan."

Proposed Change None

ID Number	246	Organisation	Weald of Kent Preservation Society	Name	Mr Hugh Cooper	Position	Secretary			
Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Support	Yes		
Comment No	D-2047	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	Very readable & user friendly layout. Most policies laudable & appropriately ambitious. Appreciated emphasis on affordable housing, sustainable communities & Green Corridor concept. Attention to environment far exceeds that of 10 years ago & welcome references to "views" (e.g. QL4) & visual impact of development.									
Officer Comments	Support noted.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	248	Organisation	Weald of Kent Preservation Society	Name	Mr Hugh Cooper	Position	Secretary			
Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-2048	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	Reservations, (a) Many policies use the word "unless". Often this weakens/nullifies preceding statement & virtually invites unscrupulous developers to argue the opposite case. (b) Too sympathetic to non-agricultural development in countryside & conversions of farm buildings to dwellings. The recent PPS7 should be most carefully studied.									
Officer Comments	a) The use of phrases such as 'unless' does not necessarily weaken a policy - instead it gives clearer guidance on those situations or circumstances where proposals may or may not be acceptable. b) The Plan contains a number of policies relating to non-agricultural development in the countryside and conversion of farm buildings to dwellings which have regard to current government guidance, including Policy FP6 (employment in rural areas), FP7 (farm diversification) and HP6 (housing in the countryside). These policies provide a sound framework for more detailed policies in local plans/local development frameworks. PPS7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas) is currently draft guidance and may still be subject to amendment, although the preparation of the Plan has largely taken this into account. Any amendments required to the Plan as a result of the publication of the 'full' version of this guidance will be carried out at that time.									
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	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-1344	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	Plan has much to commend it. Clearly laid out, covers a huge amount of ground and information in reasonable length. Would like to see further efforts to shorten it even more - the shorter it is the more likely it is to be frequently used and consulted and thus to be really worthwhile.									
Officer Comments	Noted. There is a clear trade off to be made between the length of the Plan, achieving sufficiently comprehensive coverage and providing adequate supporting justification and context.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	357	Organisation	Kent Thameside Association	Name	Mr D Nessling	Position				
Date Received	17/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-1235	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	Structure Plan is welcomed as it sets a framework through to 2021 for the LDFs and implementation process. It also means that there will be no policy vacuum as there is an up to date strategic document in place well before the RSS is developed.									
Officer Comments	Support noted.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	668	Organisation	Kent Developers Group		Name	Mr David Dye		Position	Chairman	
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-3603	Proposed Action	Proposed Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	KMSP contains no reference to the transition to the Regional Strategy. Developers need certainty & should be reassured that in a few years time proper progress of the KMSP will not be hampered by, but rather complemented by the RS.									
Officer Comments	At the time of publication of the Deposit Plan the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Bill had still to be enacted. The KMSP has an important role in maintaining a framework of strategic planning policy and guidance over the coming years and helping to set the sub regional planning agenda for Kent and Medway under the new regional planning arrangements. The introductory text of the KMSP when adopted could refer to the role of the Plan under the transitional arrangements.									
Proposed Change	Consider future reference at time of Plan adoption to the role of the Plan under the transitional arrangements.									

ID Number	712	Organisation	Maidstone Borough Council		Name	Mr Brian Morgan		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	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-0842	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	A number of policies, particularly in relation to greenfield sites, transportation and employment/retailing provision, are too restrictive and will constrain the Borough Council's ability to meet its priorities and objectives.									
Officer Comments	Statement does not amplify on what 'restrictive' means and it is assumed that the objector has raised any specific concerns through individual policy objections.									
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	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-0802	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	The photograph of the Oast House conversion on the front cover is a particularly poor example with features that would not be acceptable.									
Officer Comments	Comment noted. This is a presentational point and not relevant to the policies in the Plan.									
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	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-0802	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	The KMSP is proposing to control matters that may be covered by new legislation and regulations that will control the content of the RS and LDD's. In practice there are some policies which lie outside the current planning acts and regulations that govern what it may contain, and may therefore be ultra vires.									
Officer Comments	The Structure Plan has been prepared to take account of the fact that there will be a sub-regional policy vacuum until the new system of a Regional Spatial Strategy and Local Development Frameworks are firmly in place. This is recognised by the fact that the Structure Plan can be saved for a period of three years, or longer if appropriate, once it has been adopted. The Councils therefore need to ensure that a sound and comprehensive sub-regional policy base is in place from which the new planning system can continue.									
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	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2064	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	Well presented & gives a good overview of main planning issues affecting Kent.									
Officer Comments	Support noted.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	927	Organisation	.	Name	Mrs A Wilks	Position				
Date Received	23/10/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-0069	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	Not making best use of available building land as public buildings are being wastefully laid out. Provides example of health centre in Canterbury, which is like a bungalow with spacious grounds. Also the scheme to rebuild Bysing Wood School, Faversham, which is all one floor and Hampton Primary School, Herne Bay, which is a sprawling bungalow set in what appears to be several acres of land, only some of which is playing fields or playgrounds. Propose that public buildings be at least four or five storeys (or up to the height planners permit) and if schools insist on only using the ground floor, then flats should be built above.									
Officer Comments	Policy SS3 of the Structure Plan aims to make best use of land by prioritising previously developed land and using the sequential approach to development, whereby development locations should reflect the sequential consideration of the county's major/principal urban areas, rural service centres and smaller rural settlements. In addition, Policy QL5 reflects the importance of making effective use of development land by proposing average net densities for residential and business uses, while Policy QL6 encourages a mix of uses on development sites.									
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	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-0042	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			
Consultee Comments	Objector's primary concerns lie with the interests of the land-based sector, the rural economy and with the management of the rural environment. The Plan recognises the significance of these interests. There are many references in the Plan to the intention to support the rural economy but there is a lack of balance between those broad ambitions and others which focus on protection of the environment. Few of the Plan's objectives and policies display any explicit prioritisation, and the implicit priority favours restriction on development. Supports conservation of the countryside, but people must live and make a living in the countryside and the Plan does little more than pay lip-service to that. Instances of lack of balance are set out in specific objections.									
Officer Comments	The Plan contains policies which aim to assist the rural economy, such as FP6 (employment in rural areas) and FP7 (farm diversification). These policies allow certain types of development subject to defined criteria. The Plan also contains a suite of strong environmental protection policies. This follows government guidance (Rural White Paper, 2000), which acknowledges that planning policy should do more to support the wider rural economy, but that this should not undermine the continued protection of the countryside. Furthermore, it is intended that the Plan should be read as a whole. Each individual proposal should be treated on its own merits according to the relevant development plan policies and any other material considerations in force at that time.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	1090	Organisation	Old Road Securities Plc (ORS)	Name	Ms Kate Sylvester-Kilroy	Position	Planning Director			
Date Received	05/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-1715	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments The Plan has a high level of detail which is more suited to policies in Local Plans (or Local Development Frameworks). Thus, the thrust of policies is fairly prescriptive which goes against PPG12 that states 'The main function of the Structure Plan is to state in broad terms the general policies and proposals of strategic importance for the development and use of land in the area, taking account of national and regional policies and should concentrate on providing a strategic framework within which detailed policies can then be framed in local plans. They should not include detailed development control policies'.

Officer Comments The Structure Plan has been prepared to take account of the fact that there will be a sub-regional policy vacuum until the new system of Regional Spatial Strategy and Local Development Frameworks are firmly in place. This is recognised by the fact that the Structure Plan can be saved for a period of three years, or longer if appropriate, once it has been adopted. The Councils therefore need to ensure that a sound and comprehensive sub-regional policy base is in place from which the new planning system can continue.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	1161	Organisation	English Heritage SE	Name	Mr Steve Williams	Position	Land Use Planner			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2652	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments LATE RESPONSE (received 20:14 10/11/03)
Reference should be to land "AND BUILDINGS" throughout the whole Plan.

Officer Comments It is considered that the use of the general term 'land' is often sufficient throughout the Plan (in effect, a building would be a use of land). Where necessary, policies and text refer to either land or buildings, or have included both terms where appropriate.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	1162	Organisation	.	Name	Mr J Kircher	Position				
Date Received	26/10/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-2333	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Tell the Government and KCC how many new properties Medway can live with. Do not be forced into more than the brown sites can accept. There are too many people in Medway already, the maximum pressure should be used to push them north.

When areas are allocated for shops, work, housing, pleasure, they should be landscaped. New building/development should be subject to a bond returnable when it has disposed of debris and not flytipped. All new estates to have roads and pathways laid out first and all services laid out to prevent digging up again. The water company to be consulted to ensure that supply is available in adequate quantity. All new electricity cables to go underground - no more ugly pylons. Predetermine sites for satellite aerials, not let them spring up where they fancy.

Officer Comments The housing provision and distribution set out in the Plan for Kent and Medway in Policy HP1 is in line with current Government guidance in that the emphasis is on concentration of development in the County's towns and the fullest possible use is made of brownfield sites in accordance with Government density and quality standards. Provision also takes account of the nature of the County in terms of environmental and other constraints and distributes provision accordingly.

Policies QL12 and QL13 seek to ensure that both existing and new communities are provided with a good range of community facilities, while Policy IMP1 seeks to ensure that contributions are required from developers in appropriate cases. Other detailed matters such as landscaping and satellite aerials are an issue for Local Plans and are dealt with at the individual planning application stage.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	1225	Organisation	Brenchley Parish Council		Name	Mrs P Playfoot		Position	Clerk	
Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Technical/Info	No		
Comment No	D-2364	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	No comments to make at this stage.									
Officer Comments	Comments noted.									
Proposed Change	None									

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	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-3579	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	The term 'Kent Thameside' appears in several places in the Plan. Whilst acknowledging that this terminology is necessary in order to reflect national, regional and sub-regional planning policy guidance, preserving the identity of individual communities within the area should be paramount. It is of fundamental importance that separate references to the district communities of Dartford and Gravesham also feature within the KMSP.									
Officer Comments	When looking strategically, it is sometimes difficult to separate the individual districts of Dartford and Gravesham due to their geographical nature, the links between them (e.g. Fastrack, River Thames, the 'Green Grid', etc) and the fact that they are referred to as 'Kent Thameside' in national, regional and sub-regional planning guidance. However, the districts are referred to separately where possible, for example when allocating housing and employment land provision.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	1045	Organisation	Dartford Borough Council		Name			Position		
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-1045	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	The wording of some of the policies does not reflect the respective roles of the County and District Councils for development control matters. It would be more helpful if the Plan set out the strategic planning matters which it wishes the Districts to consider when deciding planning applications, leaving Districts to balance these against other material considerations, including the Local Plan. The plan should not specify where development will or will not be permitted, except for County Matters. The Plan's policies should be amended to remove reference to the words 'will not be permitted'.									
Officer Comments	The Structure Plan has been prepared to take account of the fact that there will be a sub-regional policy vacuum until the new system of Regional Spatial Strategy and Local Development Frameworks are firmly in place. This is recognised by the fact that the Structure Plan can be saved for a period of three years, or longer if appropriate, once it has been adopted. The Councils therefore need to ensure that a sound and comprehensive sub-regional policy base is in place from which the new planning system can continue.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number	1901	Organisation	Countryside Agency	Name	Ms Fiona Fraser-Boulton	Position				
Date Received	07/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-1944	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			

Consultee Comments The Agency welcomes the consideration and integration of sustainable development principles throughout the Plan. The Agency supports the criteria based approach that is used in a number of the Plan's policies, although it is noted that a number of policies are quite detailed and the Agency would question the extent to which this is necessary. The Plan comprehensively covers the key themes and topics.

Officer Comments The Structure Plan has been prepared to take account of the fact that there will be a sub-regional policy vacuum until the new system of Regional Spatial Strategy and Local Development Frameworks are firmly in place. This is recognised by the fact that the Structure Plan can be saved for a period of three years, or longer if appropriate, once it has been adopted. The Councils therefore need to ensure that a sound and comprehensive sub-regional policy base is in place from which the new planning system can continue.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	2121	Organisation		Name	Cllr N R D Wallace	Position	Councillor for Downs West (Ashford BC)			
Date Received	30/10/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-0901	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			

Consultee Comments The document is being drafted very quickly. The speed enhances the risk of error or omission. Maybe more resources are required to ensure its coherence and relevance.

Officer Comments Comments noted. The Councils have followed government guidance on the preparation of the Structure Plan, including adhering to statutory timescales for consultation. Consultation and the public examination of the Plan provide for the scrutiny and testing of its provisions.

Proposed Change None

Date Received	30/10/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-0908	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			

Consultee Comments The period covered by this document is very different in nature from the conditions covered by previous documents. The principal change is the proposed development of Thames Gateway and Ashford. It is not necessarily a sequitur therefore that the format of a previous plan is adequate for the current plan.

Officer Comments The Structure Plan has been prepared in accordance with government guidance, covering the necessary policy areas. Format of the Plan has changed slightly to reflect the grouping together of related themes. There is clear recognition at a number of points within the Plan of the role of the growth areas in Thames Gateway and at Ashford.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	2142	Organisation	Faversham Town Council	Name	Mrs Susan Brockman	Position	Town Clerk			
Date Received	06/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-3137	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF			

Consultee Comments Request that Faversham retains its natural boundaries, being Love Lane, the Western Link Road, the A2 and the Coast.

Officer Comments It is not the purpose of the Structure Plan to define specific boundaries for policy allocations. The issue of detailed boundaries is a matter for district local plans/LDFs.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	2143	Organisation	Kent Association of Parish Councils/Tunbridge Wells		Name	Mr David Coleman	Position	Chairman		
Date Received	06/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-3254	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	The vision for Kent in the KMSP is welcome.									
Officer Comments	Support noted.									
Proposed Change	None									
<hr/>										
ID Number	2210	Organisation	Environment Agency		Name	Mr Paul Hoppen	Position	Team Leader - Planning Liaison		
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-1520	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	The Environment Agency looks to County and Unitary Authorities to promote the Agency's concerns and priorities, and hopes to encourage the adoption of sustainable environmental solutions to development needs. Warmly supports the approach laid down in the Structure Plan and congratulates the Councils on producing an informative and well set-out Plan. The Plan's guiding principles and key themes reflect EA aims and has many shared priorities for the Kent and Medway area. Welcomes the chance to have been included at all stages of the Plan's preparation.									
Officer Comments	Comments and support noted.									
Proposed Change	None									
<hr/>										
ID Number	2238	Organisation	Egerton Parish Council		Name	S J Palmer	Position	Parish Clerk		
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Support	No		
Comment No	D-0566	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	Support all relevant polices to rural communities.									
Officer Comments	Support noted.									
Proposed Change	None									
<hr/>										
ID Number	2241	Organisation			Name	Mr David Symons	Position			
Date Received	10/11/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	---	---	Object	Yes		
Comment No	D-0571	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		
Consultee Comments	The Canterbury City Council Local Plan is in conflict with the stated aims and objectives of the emerging KMSP.									
Officer Comments	Comments noted. Under plan preparation procedures laid down by the Regulations, the County Council must issue a certificate of conformity for all district local plans. Any issues of non-conformity will be dealt with under these procedures and through formal representations to the Canterbury Local Plan Inquiry as necessary.									
Proposed Change	None									

ID Number 2257	Organisation .	Name Mrs M Brown	Position						
Date Received 09/11/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D00	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-0486	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments There is no policy which deals with the situation where developers contribute in a cumulative way towards any necessary major infrastructure improvements. Given that the main thrust of accommodating new housing is directed towards developing within town centres where development sites are likely to be small and generally dispersed, this seems a serious omission. Mr Keith Hill announced in the ODPM press release 2003.0231 that he proposes an optional charge which developers could choose to pay instead of negotiating a conventional 106 agreement. The charge would allow local authorities to spend monies on community projects - green travel plans, educational facilities or road improvements.

Officer Comments Policies QL12 and QL13 deal with the issues of existing community services and provision of new community services respectively. In addition, Policy IMP1 deals with the issue of contributions towards development. Should the Government issue any specific guidance on this issue during the preparation of the Plan, the Councils will consider this and respond accordingly.

Proposed Change None

ID Number 2259	Organisation Cobham Manor Riding Centre	Name Mr J Brumer	Position						
Date Received 10/11/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D00	Policy Number D-No Policy Ref	Paragraph Number ---	Map/Table Diagram ---	Supp/Obj Object	Participate in EIP? Yes	Withdrawn	Date
Comment No	D-0521	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Support should be given to land based industry that provide programmes that help reduce social exclusion.

Officer Comments Comments are noted. Any detailed development proposals of this nature that come forward will be assessed on their own merits against the relevant development plan policies and any other material considerations at that time.

Proposed Change None

ID Number 2363	Organisation Platt Parish Council	Name Mr D Palmer	Position Chairman						
Date Received 20/11/2003	Stage Deposit	Chapter D00	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-2780	Proposed Action	No Change			Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments LATE RESPONSE
Largely in agreement with the major policy objectives: quality of design, protection of the countryside and the Green Belt, development of brownfield sites in preference to greenfield, separation of settlements, encouragement of public transport, protection of good employment land, securing road safety, discouraging traffic from using rural lanes, and the provision of all necessary infrastructure at the same time as development takes place.

Officer Comments Support noted.

Proposed Change None

ID Number	2380	Organisation	Gravesham Borough Council		Name	Mr A J Chadwick		Position	Senior Planning Officer	
Date Received	17/10/2003	Stage	Chapter	Policy Number	Paragraph Number	Map/Table Diagram	Supp/Obj	Participate in EIP?	Withdrawn	Date
		Deposit	D00	D-No Policy Ref	- - -	- - -	Support	Don't Know		
Comment No	D-1273	Proposed Action	No Change				Case Officer	JF		

Consultee Comments Structure Plan is welcomed as it sets a framework through to 2021 for the LDFs and implementation process. It also means that there will be no policy vacuum at a critical time for Kent Thameside as there is an up to date strategic document in place well before the RSS is developed.

Officer Comments Support noted.

Proposed Change None